

Appendix 2 – Core Strategy ‘Issues & Options’ sustainability appraisal matrices

Appendix 2 contents:

Strategy – page 2

Housing – page 21

Economic Prosperity – page 60

Transport and Accessibility – page 72

Health and well being – page 81

Environmental Quality – page 81

List of the Core Strategy Issues and Options which haven’t been assessed as they aren’t ‘options’ in the plan-making sense:

S2; S4D; S5D/F; H1E; H2G; H3C/F; EP2 (A-D); EP3C; TA1D; TA4D; TA5a)E; TA6E; HW1F; HW2; EQ3a)E; EQ3b)C; EQ4D; EQ5D; EQ6D; DMTA2; DMTA3; DMTA4; DMEP3; DMEQ2; DMEQ3; DMHWB1; DMH4.

Policies that have been screened out (i.e. not formally appraised)	Reasons why
Option S4 (A, B, C, E, F)	Appraised as part of Options DMH1 and DMH2.
Option EP3 (A, B)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option EP4	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option EP5	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option TA1C	Appraised as part of Options TA1A and B.
Option TA2D	Appraised as part of TA2A-C.
Option TA4 (A-C)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option TA5a) (A-D)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option TA5b) (A-C)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option TA6 (A-E)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option TA7 (A-D)	Not a reasonable option because it goes against national policy.
Option HW1 (A-E)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option EQ4 (A-C)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.

Option EQ5 (A-C)	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option DMTA1	This policy is not considered to be likely to lead to significant effects and has therefore been screened out of consideration within the SA.
Option DMEQ5	Appraised as part of Option EQ3.

'Strategy' chapter

Option S1 – Levels of development (A) Draft RSS:		
This option would see 13,600 dwellings built within South Somerset in 2006-26, of which 6,400 would be at Yeovil (plus accompanying employment and infrastructure development).		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	New development should be directed towards the larger settlements where there is already a good access to services and facilities. Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in 'barriers to housing and services' (IMD, 2007). The provision of 7,200 dwellings outside Yeovil could help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence identified in the RSS suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	South Somerset is not particularly deprived in compared to national trends, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne in particular (IMD, 2007). New development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	There would be an under-provision of housing compared to the latest (2009) CLG household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period) or the further investigation into these figures by the district council (19,800). The SHMA states that 659 affordable homes would be needed annually to meet the needs of the community; therefore less opportunity to meet this need.	--
4. Improve health and well being	South Somerset is relatively healthy compared to national averages according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, apart from parts of Yeovil which are in the most deprived 20% in England. Additional development will require enhancements to health and leisure facilities. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being. Generally uncertain effect.	?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends. (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, Baker Assocs, 2007). The relatively low level of population increase under this option would make it difficult to support smaller rural primary schools in particular.	-

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Crime levels in South Somerset are generally relatively low compared to national average, although parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. Fear of crime is also an issue in the more urban areas at night time. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to 'design out crime'. Level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	This scenario is based upon an economic-led approach that seeks to balance housing requirement with economic growth projections. Yeovil's economy would be able to support the level of dwellings identified at the town in this scenario (Implications of ONS household projections for Somerset, 2007).	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Additional development likely to increase traffic levels, particularly in rural areas where there limited alternatives to the car. Some focus on Yeovil should reduce the need to travel where there is greater access to jobs, services and facilities. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape study identifies land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around most of the main settlements. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	South Somerset has a rich historic environment, which new development should conserve and enhance. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed, but the level of development under this scenario should enable significant adverse impacts on the historic environment to be avoided.	? / 0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Increased CO2 emissions as a result of new development, although medium-long term effects likely to reduce as building regulations require buildings to be zero carbon (2016 for residential, 2019 for non-residential). Sustainable construction should be promoted.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a negative effect on Yeovil is likely to due to significant levels of development and presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Best and most versatile agricultural land is relatively widespread around Yeovil and most of the other main settlements – development should use lower quality land in preference.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements with sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property.	? / -
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report identified a potential adverse impact on water quality on the Somerset Levels and Moors from development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, and Somerton. Population growth could result in increased recreational disturbance to birds in the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	-
Conclusion: Significant under provision of housing compared to household projections would mean the needs of the community are not met, particularly in relation to identified affordable housing need, although this scenario does have the benefit of being an economic-led approach which balances housing with forecast job creation. Less development means that the environmental effects are the lowest of the three options, although negative effects on the landscape and biodiversity will require mitigation. Increase in CO2 emissions is likely, but lower than the other two options due to less development.		

Option S1 – Levels of development (B) ONS population projections

Under this option, 16,600 dwellings would need to be provided in South Somerset, of which 7,400 dwellings would be at Yeovil and 9,200 elsewhere in the district (plus accompanying employment and infrastructure development).

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in 'barriers to housing and services' (IMD, 2007). The provision of 9,200 dwellings outside Yeovil could help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	South Somerset is not particularly deprived in general, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne in particular. New development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Under supply in housing delivery which would not meet the latest (2009) CLG household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period) or the further investigation into these figures by the district council (19,800). The SHMA states that 659 affordable homes would be needed annually to meet the needs of the community; greater potential to meet this need compared to Option S1A above.	-
4. Improve health and well being	South Somerset is relatively healthy according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation, apart from parts of Yeovil which are in the most deprived 20% in England. Additional development will require enhancements to health and leisure facilities. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being. Generally uncertain impact.	?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends. This level of growth would support existing education needs (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, 2007).	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Crime levels in South Somerset are generally relatively low, although parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. Fear of crime is also an issue in the more urban areas at night time. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to 'design out crime'. Level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population. Uncertainty as to the effect.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Yeovil's economy would be able to support the level of dwellings identified at the town (Implications of ONS household projections for Somerset, Baker Assocs 2007). Additional development compared to first option should bring further local economic prosperity to shops and other businesses.	+ +
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Additional development likely to increase traffic levels. Some focus on Yeovil should reduce the need to travel where there is greater access to jobs, services and facilities. But large amount of development in more rural areas compared to option A could increase the need to travel by car outside Yeovil. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised.	-

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape studies identify land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around the main settlements. Potential negative impact on smaller settlements due to large amount of development proposed outside Yeovil. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	South Somerset has a rich historic environment, which new development should conserve and enhance. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed, but the level of development under this scenario should enable significant adverse impacts on the historic environment to be avoided.	? / -
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Increased CO2 emissions as a result of new development, although medium-long term effects likely to reduce as building regulations require buildings to be zero carbon (2016 for residential, 2019 for non-residential). Large amount of development outside Yeovil has the potential to increase car use and therefore CO2 emissions. Sustainable construction should be promoted.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a major negative effect on Yeovil is likely to due to significant levels of development and presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Best and most versatile agricultural land is relatively widespread around Yeovil and most of the other main settlements – development should use lower quality land in preference.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements with sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property.	? / -
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report identified a potential adverse impact on water quality on the Somerset Levels and Moors from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, and Somerton. Population growth could result in increased recreational disturbance to birds in the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	-
Conclusion: Under provision of homes compared to household projections, but evidence suggests that the economy can support this level of housing development. Likely to be negative environmental effects, including development of green field land, increase in CO2 emissions, and additional car traffic. Mitigation measures are recommended to ensure these effects are minimised, such as prioritising sustainable transport modes, avoiding the development of sites of biodiversity value, and sensitive landscaping and design.		

Option S1 – Levels of development (C) Department of Communities and Local Government projection: 19,700 dwellings within South Somerset District Housing Market Area of which an undefined number of dwellings to be provided for at Yeovil

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in 'barriers to housing and services' (IMD, 2007). The provision of 19,700 dwellings should help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Substantial levels of new development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. South Somerset is not particularly deprived in general, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne in particular. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Falls slightly short of latest (2009) CLG household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period), although meets the target derived from further work carried out by the district council (19,800 dwellings). Greater opportunity to contribute to meeting affordable housing need (although lack of viability may mean will fall short of the requirement identified in the SHMA of 659 affordable homes per annum).	+
4. Improve health and well being	Significant additional development will mean greater pressure on health and leisure facilities, which will require substantial enhancements to health and leisure facilities to mitigate negative effects. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being.	-
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, 2007). This relatively high level of additional development would help to support schools, and increase the number of skilled workers in the economy.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Significant level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population. Parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to 'design out crime'. Uncertainty as to the effect.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Under this scenario the ratio of jobs to homes in South Somerset will be 0.97 in 2026, a fall from 1.09 in 2006 due to the relative increase in housing compared to job provision. Although some demand for housing will be from non-economically active households (e.g. retired people), this will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities and potentially exacerbate outward commuting. Therefore, this option would not foster balanced economic growth or provide jobs for all. On the other hand, additional development/population is likely to promote local economic prosperity generally, e.g. for shops and other businesses.	-
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Significant level of development that is likely to increase traffic levels given the general lack of alternatives to the car in this rural district. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised to minimise the growth of congestion, CO2 emissions and impact on air quality. If housing growth outside Yeovil is too dispersed it is likely to encourage commuting.	--

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape study identifies land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around most of the main settlements. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated.	--
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	This level of development is likely to negatively impact on South Somerset's rich historic environment which includes over 80 conservation areas, 15 historic parks and gardens, and thousands of listed buildings. Potential for significant negative effect at Yeovil given the presence of four historic parks and gardens on the periphery of the town, as well as numerous listed buildings and some conservation areas. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed.	? / --
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Significant amount of new development will increase CO2 emissions. Medium term negative effects of new buildings increasing CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a major negative effect on Yeovil is likely to be due to the presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Therefore new development should ensure that alternatives to the car are prioritised. Recent evidence from Wessex Water (to inform the Appropriate Assessment) does not envisage any particular issues with waste water treatment or water supply up to 2015. Best and most versatile agricultural land is widespread around Yeovil, and also present around most of the other main settlements – development should use lower quality land in preference which would be very challenging at Yeovil under this scenario.	--
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements. Sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue, and potential for this to worsen with significant development here. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property.	-
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report identified a potential adverse impact on water quality on the Somerset Levels and Moors from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, and Somerton. Population growth could result in increased recreational disturbance to birds in the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA – the high growth under this scenario would increase the likelihood of adverse effects. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	-
<p>Conclusion: The significant effects are very similar to Option S1D, the key difference being general uncertainty due to less prescription on the distribution of development. Positive effect of meeting the community's need for new homes, and the potential to provide high levels of affordable housing. High level of development could help to make services and facilities more viable, although infrastructure improvements will be required to ensure the effect is not negative. Relative increase in homes compared to job creation in this option will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities, and potentially exacerbate outward commuting. Potential for significant environmental impact and increased CO2 emissions – negative effect on landscape and townscape, biodiversity, historic environment, pollution, loss of high quality agricultural land, and increased traffic levels.</p>		

Option S1 – Levels of development (D) Draft RSS EiP Panel Report recommendation – subsequently incorporated within the Secretary of State’s Proposed Changes to the RSS

This option would see 19,700 dwellings in South Somerset, of which 6,400 should be within the existing urban area of Yeovil and 5,000 in an ‘area of search’ on the edge of Yeovil, and 8,300 elsewhere in South Somerset (outside Yeovil) (plus accompanying employment and infrastructure development). Compared to the draft RSS, this represents a 45% increase on the total number of homes, and a 78% increase at Yeovil specifically. A key difference with the other options is the significant scale of additional housing at Yeovil which, under this option, would see a 59% growth in its housing stock.

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in ‘barriers to housing and services’ (IMD, 2007). The provision of 8,300 dwellings outside Yeovil could help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Substantial levels of new development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. South Somerset is not particularly deprived in general, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne in particular. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Falls slightly short of latest (2009) CLG household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period), although meets the target derived from further work carried out by the district council (19,800 dwellings). Greater opportunity to contribute to meeting affordable housing need (although lack of viability may mean will fall short of the requirement identified in the SHMA of 659 affordable homes per annum).	+
4. Improve health and well being	Significant additional development will mean greater pressure on health and leisure facilities, which will require substantial enhancements to health and leisure facilities to mitigate negative effects. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being.	-
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, 2007). This relatively high level of additional development would help to support schools, and increase the number of skilled workers in the economy.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Significant level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population. Parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to ‘design out crime’. Uncertainty as to the effect.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Under this scenario the ratio of jobs to homes in South Somerset will be 0.97 in 2026, a fall from 1.09 in 2006 due to the relative increase in housing compared to job provision. Although some demand for housing will be from non-economically active households (e.g. retired people), this will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities and potentially exacerbate outward commuting. Evidence suggests Yeovil’s economy would not be able to support the level of dwellings identified at the town (Implications of ONS household projections for Somerset, 2007). Therefore, this option would not foster balanced economic growth or provide jobs for all. On the other hand, additional development/population is likely to promote local economic prosperity generally, e.g. for shops and other businesses.	-

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Significant level of development that is likely to increase traffic levels given the general lack of alternatives to the car in this rural district. The focus on Yeovil should ensure greater access to jobs, services and facilities by reducing the need to travel, but is likely to require significant improvements to road infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised to minimise the growth of congestion, CO2 emissions and impact on air quality. If housing growth outside Yeovil is too dispersed it is likely to encourage commuting.	--
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape study identifies land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around most of the main settlements. There could be a particularly negative impact on the landscape and townscape on Yeovil given the level of development proposed. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated.	--
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	This level of development is likely to negatively impact on South Somerset's rich historic environment which includes over 80 conservation areas, 15 historic parks and gardens, and thousands of listed buildings. Potential for significant negative effect at Yeovil given the presence of four historic parks and gardens on the periphery of the town, as well as numerous listed buildings and some conservation areas. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed.	? / --
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Significant amount of new development will increase CO2 emissions. Medium term negative effects of new buildings increasing CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. Greater focus on Yeovil should maximise use of sustainable travel modes. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a major negative effect on Yeovil is likely to due to significant levels of development and presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Therefore new development should ensure that alternatives to the car are prioritised. Potential negative impact on water quality although evidence from EA ¹ is that there is capacity to handle increased flows associated with the additional 5,000 dwelling Yeovil urban extension, but this did not consider the remainder of the housing growth in the district. Recent evidence from Wessex Water (to inform the Appropriate Assessment) does not envisage any particular issues with waste water treatment or water supply up to 2015. Best and most versatile agricultural land is widespread around Yeovil, and also present around most of the other main settlements – development should use lower quality land in preference which would be very challenging at Yeovil under this scenario.	--
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements. Sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue, and potential for this to worsen with significant development here. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property.	-

¹ Draft RSS SW Panel Report, The EA's observations on housing growth and waste water treatment, EA, March 2008.

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report identified a potential adverse impact on water quality on the Somerset Levels and Moors from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, and Somerton. Population growth could result in increased recreational disturbance to birds in the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA – the high growth under this scenario, particularly at Yeovil would increase the likelihood of adverse effects. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	-
<p>Conclusion: Positive effect of meeting the community's need for new homes, and the potential to provide high levels of affordable housing. High level of development could help to make services and facilities more viable, although infrastructure improvements will be required to ensure the effect is not negative. Relative increase in homes compared to job creation in this option will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities, and potentially exacerbate outward commuting. Potential for significant environmental impact (particularly at Yeovil) and increased CO2 emissions – negative effect on landscape and townscape, biodiversity, historic environment, pollution, loss of high quality agricultural land, and increased traffic levels.</p>		

Option S1 – Levels of development (E) Growth in excess of 19,700 dwellings reflecting the Government's Housing Green Paper "Homes for the future: more affordable, more sustainable" (July 2007)		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although access to services in the main settlements is relatively good, most of rural South Somerset is in the most deprived 20% in England in 'barriers to housing and services' (IMD, 2007). The substantial extra provision of dwellings could help to make services and facilities more viable, although evidence suggests that population growth and the delivery of more housing in villages may not solely be the solution to rural service decline.	+ / ?
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Substantial levels of new development should bring economic and housing opportunities that should help to tackle poverty and social exclusion. South Somerset is not particularly deprived in general, although there are pockets of deprivation in Yeovil, Chard, and Crewkerne. Fuel poverty can be assisted through the development of energy efficient buildings.	+ + / ?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Greater opportunity to meet housing needs identified in latest household projections (22k increase in homes over plan period). Also more ability to contribute to meeting affordable housing need (although lack of viability may mean will fall short of the requirement identified in the SHMA of 659 affordable homes per annum).	+ + / ?
4. Improve health and well being	Significant additional development will mean greater pressure on health and leisure facilities, which will require substantial enhancements to health and leisure facilities to mitigate negative effects. The provision of open space and green infrastructure should be encouraged to improve health and well being.	- / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Somerset is characterised by having many small primary schools, reflecting the rural characteristics of the area – a general decline is predicted in the number of primary school pupils in Somerset, in line with national trends (Implications of ONS Household Projections for Somerset, 2007). This relatively high level of additional development would help to support schools, and increase the number of skilled workers in the economy.	+ / ?

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Significant level of development that should be matched by improvements in service provision in order to ensure that crime does not increase with additional population. Parts of Yeovil are in the 20% most deprived in England for crime rates. High quality design standards in new developments should be incorporated in order to 'design out crime'. Uncertainty as to the effect.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The relative increase in housing compared to job provision will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities and potentially exacerbate outward commuting, although some demand for housing will be from non-economically active households (e.g. retired people). Therefore, this option would not foster balanced economic growth or provide jobs for all. On the other hand, additional development/population is likely to promote local economic prosperity generally, e.g. for shops and other businesses.	- / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Significant level of development that is likely to increase traffic levels given the general lack of alternatives to the car in this rural district. This is likely to require significant improvements to road infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic. Sustainable transport modes should be prioritised to minimise the growth of congestion, CO2 emissions and impact on air quality. If housing growth outside Yeovil is too dispersed it is likely to encourage commuting.	-- / ?
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The rural nature of South Somerset means that the landscape is a prime element of the district's character. The peripheral landscape study identifies land with landscape capacity to accommodate new development around most of the main settlements. The level of development in this option is likely to mean a particularly negative impact on the landscape and townscape. Sensitive design standards should be incorporated as mitigation measures.	-- / ?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	This level of development is likely to negatively impact on South Somerset's rich historic environment which includes over 80 conservation areas, 15 historic parks and gardens, and thousands of listed buildings. Potential for significant negative effect at Yeovil given the presence of four historic parks and gardens on the periphery of the town, as well as numerous listed buildings and some conservation areas. More precise effects should become apparent when specific locations for development are proposed.	-- / ?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Significant amount of new development will increase CO ₂ emissions. Medium term negative effects of new buildings increasing CO ₂ emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. New development should be located and designed to cope with hotter, drier summers and warmer, wetter winters.	- / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Deterioration in air quality due to additional traffic generated by new development – a major negative effect on Yeovil is likely to be due to presence of the Air Quality Management Area. Therefore new development should ensure that alternatives to the car are prioritised. Potential negative impact on water quality, although short term forecasts from Wessex Water does not envisage any particular issues with waste water treatment or water supply up to 2015. Best and most versatile agricultural land is widespread around most of the main settlements in South Somerset – development should use lower quality land in preference which would be very challenging at Yeovil in particular.	- / ?
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Some uncertainty until more precise locations for development are proposed – fluvial flood risk and surface water flooding is an issue at many of the main settlements. Sewer flooding at Yeovil identified as a particular issue, and potential for this to worsen with significant development here. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged in order to minimise flood risk to people and property.	- / ?

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Appropriate Assessment Scoping Report identified a potential adverse impact on water quality on the Somerset Levels and Moors from potential development at Martock, South Petherton, Langport/Huish Episcopi, and Somerton. Population growth could result in increased recreational disturbance to birds in the Somerset Levels and Moors SPA – the high growth under this scenario, particularly at Yeovil would increase the likelihood of adverse effects. European Protected Species are widely present in the district, particularly around Yeovil, Chard and Ilminster – need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	- / ?
Conclusion: Largely similar SA effects to Option S1 D, although general uncertainty across all objectives due to the lack of prescription over the scale and location of development. The effect of meeting the community's need for new homes, and the potential to provide high levels of affordable housing are positive. High level of development could help to make services and facilities more viable, although infrastructure improvements will be required to ensure the effect is not negative. Relative increase in homes compared to job creation in this option will make it harder for those living in South Somerset to access suitable local employment opportunities, and potentially exacerbate outward commuting. Potential for significant environmental impact (particularly at Yeovil) and increased CO2 emissions – negative effect on landscape and townscape, biodiversity, historic environment, pollution, loss of high quality agricultural land, and increased traffic levels.		

Option S3 (A) –Distribute the residual (non-Yeovil) dwellings and commensurate jobs, infrastructure etc to only Development Policy B settlements		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Development Policy B settlements, by definition, will be the focus for services and facilities and have the best opportunities to walk, cycle and use public transport outside Yeovil. Therefore, only allowing development at these settlements will ensure new residents have high levels of accessibility and promote social inclusion, although there may be a negative impact on rural areas due to limited development opportunities.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The concentration of new development at Policy B settlements could benefit particularly deprived areas through additional investment – the most deprived areas (outside Yeovil) are Chard and Crewkerne. More focussed development could help minimise fuel poverty through reduced travel distances and therefore lower travel costs.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Although the total dwelling figure concurs with ONS population projections 2004, the focus of development solely on Policy B settlements may not meet the geographic range of housing need in the smaller settlements, particularly affordable housing need in rural areas.	+ / - -
4. Improve health and well being	The impact of construction may cause a temporary short term negative impact on health (impact on noise, vibration, air quality). Policy B settlements, by definition, should contain 'strategic'/high quality health facilities; meaning future residents should have good access to these facilities and this growth may bring opportunity for enhancement of these facilities at Policy B settlements. However, the restriction of development outside Policy B settlements could undermine the viability of health facilities in rural areas.	+ / -
5. Improve education and skills of the population	The focus of development at Policy B settlements should help improve education and skills as education facilities are already in place, and new development could contribute to enhancing these facilities. New development would bring additional workers. However, the restriction of development outside Policy B settlements could affect the viability of schools in rural areas.	+ / -

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The incorporation of high quality design standards in new developments can offer the opportunity to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at a site specific level.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional development will benefit the district's economy generally, but the benefits will be limited to Policy B settlements to the potential detriment of the more rural areas, and town and local centre vitality in C settlements. Tourism opportunities in rural areas may also be adversely affected. A positive effect is that accessibility to work by foot, bike and public transport is generally better in B settlements.	+ / -
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Although accessibility is generally better at B settlements meaning the need to travel is reduced in these places, the lack of development in more rural areas will mean the need to travel will increase for rural residents in large parts of the district. Congestion could increase at B settlements so sustainable travel should be prioritised at these places.	--
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The landscape and townscape of non-B settlements will be protected, but there will greater impact on B settlements so high quality design should be incorporated. Given that brownfield land tends to be concentrated in larger settlements, this strategy should have a positive impact on reducing the amount of derelict land. High quality design should be required.	+ / -
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	South Somerset has a high quality historic environment, and all B settlements contain Conservation Areas. Generally uncertain effect until more precise locations for development are determined, but adverse effects on the historic environment should be mitigated.	? / -
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Medium term impact of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. Carbon dioxide emissions from transport as a result of new development may be minimised through only permitting development at the most accessible settlements. However travel from C settlements and rural areas to B settlements could increase due to lack of employment development outside B settlements; so overall a neutral impact is proposed. Sustainable construction should be encouraged in new development, including water efficiency measures, in order to adapt to climate change.	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Any adverse impacts upon air / water quality, and pollution will be disproportionately focussed on B settlements; although sustainable travel should be easier to achieve in B settlements. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. New development should seek to use lower quality agricultural land ahead of best and most versatile land where possible.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed – fluvial flood risk is an issue in some B settlements but not others. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed, but need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	? / -
Conclusion: Limiting new development to only B settlements will help to reduce the need to travel and ensure new residents have good access to jobs, shops and community facilities. This approach would also limit adverse environmental impacts to B settlements. However, there are likely to be negative effects for the rural areas through limited economic benefits, rural housing need not being met, and potential negative impact on the viability of rural services.		

Option S3 (B) – Distribute the residual dwellings and commensurate jobs, infrastructure etc to only some Development Policy B (Market Towns) and C (small towns and villages) settlements		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	By definition, Development Policy B and C settlements contain essential services and facilities, and therefore focussing development at these settlements should ensure high levels of accessibility. Uncertainty as to where development will be directed due to the term 'some' settlements.	+ / ?
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Uncertainty dependent on how development is distributed. Development opportunities should be help particularly deprived areas (outside Yeovil) i.e. parts of Chard.	?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Supply of new housing to meet need is positive, but uncertainty as to its distribution.	+ / ?
4. Improve health and well being	The impact of construction may cause a temporary short term negative impact on health (impact on noise, vibration, air quality). Development will be directed to settlements that should contain health facilities i.e. B and C settlements, although C settlements may not contain sports facilities that would encourage healthy lifestyles e.g. swimming pool, sports centre.	+ / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	New development at B and C settlements will ensure a high proportion of the future population will have good access to education and skills. New development would bring an additional supply of workers.	+ / ?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The incorporation of high quality design standards in new developments can offer the opportunity to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at a site specific level.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Most employment opportunities are in B and C settlements, and this spatial strategy option would allow this to continue. There is potential to walk, cycle and use public transport in B and C settlements. Additional development at B and C settlements should promote town and local centre vitality and viability, which could benefit tourism. Uncertainty as to where development will be directed due to the term 'some' settlements.	++ / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Given the rural nature of South Somerset (outside Yeovil), additional development is likely to lead to increased congestion generally. However the focus at B and C settlements (where jobs, shops, community facilities are located) should ensure that the need to travel is reduced, and promote non-car transport modes. In order to reduce the need to travel, new development should be directed to B settlements that contain 'strategic' services and facilities, and sustainable travel prioritised.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The distribution of development to some B and C settlements could have a negative effect on the landscape and townscape at some of these settlements, although it will mean that smaller, rural settlements are protected. High quality design should be incorporated that fosters local distinctiveness. Uncertainty as to where development will be directed due to the term 'some' settlements.	- / ?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	South Somerset has a high quality historic environment, and all B and C settlements contain Conservation Areas. Generally uncertain effect until more precise locations for development are determined, but adverse effects on the historic environment should be mitigated.	- / ?

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The approach of distributing development to all B and C settlements should ensure the need to travel is minimised. Medium term impact of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. Sustainable construction should be encouraged in new development, including water efficiency measures, in order to adapt to climate change.	- / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The focus of development at B and C settlements should minimise pollution by reducing the need to travel, and disperse impacts on air and water quality. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. New development should seek to use lower quality agricultural land ahead of best and most versatile land where possible.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged.	?
Conclusion: There is general uncertainty associated with this option, as it does not prescribe how development will be distributed to B and C settlements. The distribution of development to all of the main settlements in the district should ensure that the need to travel is reduced, and public transport opportunities are maximised. There could be some negative environmental impacts due to additional development, particularly on the character of some of the smaller C settlements.		

Option S3 (C) – Distribute the residual dwellings and commensurate jobs, infrastructure etc to all Development Policy B and C settlements		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	By definition, Development Policy B and C settlements contain essential services and facilities, and therefore focussing development at these settlements should ensure high levels of accessibility. This more dispersed approach of directing development to all B and C settlements could ensure the benefits of additional development are felt more widely by, for example, maintaining the viability of services that could be an issue at C settlements in particular.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Uncertainty dependent on how development is distributed, the dispersal of development across B and C settlements may not maximise opportunities in particularly deprived areas (outside Yeovil) i.e. parts of Chard.	? / -
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The dispersal of development across B and C settlements would ensure housing need would be met more widely across the district.	+
4. Improve health and well being	The impact of construction may cause a temporary short term negative impact on health (impact on noise, vibration, air quality). Development will be directed to settlements that should contain health facilities i.e. B and C settlements, although C settlements may not contain sports facilities that would encourage healthy lifestyles e.g. swimming pool, sports centre.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	The focus on B and C settlements will ensure a high proportion of the future population will have good access to education and skills. New development would bring an additional supply of workers.	++

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The incorporation of high quality design standards in new developments can offer the opportunity to 'design out crime'. The effect should be more certain at a site specific level.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Most employment opportunities are in B and C settlements, and this spatial strategy option would allow this to continue. There is potential to walk, cycle and use public transport in B and C settlements. Additional development at B and C settlements should promote town and local centre vitality and viability, which could benefit tourism.	++
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Given the rural nature of South Somerset (outside Yeovil), additional development is likely to lead to increased congestion generally. However the focus at B and C settlements (where jobs, shops, community facilities are located) should ensure that the need to travel is reduced, and promote non-car transport modes. In order to reduce the need to travel, the focus for development should be at B settlements that contain 'strategic' services and facilities, and sustainable travel prioritised.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The distribution of development to all C settlements could have a negative effect on the landscape and townscape at some of these settlements, although it will mean that smaller, rural settlements are protected. High quality design should be incorporated that fosters local distinctiveness.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	South Somerset has a high quality historic environment, and all B and C settlements contain Conservation Areas. Generally uncertain effect until more precise locations for development are determined, but adverse effects on the historic environment should be mitigated.	? / -
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The approach of distributing development to all B and C settlements should ensure the need to travel is minimised. Medium term impact of new buildings likely to mean increased CO2 emissions unless/until zero carbon development is achieved – building regulations will require new dwellings to be zero carbon from 2016 and non-residential from 2019. Sustainable construction should be encouraged in new development, including water efficiency measures, in order to adapt to climate change.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The focus of development at B and C settlements should minimise pollution by reducing the need to travel, and disperse impacts on air and water quality. There will be a short term negative effect associated with construction e.g. vibration, noise. New development should seek to use lower quality agricultural land ahead of best and most versatile land where possible.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed. Sequential test should be applied and SUDS encouraged.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Uncertain until location/scale of development are proposed, but need to ensure that designated sites and protected species are avoided or any harm is mitigated.	?
Conclusion: This more dispersed approach of directing development to all B and C settlements would ensure the social and economic benefits of additional development are felt more widely. The distribution of development to all of the main settlements in the district should ensure that the need to travel is reduced, and public transport opportunities are maximised. There could be some negative environmental impacts due to additional development, particularly on the character of some of the smaller C settlements.		

D. An alternative option – the following options were suggested through public consultation on the 'Issues & Options'.

- A new settlement – this was not subject to SA as it was contrary to RSS Proposed Changes policy. It is worth noting that the Sustainability Appraisal of the RSS Proposed Changes does recommend that, given the substantial further increase in housing growth in the south west, the option of building one or more large new settlements in the region should be considered in an early review of the RSS.

- 60% of new development at Yeovil, Chard, Crewkerne; 30% to Ilminster, Wincanton, Somerton, Martock; 8% to South Petherton, Milborne Port, Bruton, Tatworth and Forton, Castle Cary, Ilchester; 2% to Curry Rivel, Stoke Sub Hamdon, West Coker, Merriot – this was not subject to SA as it is contrary to RSS Proposed Changes policy which states that nearly 60% of new development should be at Yeovil alone.

Option S5 – Sustainable Development – What should the Core Strategy's target for development taking place on Previously Developed Land (PDL) be?		
<p>A. 40%; B. 50%; C. 60%; D. An alternative percentage; E. Locationally-specific target percentages should be set for different Development Policy A, B and C settlements (SSCT's, Market Towns, Small Towns & Villages) and elsewhere; F. An alternative option.</p> <p>Options A and B have been appraised together as they would result in similar impact on the environment and are also both close to the 45% target set in the South Somerset Local Plan 2006. Options D and F have not been appraised as no alternatives were suggested at consultation.</p>		
Options A. 40% & B. 50%		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Since April 2001 about 50% of housing completions, housing under construction and housing commitments have occurred on PDL within development areas, with most development outside development areas being on greenfield sites. The promotion of PDL for housing development would therefore encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy will limit number of settlements that will be designated for growth, reducing the availability of PDL. Changes in PPS 3 regarding garden land will further reduce the amount of PDL available for development.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The use of disused land in urban areas will reduce the impact of development in rural locations.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The use of PDL can involve much costs to the developer (eg due the costs of dealing with contamination) and therefore may not improve affordability. Although it will contribute to the housing supply the housing will need to be supplied whether PDL or greenfield land is used.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The promotion of PDL for housing development would encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Disused sites can be attractive for criminal activity. Their use for housing development can give opportunities for reducing this criminal activity and promoting greater surveillance of the area.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The use of PDL could lead to loss of employment sites. However as many sites are within the larger settlements they could increase accessibility to work, services and facilities, and promote town centre vitality in those settlements.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	PDL sites within main settlements could reduce the need to travel for employment, or to access services and facilities. However congestion within settlements could be exacerbated; therefore sustainable travel modes should be encouraged.	+

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of sites and to provide new recreational open space.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of the historic environment.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The use of PDL for housing development will reduce the use of greenfield sites. However pollution within a settlement could be increased.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: The target of 45% for the Local Plan period, to 2011, has been well exceeded over the past few years, partly due to the application of the PDL policies advocated by PPG3/PPS3, and partly due to delays in the coming forward of Local Plan housing allocations that are mainly greenfield sites. However, this percentage is anticipated to decrease substantially due to a reduction in housing commitments on brownfield land (22% in 2008/9 as opposed to 48% in 2007/8) and as Local Plan allocated sites come forward. It is important to encourage the use of PDL for housing development as it can have a significant effect on the efficient use of land. However, it is important not to promote PDL as an over-riding priority as the site may not always be in the most sustainable location, or housing the most sustainable use.</p>		

Option S5 – Sustainable Development		
What should the Core Strategy's target for development taking place on Previously Developed Land (PDL) be? Option C. 60%		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Since April 2001 about 50% of housing completions, housing under construction and housing commitments have occurred on PDL within development areas, with most development outside development areas being on greenfield sites. The promotion of PDL for housing development would therefore encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy will limit the number of settlements that will be designated for growth, reducing the availability of PDL. Changes in PPS 3 regarding garden land will further reduce the amount of PDL available for development.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The use of disused land in urban areas will reduce the impact of development in rural locations.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The use of PDL can involve higher costs to the developer (e.g. due to the costs of dealing with contamination) and therefore may not improve affordability. Although it will contribute to the housing supply the housing will need to be supplied whether PDL or greenfield land is used.	0

4. Improve health and well being	The promotion of PDL for housing development would encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Disused sites can attract criminal activity. Their use for housing development can give opportunities for reducing this criminal activity and promoting greater surveillance of the area.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The use of PDL could lead to loss of employment sites. However as many sites are within the larger settlements they could increase accessibility to work, services and facilities, and promote town centre vitality in those settlements.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	PDL sites within main settlements could reduce the need to travel for employment, or to access services and facilities. However congestion within settlements could be exacerbated, therefore sustainable travel modes should be encouraged.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of sites and to provide new recreational open space.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of the historic environment.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The use of PDL for housing development will reduce the use of greenfield sites. However pollution within a settlement could be increased.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: This option has the most benefits through reduction in the loss of greenfield land as a result of greater development on brownfield sites. The target of 45% for the Local Plan period, to 2011, has been well exceeded over the past few years, partly due to the application of the PDL policies advocated by national policy, and partly due to delays in the coming forward of Local Plan housing allocations that are mainly greenfield sites. However, this percentage is anticipated to decrease substantially due to a reduction in housing commitments on brownfield land (22% in 2008/9 as opposed to 48% in 2007/8) and as Local Plan allocated sites come forward. It is important to encourage the use of PDL for housing development as it can have a significant effect on the efficient use of land. However, it is important not to promote PDL as an over-riding priority as the site may not always be in the most sustainable location, or housing the most sustainable use.</p>		

Option S5 – Sustainable Development
What should the Core Strategy's target for development taking place on Previously Developed Land (PDL) be?
Option E. Locationally-specific target percentages should be set for different Development Policy A, B and C settlements (SSCT's, Market Towns, Small Towns & Villages) and elsewhere

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Since April 2001 about 50% of housing completions, housing under construction and housing commitments have occurred on PDL within development areas, with most development outside development areas being on greenfield sites. The promotion of PDL for housing development would therefore encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities. However, the Core Strategy will limit number of settlements that will be designated for growth, reducing the availability of PDL. Changes in PPS 3 regarding garden land will further reduce the amount of PDL available for development.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The use of disused land in urban areas will reduce the impact of development in rural locations.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The use of PDL can involve higher costs to the developer (e.g. due the costs of dealing with contamination) and therefore may not improve affordability. Although it will contribute to the housing supply the housing will need to be supplied whether PDL or greenfield land is used.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The promotion of PDL for housing development would encourage development in the most sustainable locations, ensuring high levels of accessibility to services and facilities.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Disused sites can be attractive for criminal activity. Their use for housing development can give opportunities for reducing this criminal activity and promoting greater surveillance of the area.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The use of PDL could lead to loss of employment sites. However as many sites are within the larger settlements they could increase accessibility to work, services and facilities, and promote town centre vitality in those settlements.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	PDL sites within main settlements could reduce the need to travel for employment, or to access services and facilities. However congestion within settlements could be exacerbated; therefore sustainable travel modes should be encouraged.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Positive effect of locationally specific PDL targets would consider townscape character and should therefore protect and enhance townscape. The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of sites and to provide new recreational open space.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	The use of PDL for housing development can afford opportunities for the enhancement of the historic environment.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The use of PDL for housing development will reduce the use of greenfield sites. However pollution within a settlement could be increased.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: Locationally specific targets would have the positive benefit of considering townscape character and therefore protect and enhance townscape. The target of 45% for the Local Plan period, to 2011, has been well exceeded over the past few years, partly due to the application of the PDL policies advocated by PPG3/PPS3, and partly due to delays in the coming forward of Local Plan housing allocations that are mainly greenfield sites. However, this percentage is anticipated to decrease substantially due to a reduction in housing commitments on brownfield land (22% in 2008/9 as opposed to 48% in 2007/8) and as Local Plan allocated sites come forward. It is important to encourage the use of PDL for housing development as it can have a significant effect on the efficient use of land. However, it is important not to promote PDL as an over-riding priority as the site may not always be in the most sustainable location, or housing the most sustainable use.</p>		

'Housing' chapter (including Development Management policies section)

Option H1 – Affordable Housing threshold		
A. All sites (1 or 2 dwellings requiring a commuted sum with on site provision for 3 or more dwellings)		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	PPS 3: Housing states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 15 dwellings, however it also accepts that local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds where viable and practicable. An informed assessment of economic viability of site thresholds as well as the extent to which smaller sites can contribute to supply is therefore required. The SHMA (2009) indicates that in light of the evidence gathered a case can be made on supply and viability grounds (SHLVA) for a general threshold of 10 dwellings in South Somerset. The evidence suggests that in rural areas thresholds should be set as low as possible however any threshold below 10 would require further economic appraisal. That additional economic appraisal was carried out in May 2010 and the Annex to the SHLVA shows that a threshold of 6 dwellings would be viable. Seeking a contribution from all sites would mean that an affordable housing contribution can be sought on more sites than if the national indicative minimum was adopted. Whilst a contribution from all sites would increase affordable housing supply (therefore going further towards meeting the need of 659 affordable homes per annum) evidence shows that issues of viability would arise (PPS 3 expects viability to be taken into account).	++
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+

5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: An affordable housing contribution on all sites either by a commuted sum or on site (3 or more dwellings) would lead to the provision of more affordable homes or commuted sums towards their provision and contribute to meeting the need in the District; with more sites being expected to contribute towards affordable housing provision than at present (currently the national indicative minimum threshold of 15 dwellings is being applied). However evidence shows that this would lead to viability issues, which should be taken into account.		

B. 5 dwellings or more		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need.	++

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	PPS 3: Housing states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 15 dwellings, however it also accepts that local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds where viable and practicable. An informed assessment of economic viability of site thresholds as well as the extent to which smaller sites can contribute to supply is therefore required. The SHMA (2009) indicates that in light of the evidence gathered a case can be made on supply and viability grounds (SHLVA) for a general threshold of 10 dwellings in South Somerset. The evidence suggests that in rural areas thresholds should be set as low as possible however any threshold below 10 would require further economic appraisal. That additional economic appraisal was carried out in May 2010 and the Annex to the SHLVA shows that a threshold of 6 dwellings would be viable This lower threshold means that an affordable housing contribution can be sought on more sites than if the national indicative minimum was adopted or even that suggested in the original SHLVA. So whilst a threshold of 5 would contribute towards meeting need evidence shows issues of viability would arise (PPS 3 expects viability to be taken into account).	+
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0

Conclusion: A threshold of 5 would lead to the provision of more affordable homes and contribute to meeting the need in the District; with more sites being expected to contribute towards affordable housing provision than at present (currently the national indicative minimum threshold of 15 dwellings is being applied). However, evidence shows that a threshold as low as 5 would lead to viability issues which should be taken into account.

C. 10 dwellings or more		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	PPS 3: Housing states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 15 dwellings, however it also accepts that local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds where viable and practicable. An informed assessment of economic viability of site thresholds as well as the extent to which smaller sites can contribute to supply is therefore required. The SHMA (2009) indicates that in light of the evidence gathered a case can be made on supply and viability grounds (SHLVA) for a general threshold of 10 dwellings in South Somerset. The evidence suggests that in rural areas thresholds should be set as low as possible however any threshold below 10 would require further economic appraisal. That additional economic appraisal was carried out in May 2010 and the Annex to the SHLVA shows that a threshold of 6 dwellings would be viable. This lower threshold means that an affordable housing contribution can be sought on more sites than if the national indicative minimum was adopted or even that suggested in the original SHLVA. Whilst a threshold of 10 would result in the number of affordable homes in the District being increased and contribute towards reducing homelessness the evidence shows that the threshold could be set lower.	+
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: A threshold of 10 would lead to more sites being expected to contribute towards affordable housing provision than at present (currently the national indicative minimum threshold of 15 dwellings is being applied), this would have the positive impact of increasing the supply of affordable housing thus contributing towards meeting the annual need of 659 dwellings however viability evidence shows that the threshold can be set lower which would result in more affordable homes being provided.</p>		

D. 15 dwellings or more		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need.	+

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	PPS 3: Housing states that the national indicative minimum site size threshold for the provision of affordable housing is 15 dwellings, however it also accepts that local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds where viable and practicable. An informed assessment of economic viability of site thresholds as well as the extent to which smaller sites can contribute to supply is therefore required. The SHMA (2009) indicates that in light of the evidence gathered a case can be made on supply and viability grounds (SHLVA) for a general threshold of 10 dwellings in South Somerset. The evidence suggests that in rural areas thresholds should be set as low as possible however any threshold below 10 would require further economic appraisal. That additional economic appraisal was carried out in May 2010 and the Annex to the SHLVA shows that a threshold of 6 dwellings would be viable. The retention of the current threshold of 15 (the national indicative minimum) would be contrary to the evidence presented in the SHMA, SHLVA and SHLVA Annex and would potentially result in less affordable housing being delivered than might otherwise be possible.	-
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: The retention of the current threshold of 15 (the national indicative minimum) would be contrary to the evidence arising from the SHMA, SHLVA and SHLVA Annex and whilst the delivery of any affordable housing is a positive the adoption of a lower threshold would maximise the potential to deliver more affordable home and meet the needs of the District.		

Option H2 – Affordable housing target

A. Maintain 35% across the district

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset.	++
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: The provision of 35% affordable housing will help meet the need identified in the SHMA the evidence form the SHLVA can be used to inform negotiations on viability. Additional affordable housing will help to reduce social exclusion by improving access to accommodation for those who are not able to access market housing.		

B. Set a higher district-wide target based on most recent evidence		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. Whilst setting a higher target will contribute to meeting the need for affordable homes it is not supported by the viability evidence in the SHLVA.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: The evidence in the SHMA (2009) supports a target of 35% (based on the level of need) – the option to set a higher target could not be supported.		

C. Developments in Yeovil to provide a higher percentage than elsewhere		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. Concentrating a higher proportion of affordable housing in Yeovil is likely to lead to problems of social exclusion elsewhere in the district.	0

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the needs of the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in one area which is what this option is suggesting. The SHMA shows that the highest future need for affordable housing will be in Yeovil however this is not surprising given the fact that it is the largest settlement in the District and subsequently will be the location for significant further development. That new housing development will include 35% affordable housing wherever viable therefore to have a separate target for Yeovil is not necessary.	-
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0

Conclusion: There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in one area which is what this option is suggesting. This option could lead to unbalanced communities. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable option.

D. Developments in RSS Development Policy B settlements to provide a higher percentage than elsewhere		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. Concentrating a higher proportion of affordable housing in Primary Service Centres is likely to lead to problems of social exclusion elsewhere in the district.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the needs of the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in one area which is what this option is suggesting. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable option.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in one area which is what this option is suggesting. This option could lead to unbalanced communities. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable option.		

E. Developments on greenfield sites to provide a higher percentage than elsewhere		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. Concentrating a higher proportion of affordable housing on greenfield sites is likely to lead to problems of social exclusion elsewhere in the district.	0

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the needs of the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in particular areas which is what this option is suggesting. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable option.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing on greenfield developments which is what this option is suggesting. This option could lead to unbalanced communities and the SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that it would be favourable.		

F. Developments in rural areas to provide a higher percentage than elsewhere		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. Concentrating a higher proportion of affordable housing in rural areas is likely to lead to problems of social exclusion elsewhere in the district particularly those with the greatest concentration of population.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the needs of the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in particular areas which is what this option is suggesting. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable option.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing on greenfield developments which is what this option is suggesting. This option could lead to unbalanced communities and the SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be favourable.		

Additional Option 1: 40% Everywhere		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggests a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. Whilst of target of 40% might deliver more affordable housing the evidence in the SHLVA shows that it would not be viable and PPS 3 expects viability to be taken into consideration.	0

4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	40% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: The provision of 40% affordable housing will help meet the need identified in the SHMA however the SHLVA shows that such a target would not be viable. Additional affordable housing will help to reduce social exclusion by improving access to accommodation for those who are not able to access market housing.		

Additional Option 2: 35% in Yeovil and B settlements only		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need and affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. However the option of only providing affordable housing in larger settlements will exclude others from potentially benefiting from new affordable housing opportunities.	-

2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of any additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. However, a policy aimed at directing affordable housing to specific settlements excludes those in other parts of the district. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need is and viability is 35%; a target based on larger settlements only will meet some of the need but not address it district wide. The SHMA identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset, therefore any provision will help to meet that need.	+
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for additional suitable affordable housing those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this may have health benefits and potentially improve access to open space.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour but if this is in certain settlements only, the benefits are reduced.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: The provision of 35% affordable housing in Yeovil and B settlements will go some way to meeting district wide affordable housing need although large areas of the district would be disadvantaged by having no target and overall need will not be met.		

Additional Option 3: A higher percentage on Greenfield, larger Key Sites and urban extensions		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. Urban extensions and key sites should provide good access to services and facilities.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	As of September 2009 there were approximately 4,500 households on the Housing Register in South Somerset. The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. A district wide target will not direct provision towards specific areas but will maximise provision across the whole district. Private Registered Providers will be working towards directing provision where it is most needed. The provision of affordable housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. Concentrating a higher proportion of affordable housing on greenfield sites, key sites (many of which now have planning permission) and the urban extension is likely to lead to problems of social exclusion elsewhere in the district.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggested a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the needs of the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing in particular areas which is what this option is suggesting. The SHMA does not provide any evidence to suggest that this would be a favourable option.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	35% affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour but if this is in certain settlements only, the benefits are reduced.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: There is a need for affordable housing district wide, to set the maximum target possible based on need and viability district wide is the most effective way of achieving affordable housing to meet the whole community rather than concentrating the provision of affordable housing on key sites, greenfield land and the urban extension developments which is what this option is suggesting. This option could lead to unbalanced communities.		

Option H3 – Affordable housing ‘Rural Exceptions’ approach		
A. Maintain a ‘rural exceptions’ policy		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Rural exception affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The maintenance of a rural exceptions policy will allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs which will help to reduce poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	A rural exceptions policy will allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs in locations where housing would not normally permitted, this is supported by PPS 3: Housing. Allowing for this provision will contribute to meeting the housing needs of rural communities, although delivery of this type of site has proved difficult at times due to problems associated with land acquisition.	+
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space in rural locations may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The provision of rural affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The development of rural exception sites in the countryside may have a negative impact on the landscape of the local area, it will depend on the location of the site therefore the effect is uncertain.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: A rural exceptions affordable housing policy will bring about positive impacts for rural areas by providing affordable housing to meet local needs in locations where housing development would normally be restricted and it is an approach supported by PPS 3: Housing.		

B. Combine a rural 'exceptions policy' with allocations specifically for affordable housing		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Rural exception affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop and allocations would be made in sustainable locations.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The maintenance of a rural exceptions policy and the allocation of sites for affordable housing would allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs which will help to reduce poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.	+

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	A rural exceptions policy and the allocation of sites for affordable housing will allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs in locations where housing would not normally permitted, this is supported by PPS 3: Housing. Allowing for this provision will contribute to meeting the housing needs of rural communities, but there are likely to be deliverability problems associated with allocations for affordable housing only (as there sometimes are with rural exceptions sites), this is largely due to issue around land price and landowner expectation. Because of its strategic nature the Core Strategy is not the appropriate DPD in which to make such allocations.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space in rural locations may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The provision of rural affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. If large allocations of land for affordable housing were to be made this could result in a perceived increased fear of crime.	?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The development of rural exception sites or allocations for affordable housing in the countryside may have a negative impact on the landscape of the local area, the effect is uncertain as will depend where they are located.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
Conclusion: A rural exceptions affordable housing policy combined with allocations for affordable housing only would lead to an increased supply of affordable housing to meet identified need, however problems surrounding delivery, in particular land acquisition are likely to arise. The Core Strategy is not the appropriate DPD in which to make such allocations.		

Although the Core Strategy will not be allocating sites if you support the principle of allocating sites for affordable housing only in the future should those sites be located:

D. In settlements with a population of 3,000 or less only

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Settlements of less than 3,000 are rural and some may not have many facilities, housing should be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop and ideally a primary school.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The allocation of sites for affordable housing would allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs which will help to reduce poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The allocation of sites for affordable housing in settlements of 3,000 or less will allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs in these settlements alone. It is possible that there may be a greater need for affordable housing elsewhere. Such a restriction on settlement size would be overly restrictive and limit opportunities to allocate land for affordable housing in other parts of the district. Much would depend on the availability of land. Allowing for this provision will contribute to meeting the housing needs of rural communities, but there are likely to be deliverability problems associated with allocations for affordable housing only (as there sometimes are with rural exceptions sites), this is largely due to issue around land price and landowner expectation.	-
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space in rural locations may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The provision of rural affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. If large allocations of land for affordable housing were to be made this could result in a perceived increased fear of crime.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force in settlements of 3,000 or less thus which might help to support the rural economy.	?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The allocation of land for affordable housing only in the countryside may have a negative impact on the landscape of the local area (because of viability issues it is unlikely that there would sites available within Development Areas for this purpose). Much would depend on where the allocations were to be located.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
Conclusion: If in the future the Council considered it appropriate to allocate land for affordable housing only, in order to maximise delivery and make a more valuable contribution to meeting need within the District, it would not be effective if these were only located in small rural settlements i.e. those with a population of 3,000 or less.		

Although the Core Strategy will not be allocating sites if you support the principle of allocating sites for affordable housing only in the future should those sites be located:		
E. Outside of development areas where a specific local need is identified		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The allocation of sites for affordable housing would allow for the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs which will help to reduce poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	The allocation of sites for affordable housing in settlements where there is the greatest need would be appropriate. Allowing for this provision would contribute to meeting housing needs, but there are likely to be deliverability problems associated with allocations for affordable housing only (as there sometimes are with rural exceptions sites), this is largely due to issue around land price and landowner expectation.	0
4. Improve health and well being	If provision is made for suitable affordable housing, those in sub-standard accommodation may have the opportunity to relocate to a better standard of housing and as a consequence this could bring about health benefits. Access to open space may also be improved.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The provision of affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The opportunity to build more affordable homes will provide work for local builders thus contributing to the local economy. Residents of the affordable homes are likely to work in the local area thus contributing to a diverse work force.	+

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The allocation of land for affordable housing only outside of Development Areas may have a negative impact on the landscape of the local area much would depend on where it was to be located.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Private Registered Providers are already expected to build to a higher level of the Code for Sustainable Homes (Code 3) than market housing therefore affordable housing will make a more positive contribution to reducing the impact of climate change than most market housing.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Sites constrained by this element would not be allocated if mitigation measures could not be implemented.	?
Conclusion: If in the future the Council considered it appropriate to allocate land for affordable housing only, in order to maximise delivery and make a more valuable contribution to meeting need within the District it is likely that these sites would have to be outside of Development Areas. Deliverability would be very much dependent on the ability to obtain land for this purpose as in order to be viable the price of land for affordable housing needs to be significantly less than that for market housing.		

Option H4 – distribution of affordable housing		
A. 'Pepper potted' across the whole site		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. Pepper potting the affordable homes will have neither a negative or positive impact on this.	0

2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggests a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. 'Pepper potting' the affordable homes would integrate them with the market housing making identification less easy, this could help to reduce any social stigmatism that might exist. However, Strategic Housing colleagues have identified that for reasons of management and developability (delivery) Private Registered Providers (PRP's) prefer small clusters rather than pepper potting. As circumstances on each site are likely to be different this is a matter that should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and is too prescriptive to be a strategic Core Strategy policy.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what, therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
4. Improve health and well being	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour, pepper potting rather than large or small clusters may contribute reducing a perceived fear of crime by those living in market housing. .	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0

Conclusion: Whilst there may be a perceived benefit in pepper potting affordable housing within larger developments evidence from Strategic Housing experts shows that for reasons of management and developability PRP's prefer to develop small clusters of affordable housing. It is also considered that a strategic policy on the distribution of affordable housing within larger sites would be too prescriptive and that it is a matter that should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

B. In small clusters within the site		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. Small clusters of affordable homes within a larger site will have neither a negative or positive impact on this.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggests a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. Strategic Housing colleagues have identified that for reasons of management and developability (delivery) Private Registered Providers (PRP's) prefer small clusters. However, as circumstances on each site are likely to be different this is a matter that should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and is too prescriptive to be a strategic Core Strategy policy.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided regardless; therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
4. Improve health and well being	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided regardless; therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided regardless; therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. Small clusters of affordable housing are unlikely to have a positive or negative impact on this objective.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided regardless; therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: Evidence from Strategic Housing expert's shows that for reasons of management and developability, PRP's prefer to develop small clusters of affordable housing. However, it is considered that a strategic policy on the distribution of affordable housing within larger sites would be too prescriptive and that it is a matter that should be considered on a case-by-case basis, the preference for small clusters can be referred to in the Core Strategy supporting text.		

C. In large clusters within the site		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The provision of additional affordable housing will contribute towards reducing the social exclusion of those who are currently in housing need. Affordable housing will be provided in locations where there is access to at least basic facilities such as a convenience shop. Large clusters of affordable homes will only have an impact on this objective if a conscious decision is made to locate the affordable housing closest to the services and facilities available, this would be considered through the planning application process.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy suggests a minimum target of 35% affordable housing for all South West local authorities. The evidence in the SHMA suggests that the maximum district wide target based on the evidence of need and viability is 35% therefore a target of 35% is appropriate and will help to reduce homelessness in South Somerset. The SHMA also identifies that 659 affordable homes are needed annually in South Somerset. Large clusters of affordable housing could potentially lead the increased social exclusion by creating a 'ghetto' effect. Strategic Housing colleagues have identified that for reasons of management and developability (delivery) Private Registered Providers (PRP's) prefer small clusters. However, as circumstances on each site are likely to be different this is a matter that should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis and is too prescriptive to be a strategic Core Strategy policy.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0

4. Improve health and well being	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Affordable housing will contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour. Small clusters of affordable housing are unlikely to have a positive or negative impact on this objective.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	This option relates to the location of affordable housing within an approved development, the affordable housing would be provided no matter what therefore the impact is neither, negative or positive	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: Evidence from Strategic Housing experts shows that for reasons of management and developability PRP's prefer to develop small clusters of affordable housing. However, it is considered that a strategic policy on the distribution of affordable housing within larger sites would be too prescriptive and that it is a matter that should be considered on a case-by-case basis.		

Option H5 – Gypsy and traveller sites		
A: Criteria to address the following only:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site access, parking and road safety of occupants • Landscaping and visual amenity • Proximity to contaminated land • Access to the highway network 		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	This option makes no reference to accessibility to local services such as shops and schools.	--
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The provision of additional Gypsy and Traveller sites will contribute to reducing social exclusion by providing accommodation in authorised locations. However if poorly related to local facilities there would be limited opportunities for social integration. Does not meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Option provides the policy context for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites as required by Circular 01/2006. Criteria can be used to assess planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller Sites until such time as a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD is produced to meet the need identified in the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the RSS which will be updated by the Somerset GTAA which is ongoing. Although this option provides criteria against which Gypsy and Travellers sites can be judged it does not deliver sites themselves. Does not meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople as required by Circular 04/2007 or help to meet their needs as set out in the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the RSS.	+
4. Improve health and well being	This option makes no reference to accessibility to local health services such as hospitals Drs surgeries, dental services or open space.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	This option makes no reference to accessibility to services such as primary schools, secondary education, pre school, nurseries and employment.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Although there is little evidence to suggest that increasing the numbers of Gypsies and Travellers in an authority will impact upon the crime baseline, there is the potential for baseline conditions in terms of fear of crime to be worsened.	-
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Uncertain effect. The degree to which the Gypsy and Traveller community will impact on local economies is unknown.	?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Likely to lead to increased levels of travel by private car in rural locations.	--
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	A criterion aimed a taking landscaping and visual amenity into consideration will help to protect against any negative impacts although landscape and townscape is unlikely to be enhanced.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Not specifically mentioned in the option although partly covered by the landscaping and visual amenity criterion.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Uncertain effect. The degree to which the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites will impact on climate change and vulnerability to its effects is not known.	?

12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Significantly contaminated land should be avoided.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Option does not consider flood risk. It will depend on the location of the site. PPS25 should be applied, this directs development to areas at least risk from flooding.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Option does not consider conserving or enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity and green infrastructure. This will depend on the location of the site, it will be necessary to ensure that bio and geodiversity interest is conserved and enhanced.	?
Conclusion: This option presents some criteria that will contribute the locating Gypsy and Traveller sites in the most sustainable locations, however it is less effective than it could be due to the omission of a criterion relating to proximity to local services.		

Option B: In addition to 'A' above criteria relating to accessibility to local services such as shops and schools		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The inclusion of a criterion relating to accessibility to local services such as shops and schools will help to ensure that Gypsy and Traveller sites are located where residents will have reasonable access to education and health facilities and shops that cater for their day to day needs.	++
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The provision of additional Gypsy and Traveller sites will contribute to reducing social exclusion by providing accommodation in authorised locations by being well related to local facilities and therefore settlements there would be increased opportunities for social integration. Does not meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Option provides the policy context for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites as required by Circular 01/2006. Criteria can be used to assess planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller Sites until such time as a Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation DPD is produced to meet the need identified in the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the RSS which will be updated by the Somerset GTAA which is ongoing. Although this option provides criteria against which Gypsy and Travellers sites can be judged it does not deliver them. Does not meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople as required by Circular 04/2007 or help to meet their needs as set out in the Secretary of States Proposed Changes to the RSS.	+
4. Improve health and well being	By requiring sites to be located within reasonable proximity to health facilities the opportunity for improved health and well being will be increased. Formal open space provision is not addressed however given that Gypsy and Traveller sites are primarily located in rural areas it is likely that access to informal open space will be accessible.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	By requiring sites to be located within reasonable proximity to education facilities such as schools the opportunity for improved education will be increased. There will also be greater opportunities for access to employment although this is not specified by the criterion.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Although there is little evidence to suggest that increasing the numbers of Gypsies and Travellers in an authority will impact upon the crime baseline, there is the potential for baseline conditions in terms of fear of crime to be worsened.	-

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The degree to which the Gypsy and Traveller community will impact on local economies is unknown.	?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	May lead to reduced levels of travel by private car, as sites will be located in closer proximity to settlements with key services.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	A criterion aimed at taking landscaping and visual amenity into consideration will help to protect against any negative impacts although landscape and townscape is unlikely to be enhanced.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Not specifically mentioned in the option although partly covered by the landscaping and visual amenity criterion.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	May lead to reduced travelling by Gypsies and Travellers as sites will be located in closer proximity to settlements with key services.	?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Significantly contaminated land should be avoided.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Option does not consider flood risk. It will depend on the location of the site. PPS25 should be applied, this directs development to areas at least risk from flooding.	?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Option does not consider conserving or enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity and green infrastructure. This will depend on the location of the site, It will be necessary to ensure that bio and geodiversity interest is conserved and enhanced.	?
Conclusion: The inclusion of a criterion relating to proximity to local services such as shops and schools makes this option more sustainable.		

Option H6 – Housing demand		
A. Require a % of all housing in the district to meet lifetime homes standards? If so what should that percentage be?		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	ONS population projections show that South Somerset will have an increasingly ageing population; if more homes were to be built to Lifetime Homes standards the long term impact is likely to be positive, as home owners will not have to move home as their needs change over the years, thus reducing house moving costs over the long term. The number of people needing to move into residential care homes could potentially be reduced.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	ONS population projections show that South Somerset will have an increasingly ageing population; if more homes were to be built to Lifetime Homes standards the long term impact could be positive by providing homes that can meet whole life needs. However, issues of viability do arise (noted under objective 11)	0
4. Improve health and well being	The provision of more smaller homes will provide increased opportunities for those in unfit housing to move into more suitable accommodation which could lead to health benefits.	+

5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Local planning authorities are able to seek the implementation of the Code for Sustainable Homes where there are particular opportunities, which includes the consideration of Lifetime Homes standards. However, the Strategic Land Viability Assessment (2008) worked on the assumption that affordable and market housing would be built to Code Level 3 and notes that “given what is currently known about technology, the additional cost of the proposed changes (<i>i.e. the move to Code the Government’s intention to introduce Code Level 4 up to 6 over the coming years</i>) are going to be more considerable and may push developers to focus rather more on premium and niche products where the additional costs can be wholly or at least partially, recovered in enhanced prices, though with the present regulatory framework it is difficult to see how that could apply to the affordable elements. Whatever happens, the impact on viability following the changes is a matter for concern.”	?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	See above.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: Whilst some positive impacts could be achieved by seeking to achieve Lifetime Homes standards in advance of national timescales, given that evidence in the SHMA indicates that the early compulsory implementation of Lifetime Homes standards is likely to have a negative impact on the viability and deliverability of housing both market and affordable therefore it would not appear to be beneficial to implement this option. Therefore it is recommended that Lifetime Homes will be promoted as part of nationally recognised design criteria but no specific percentage will be sought.		

B. Be seeking to provide a % of new dwellings as 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings and if so what should that % be?		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0

2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Smaller dwellings are likely to be more affordable to a wider cross section of the population and the delivery of a certain percentage could provide those on lower incomes to enter the housing market especially given that the Taunton and South Somerset Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) identifies that the average house price in South Somerset is 8.4 times the average salary, which makes it very difficult for first time buyers to enter the housing market. The provision of small units of lower cost housing is more likely to result in younger members of the community continuing to live locally. The construction of small dwellings also creates opportunities for younger people to move out of the family home and for older people to downsize, freeing up family housing.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	With regards to 1 and 2 bedroom properties the Taunton and South Somerset Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2009) indicates that there is a requirement for approximately 37% of new market housing to have 1 or 2 bedrooms and 75% of affordable housing to be 1 or 2 bedroom. The evidence goes on to indicate that the proportion of demand for detached houses, semi-detached houses and bungalows is in excess of the supply whereas in the case of terraced houses and flats/maisonettes supply is in excess of demand. The evidence also shows that demand is greatest for 2 and 3 bedroom detached or semi-detached homes. This evidence should however be addressed with a degree of caution, by looking at demand it masks householders aspirations to live in homes larger than those that meet their basic needs. But it does suggest that an approach encouraging more 2 and 3 bedroom semi-detached and detached homes should be taken in the Core Strategy. Any housing mix policy would need to ensure that a mix of all housing types and sizes is achieved across the district reflecting the most recent evidence to concentrate in just 1 and 2 bedroom properties would not be appropriate or meet the wider housing needs of the district.	-
4. Improve health and well being	The provision of more smaller homes will provide increased opportunities for those in unfit housing to move into more suitable accommodation which could lead to health benefits.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Additional smaller dwellings within the housing market will contribute the creation of mixed and inclusive communities, which is more likely to lead to a reduction in anti social behaviour.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0

12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: Whilst some positive impacts could be achieved by seeking a certain percentage of new housing to be 1 or 2 bedroom it does not meet the housing needs of the wider community or reflect the evidence set out in the Taunton and South Somerset Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessment.		

C. Be providing more sheltered or warden assisted housing to meet the particular needs of the elderly and if so where is that housing needed?		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Provision of additional sheltered or warden assisted housing may help some elderly members of society access homes that offer them a greater level of care than they would have if they remained in their own homes.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	ONS projections show that South Somerset is going to have an increasingly ageing population. The SHMA housing needs survey looked at households where all members were of pensionable age (60 and over for females and 65 for males), it shows that 29.6% of all households are older person only households and that 0.1% of these households are in housing need. 7.8% of those households felt that they needed to or were likely to move in the next 2 years. Some 55.1% of all single person households are older person households. The evidence shows that almost three-quarters of older person households are owner-occupiers. 42% of social rented dwellings contain only older people – which may have implications for future supply of and demand for specialised social housing. But, given the requirement to provide a mix of housing to meet identified needs, officers, when considering the mix and tenure of housing within strategic allocations will need to take this evidence into account and ensure that the needs of all parts of the community as well as elderly people are catered for. The strategic Housing Team work on the deployment of funds to provide this type of housing. To have a specific policy on this matter would be too prescriptive.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The provision of more sheltered or warden assisted housing could bring about improved health and well being for some elderly people.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The provision of more sheltered or warden assisted housing could reduce the fear of crime for some elderly people.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: Whilst some positive impacts could be achieved by providing more sheltered or warden assisted housing, this is not a strategic spatial planning matter requiring a Core Strategy policy and can be encouraged and managed through the Development Management process. Given the requirement to provide a mix of housing to meet identified needs, officers, when considering the mix and tenure of housing within strategic allocations will need to take this the needs of older people into account and ensure that the needs of all parts of the community as well as elderly people are catered for. The strategic Housing Team work on the deployment of funds to provide this type of housing.</p>		

<p>Option DMH1 – housing density Develop one broad density range across the District or set out a range of densities across the plan area. This option can be split into two, either have one broad density across South Somerset or have a range of densities. The effect of having a range of densities is appraised under Option DMH2 and the option of having one broad density range across the District is appraised below.</p>		
<p>One broad density of between 30 to 50 dph</p>		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Higher housing densities close to services and facilities could mean improved access to them, however this would depend on suitable sites being available for development.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Maximising housing densities across the district will assist in meeting the needs of the community where there is an accommodation shortfall as is the case in South Somerset.	+
4. Improve health and well being	High density living, if not properly supported by community infrastructure may result in a poorer quality environment, which could result in a negative impact on health.	?

5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	High density housing development may lead to an increase in the perceived fear of crime. The application of Secure by Design principles to the new built form will be a positive.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Unless high density living is properly supported by public transport infrastructure increased congestion could arise.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The application of a District wide density of 30 dph (the previously set national indicative minimum set by Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006)) would lead to larger quantities of Greenfield land been lost to development around the settlements where the most development should be directed i.e. Yeovil and the Market Towns. Conversely a district wide target that is set high could have a negative impact on the landscape and townscape of the more rural parts of the district. Policy H2 of the now revoked RSS promotes a range of densities and expects local planning authorities to achieve a net target density of 40dph across all new housing in their Housing Market Areas, seek to achieve a net density of 40-50 dph within SSCTs (Yeovil) and 50 dph or more overall in planned urban extensions to SSCT. This suggests that a range of densities rather than one broad density be it 30, 40 or 50 dph would be more appropriate. Given the revocation of the national and regional guidance on densities further work will need to be undertaken on this matter to inform the 'Publication' Core Strategy.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	A district wide target of 30 dph would result in the loss of more greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns which could potential lead to a detrimental impact on the historic environment, although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised elsewhere.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An overall lower density would result in more agricultural land being required to accommodate growth particularly around Yeovil and the Market Towns.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	A lower density across the whole District would result in a greater impact on biodiversity and geodiversity particularly around Yeovil and the Market Towns, although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised elsewhere.	?
Conclusion: One broad density of 30dph across South Somerset would have a negative impact in terms of loss of greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns. Conversely the application of a South Somerset wide density of 50 dph would be likely to have a negative impact on the townscape of Rural Settlements. Given the revocation of the national and regional guidance on densities further work will need to be undertaken on this matter to inform the Publication Plan. PPS 3: Housing, still includes a requirement to make the best use of land.		

Option DMH2 – Housing Density

Set out a range of densities for

- A. SSCT - Yeovil
- B. RSS Development Policy B settlements (Market Towns)
- C. RSS Development Policy C settlements (Small towns and Villages)

What should the densities be:

- A. SSCT - Yeovil = 50dph
- B. Development Policy B settlements = 40dph
- C. Development Policy C settlements = 30dph

(Issues and Options document did not identify or address density in Rural Settlements).

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Higher housing densities close to services and facilities could mean improved access to them however this would depend on suitable sites being available for development.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	A range of housing densities across the district will assist in meeting the needs of the community where there is an accommodation shortfall as is the case in South Somerset as well as allowing for constraints to be taken account of.	+
4. Improve health and well being	High density living in Yeovil, if not properly supported by community infrastructure may result in a poorer quality environment, which could result in a negative impact on health.	?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	High density housing development may lead to an increase in the perceived fear of crime although this can be countered by the fact that it can lead to greater security due to increased surveillance. The application of Secure by Design principles to the new built form will be a positive and is considered in the context of the Design policy.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Unless high density living is properly supported by public transport infrastructure increased congestion could arise.	-

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006)) previously set a national indicative minimum set by would lead to larger quantities of Greenfield land been lost to development around the settlements where the most development should be directed i.e. Yeovil and the Market Towns. Conversely a district wide target that is set high could have a negative impact on the landscape and townscape of the more rural parts of the district. Policy H2 of the now revoked RSS promotes a range of densities and expects local planning authorities to achieve a net target density of 40dph across all new housing in their Housing Market Areas, seek to achieve a net density of 40-50 dph within SSCTs (Yeovil) and 50 dph or more overall in planned urban extensions to SSCT This option is in compliance with the the previously advocated national and regional approach. A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns and give the ability to seek lower density development in rural areas. Given the revocation of the national and regional guidance on densities further work will need to be undertaken on this matter to inform the Publication Plan.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns being lost and allows for the impact on the historic environment, to be minimised although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised in considering potential locations for development.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	A range of densities would result in less agricultural land being lost in the locations where the most growth is to be accommodated i.e. around Yeovil and the Market Towns.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	A lower density across the whole District would result in a greater impact on biodiversity and geodiversity particularly around Yeovil and the Market Towns, although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised elsewhere.	?
Conclusion: The option of having a range of densities presents more positive impacts than having one broad density as it benefits Yeovil and the Market Towns by minimising the loss of greenfield land and the ability to have a lower densities in Rural Settlements will allow the individual character and townscape of the settlement to be respected.		

DMH3: Develop densities based on the merits of each town, rural centre and village in relation to density		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Higher housing densities close to services and facilities could mean improved access to them however this would depend on suitable sites being available for development.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A	0

3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Housing densities based on each settlement will assist in meeting the needs of the community where there is an accommodation shortfall as is the case in South Somerset as well allowing for constraints to be considered.	+
4. Improve health and well being	High density living in Yeovil, if not properly supported by community infrastructure may result in a poorer quality environment, which could result in a negative impact on health.	?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	High density housing development may lead to an increase in the perceived fear of crime although this can be countered by the fact that it can lead to greater security due to increased surveillance. The application of Secure by Design principles to the new built form will be a positive and is considered in the context of the Design policy.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Unless high density living is properly supported by public transport infrastructure increased congestion could arise.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2006) previously set a national indicative minimum set by would lead to larger quantities of Greenfield land been lost to development around the settlements where the most development should be directed i.e. Yeovil and the Market Towns. Conversely a district wide target that is set high could have a negative impact on the landscape and townscape of the more rural parts of the district. Policy H2 of the now revoked RSS promotes a range of densities and expects local planning authorities to achieve a net target density of 40dph across all new housing in their Housing Market Areas, seek to achieve a net density of 40-50 dph within SSCTs (Yeovil) and 50 dph or more overall in planned urban extensions to SSCT This option is in compliance with the previously advocated national and regional approach. A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns and give the ability to seek lower density development in rural areas. Given the revocation of the national and regional guidance on densities further work will need to be undertaken on this matter to inform the Publication Plan. To apply settlement specific densities based on every settlement (rather than the 3 settlement strategy categories) could be very time consuming and difficult to implement particularly given that most settlements have a combination of high and low density development. In line with PPS 3: Housing, policy should seek to ensure that the best use is being made of land.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	A range of densities would result in less greenfield land around Yeovil and the Market Towns being lost and allows for the impact on the historic environment, to be minimised although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised elsewhere.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	A range of densities would result in less agricultural land being lost in the locations where the most growth is to be accommodated i.e. around Yeovil and the Market Towns.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	A lower density across the whole District would result in a greater impact on biodiversity and geodiversity particularly around Yeovil and the Market Towns, although this would depend on where the growth is located therefore the impact is uncertain and would be appraised elsewhere.	?
<p>Conclusion: The option of having a range of densities presents more positive impacts than having one broad density as it benefits Yeovil and the Market Towns by minimising the loss of greenfield land and the ability to have a lower densities in Rural Settlements will allow the individual character and townscape of the settlement to be respected. However to impose and place specific density on a village-by-village basis would be very time consuming and prescriptive. A policy based on the settlement hierarchy would be more manageable and the inclusion of a criterion allowing individual site circumstances to be taken into consideration would be more appropriate.</p>		

'Economic Prosperity' chapter (including Development Management policies section)

Option EP1 – Location of new economic development:

Two options are put forward a) planning to provide for the 9,100 jobs in the Yeovil TTWA, equating to somewhere in the region of 7,800-10,700 jobs in the District (draft RSS figure) or b) an alternative option. In this context, given the range of alternative options, for the purposes of the SA the following options will be appraised:

- a) 7,800 jobs District-wide, or
- b) 10,700 jobs District-wide (which would include 9,100 jobs in Yeovil TTWA)

These look at the alternative ends of the spectrum in terms of the ranges put forward for the District wide figure (i.e. lowest and highest).

Note. Since the development of these options, the Employment Land Review has begun to look in detail at identifying a District-wide jobs target taking into account the evidence presented by Roger Tym and Partners for the South West Regional Assembly and local evidence of need to identify how many hectares of employment land is required across the District to 2026. The outcomes of this work are likely to supersede the Option. The draft RSS identifies that 10,700 jobs should be delivered in South Somerset, this is based on economic projections and evidence of what is needed, it should be assumed before the ELR is completed that 10,700 jobs are needed to support the growing population to 2026.

Option a) 7,800 jobs District-wide

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Providing fewer jobs than economically active residents may have an impact on the amount of essential services and facilities in an area, as if people have to travel to locations outside of the District for work, then the overall economy will suffer and it will affect what becomes viable to run in an area. This is an unknown quantity though.	?
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Providing fewer jobs than economically active residents will increase poverty and social exclusion as it will increase unemployment and increase the need to travel outside the District to work, which will cost more and reduce people's disposable income.	--
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Providing fewer jobs than economically active residents may have an impact on the housing market as less people locally can afford to buy property, which could also have an impact on the need for affordable housing. This is however an unknown quantity.	?

4. Improve health and well being	Increased unemployment (by not providing sufficient jobs for economically active residents) may have negative impacts on resident's health and well being – it is recognised that there is a link between ill health, especially illnesses such as depression, and unemployment. This is however an unknown quantity.	?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Not providing enough jobs may lead to the better educated or more skilled residents leaving the District for work elsewhere.	-
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Crime may increase if more people are unemployed. Some uncertainty.	- / ?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Providing fewer jobs than economically active residents will not support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy, as it will increase unemployment and will encourage people to travel outside of the District to work, the knock-on effect will be that people will then support other economies and South Somerset will suffer.	--
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Without sufficient jobs to meet the needs of the economically active population, more people will have to travel outside of the District to work, thereby increasing the need to travel.	--
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	If people have to travel outside of the District to work, this will increase the need to travel, and have an impact on climate change.	--
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Potentially greater air pollution generated by greater travel to work outside of the District.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
Conclusion: Not providing sufficient jobs or land to accommodate jobs for the future economically active population will have a very serious negative impact on the vitality and viability of the local economy: it will directly increase levels of unemployment, which will have serious impacts on the resident population (affecting their economic and social well-being) forcing them to travel outside of the District to work. This will have negative impacts on service and facility provision, levels of pollution, air quality and climate change, mainly due to meaning people will need to travel further (outside the district) to work.		

Option EP1 – Location of new economic development:

Option b) 10,700 jobs District-wide (which would include 9,100 jobs in Yeovil TTWA)

Until addressed through ELR, assume that 10,700 jobs District-wide will meet the needs of the economically active population and SSDC economic development aspirations to 2026.

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	As with Option a) the number of jobs in relation to economically active residents may have an impact on the viability and the ability to provide essential services and facilities in an area. More jobs (than Option a) may result in less people travelling to locations outside of the District for work, thereby sustaining more services and facilities. This is an unknown quantity though.	?
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Ensuring that there are sufficient jobs to meet the future needs of the economically active population will reduce poverty and social exclusion amongst that group, but this alone will not necessarily address the issue for the wider community. Hard to reach groups and the existing unemployed and long-term unemployed, for example, require a multifaceted approach to tackle poverty and social exclusion, providing jobs alone will not address the issue.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Generating wealth in an area will give developers greater confidence in the market and may assist them in bringing forward projects. This would also increase the supply of affordable housing through deliver on Section 106 agreements. This is an unknown quantity, as in Option a.	?
4. Improve health and well being	Indirectly, health and well being will be improved through the provision of work, as many studies illustrate the positive health benefits of working.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Providing sufficient jobs may lead to the retention locally of the better-educated or more skilled residents.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Criminal activity may reduce if there are sufficient jobs. Some uncertainty.	+ / ?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Ensuring that sufficient jobs to meet future economically active population will support the economy.	++
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Sufficient jobs (distributed sustainably) will increase the level of self-containment Yeovil and the other South Somerset settlements. This, coupled with concentrating development in Yeovil, will reduce the need to travel and enable more people to use public transport, thereby reducing the effect of traffic on the environment.	++
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Concentrating development and increasing the self-containment of settlements will enable more people to use public transport, thereby reducing the need to travel by private transport.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Air pollution may be minimised by increasing the level of settlement's self-containment and enabling more people to use public transport or travel by means other than the private car.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0

Conclusion: Ensuring that there are sufficient jobs to meet the future economically active population is the most sustainable option out of (a) and (b), it has positive impacts on the residents, economy and indirectly on the housing market of South Somerset.

Option EP6 – Tourism		
Option A: Retain existing Local Plan Policy ME10 with new criteria concerning sustainable development		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Policy option A allows for new or improved tourist accommodation outside development areas provided the scale is consistent with their rural location. Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions.	-
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	NA	0
4. Improve health and well being	NA	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	NA	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions. Policy does not support major tourism proposals in the district that may form an exception to this approach and their economic benefits.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions increasing the need to travel and generating road congestion.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the landscape and townscape of the district. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan.	--
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the historic environment of the district. Issue is covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Policy option A allows for new or improved tourist accommodation outside development areas provided the scale is consistent with their rural location. This approach makes no allowances for incorporating climate change measures.	--
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Policy makes no allowance for minimising pollution - covered elsewhere within the plan.	0

13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Policy makes no allowance for flood risk - covered elsewhere within the plan.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Policy makes no allowance for Biodiversity - covered elsewhere within the plan.	0
Conclusion: Option A seeks to allow for new or improved tourist accommodation outside development areas provided the scale is consistent with their rural location. This policy option does not direct tourism proposals towards the districts most sustainable settlements but instead allows for rural exceptions. This policy approach has positive effect on the economy, but negative effects in reducing the effect of traffic on the environment, conserving and where appropriate enhance the historic environment & and vulnerability to its effects and significant negative effects in respect of improving access to services, protecting the landscape and townscape and reduce contribution to climate change.		

Option B: New Policy that directs all major tourism proposals to higher order settlements with allowance for development in Development Policy C settlements and outside development boundaries

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Policy option B seeks to promote tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements within the district. As an exception to this approach small-scale tourism proposals will be allowed outside development boundaries and in the open countryside. Policy will promote development largely in the most sustainable locations.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	In directing tourism development towards the districts most sustainable settlements this policy will maximise opportunities for employment in the most deprived areas.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	NA	0
4. Improve health and well being	NA	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will maximise opportunities for employment in the right locations, improving qualifications and skills and increasing the supply of skilled workers.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	NA	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will foster economic growth evenly across the District. Policy does not support major tourism proposals in the district that may form an exception to this approach and their economic benefits.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with an exception that allows proposals in rural locations subject to scale will allow some development to be permitted in unsustainable locations increasing the need to travel and generating road congestion.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the landscape and	-

	townscape of the district.	
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the historic environment of the district.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach makes no allowances for incorporating climate change measures.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Policy makes no allowance for minimising pollution - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Policy makes no allowance for flood risk - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Policy makes no allowance for Biodiversity - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
<p>Conclusion: Option B seeks to promote tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements within the district. As an exception to this approach small-scale tourism proposals will be allowed outside development boundaries and in the open countryside. This policy scores a positive effect by improving access to services, reducing social exclusion, promoting the skills base of the local population and diversifying, supporting the local community. The policy however fails to address major new tourism proposals and transport issues. It is also thought that these options do not satisfactorily protect the natural or historic environment on which tourism applications are likely to be associated with. The policy also fails to address climate change adaptation, minimise pollution, manage flood risk and conserve biodiversity within new proposals.</p>		

<p>Option C – New Tourism Policy as suggested by representations submitted to the Issue and Options Core Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As Option B and: • Consider the impact of major tourism attractions on the A303 and M5 motorway. • Sustainable tourism attractions should be accessed by means other than the private car; walking, cycling and public transport. • Encourage new tourism facilities and accommodation outside defined settlements subject to historic and environmental constraints • Positive position on Major New Tourism attractions • Encourage and enhance existing tourism facilities 		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Policy options A & B seek to promote tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements within the district. As an exception to this approach small-scale tourism proposals will be allowed outside development boundaries and in the open countryside. Policy will promote development largely in the most sustainable locations.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	In directing tourism development towards the districts most sustainable settlements this policy will maximise opportunities for employment in the most deprived areas.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the	NA	0

community		
4. Improve health and well being	NA	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will maximise opportunities for employment in the right locations, improving qualifications and skills and increasing the supply of skilled workers.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	NA	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements will foster economic growth evenly across the District. Additional wording encourages major new tourism proposals within the district that support and enhance the local economy as well as applications that support and enhance existing businesses.	++
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with an exception that allows proposals in rural locations subject to scale will allow some development to be permitted in unsustainable locations increasing the need to travel and generating road congestion. In additionally considering accessed by means other than the private car; walking, cycling and public transport as well as the impact of major tourism attractions on the A303 and M5 motorway. It can be expected that the impact of tourism proposals can be significantly reduced increasing the proportion of journeys made by non-car modes and the growth of congestion.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the landscape and townscape of the district.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach however makes no allowances for the protection of the historic environment of the district.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Promoting tourism facilities and accommodation in the most sustainable settlements with the exception of rural locations subject to scale. This approach makes no allowances for incorporating climate change measures.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Policy makes no allowance for minimising pollution - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Policy makes no allowance for flood risk - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Policy makes no allowance for Biodiversity - covered elsewhere within the plan.	-
<p>Conclusion: Option C builds on the policy approach outlined within options A & B but seeks to address some of the issues raised concerning major new tourism proposals and the impact of development on transport infrastructure, the landscape and the historic environment. Additional wording encourages major new tourism proposals within the district that support and enhance the local economy, considering access by means other than the private car; walking, cycling and public transport as well as the impact of major tourism attractions on the A303 and M5 motorway. The new wording also address the balance between positive economic benefits of new tourism proposals and the potential impact on the natural and historic environment. Policy proposal continues to address climate change adaptation, minimise pollution, manage flood risk and conserve biodiversity within new proposals.</p>		

Option DMEP1 – Retention of employment land and premises

a) Include a policy on the retention of employment land and premises in the Core Strategy

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The retention of employment land and premises is important for job creation and the health of the economy, therefore has an impact on poverty and social exclusion. Second-hand premises are often cheaper, and so appeal to start-ups or businesses trying to keep rental costs low, having such business premises readily available will allow job creation, thereby increasing wealth and reducing social exclusion. Social exclusion is multifaceted and so requires a range of measures to address, providing jobs alone will not address the issue.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	A policy protecting employment land and premises may reduce the ability to redevelop old employment sites for housing.	-
4. Improve health and well being	N/A	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Indirectly the policy may have positive impacts on the education and skills of the population by retaining employment opportunities locally.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Preventing alternative uses coming forward on redundant/disused employment sites might lead to their blight if they are not reoccupied with alternative employment uses, which could lead to an increased perception of crime/vandalism.	-
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Preventing the loss of sites to alternative uses ensures a ready supply of sites that can be occupied 'immediately' which are usually cheaper and are very important for small-scale businesses, which are the majority of businesses in the District.	++
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land – protecting the land reduces the amount of Greenfield sites required.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Minimises pollution by 'recycling' the building.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: The importance of providing a range of sites, by both type and cost is crucial for the economy, as set out in PPS4. The second-hand employment land/premises market is especially important for small businesses/self-employed who form a large part of the South Somerset economy. Allowing the loss of these sites/premises reduces their overall availability and this, coupled with the fact that allocated employment sites are not coming forward, would push up the cost of premises (based on economics of supply and demand) making running a business more expensive and stifling the market. Without putting a level of protection in place through including a policy in the Core Strategy, the economy and businesses would suffer as alternative, more profitable uses would occupy employment land. This would also increase unemployment and possibly encourage entrepreneurs to move outside of the District.</p>		

Option b) Not include a policy on the retention of employment land and premises in the Core Strategy		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Not protecting employment land and premises could increase poverty and social exclusion by raising the costs of businesses premises (law of supply and demand says that less premises pushes up the costs of those remaining premises) making it harder for start-up businesses and thereby reducing opportunities for job creation and the retention of businesses through cheaper rental.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	If there is no policy in place it is likely that more housing will come forward through redevelopment.	+
4. Improve health and well being	N/A	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Unless a range of employment activities are retained, the better educated and skilled residents will leave the District.	
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Allowing alternative uses to come forward on redundant/disused employment sites might reduce the fear of crime of crime/vandalism, because the buildings will be redeveloped and improved.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Not protecting employment land and premises would have negative impacts upon the economy as the importance of maintaining an existing supply and protecting the overall availability and distribution of employment land should not be underestimated. Existing employment sites provide the main supply of employment land and are required to meet the needs of the market by retaining a mix of older, more affordable premises, whilst maintaining a local balance between housing and employment. A policy vacuum would reduce opportunities for job creation and the retention of businesses.	--
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land. On this basis, it is crucially important to safeguard those existing sites that are fit for purpose.	-

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace and buildings required over the plan period, these take 'embodied energy' to build.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: Evidence demonstrates that there has been considerable pressure for local employment sites to be redeveloped for other uses, particularly housing and retailing. Data for the Employment Land Review illustrates that since the beginning of the plan period (1st April 2006 – 31st March 2010) 10.8 hectares of employment land has been lost to uses other than 'traditional' employment uses (B1, B2 & B8 of the Use Classes Order). Since 1991, 47.09 hectares of employment land has been lost, demonstrating how cumulative losses of land can add up over time to have a significant impact on the supply of employment land in an area. The importance of maintaining existing supply and protecting the overall availability and distribution of employment land should not be underestimated. Existing employment sites provide the main supply of employment land and are required to meet the needs of the market by retaining a mix of older, more affordable premises, whilst maintaining a local balance between housing and employment. It must also be remembered that any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land. On this basis, it is crucially important for sustainability reasons to safeguard those existing sites that are fit for purpose.</p>		

<p>Option DMEP2 – Retention of employment land and premises: The option whether to include a policy in the LDF which does not allow the loss of employment sites/premises to housing, unless there is an absolute need for that housing. Therefore the two options are: a) Allow the loss of employment land and premises to housing only where is an absolute need for that housing b) Do not allow the loss of employment land and premises to housing where there is an absolute need for that housing <i>The emphasis of such a policy would be the delivery of housing as opposed to the protection of employment land, and so the option is appraised in this context. Nb. A definition of "absolute need" would be required.</i></p>		
<p>a) Allow the loss of employment land and premises to housing only where is an absolute need for that housing</p>		
SA Objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0

2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Allowing the loss of employment land where there is an absolute need for housing could reduce social exclusion through the provision of housing for families who cannot enter the market otherwise, but it could have negative implications for poverty as it allows the loss of employment land – see SA of Option DMEP1 for the explanation of the need to retain employment land and premises.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	If the loss of employment land to housing is only allowed where there is an absolute need for that housing then undeniably any development of this nature will be providing a level of housing which is meeting the needs of the community.	+
4. Improve health and well being	N/A	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Without protection, the loss of employment land and premises could have negative impacts upon the economy. The importance of maintaining the existing supply of land/premises and protecting its overall availability and distribution should not be underestimated, existing employment sites provide the main supply of employment land and are required to meet the needs of the market by providing a mix of older, more affordable premises and maintaining a local balance between housing and employment. It must also be remembered that any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land. On this basis, it is crucially important to safeguard those existing sites that are fit for purpose. This option may reduce opportunities for job creation and the retention of businesses in the District.	--
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Redeveloping older employment premises may have positive impacts on townscape, as it may enhance the built form of an area. However, any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land.	+ / -
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0

Conclusion: Whilst the supply of housing is crucial, so is the supply of employment land and premises – a balance needs to be struck. The inclusion of a policy in the Core Strategy that would allow the loss of employment land to housing, would assist in the provision of housing, but would have negative impacts on the economy in South Somerset. The importance of providing a range of sites, in both type and cost is crucial for the economy and is demonstrated in PPS4 and given the ‘value’ (in monetary terms) of employment land in comparison to housing, it is better to protect the employment land unless there is an overriding need for an alternative use and the site/premises has no economic role.

Option b) Do not allow the loss of employment land and premises to housing where there is an absolute need for that housing

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Retaining employment land and premises in locations where there is a need to maintain a range of premises is very important to deliver jobs, thereby reducing poverty and social exclusion. Older premises can sometimes be cheaper for businesses and therefore offer more opportunities to create jobs (see SA of Option DMEP1 for a full explanation of the need to retain employment land and premises). From a negative perspective, housing would not come forward from this source.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Housing would not come forward from this source. Having said that, there are other policies in place to ensure the delivery of housing to meet the varied needs of the community.	-
4. Improve health and well being	N/A	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Preventing the loss of sites to alternative uses such as housing, ensures a ready supply of sites that can be occupied ‘immediately’ which are usually cheaper and are very important for small-scale businesses, which are the majority of businesses in the District (see SA of Option DMEP1 for a full explanation of the need to retain employment land and premises).	++
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Not allowing premises to be redeveloped to housing may result in old, dilapidated disused buildings being present, which is not beneficial to townscape.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A.	0

12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A	0
<p>Conclusion: Whilst the supply of housing is crucial, so is the supply of employment land and premises. Not protecting employment land and premises would have negative impacts upon the economy as the importance of maintaining existing supply and protecting the overall availability and distribution of employment land should not be underestimated. Existing employment sites provide the main supply of employment land and are required to meet the needs of the market by retaining a mix of older, more affordable premises, whilst maintaining a local balance between housing and employment. It must also be remembered that any loss of sites/premises will necessitate an increase in the amount of new floorspace required over the plan period, which could include Greenfield land. On this basis, it is crucially important to safeguard those existing sites that are fit for purpose. It would reduce opportunities for job creation and the retention of businesses - providing a range of sites, in both type and cost is crucial for the economy and this is demonstrated in PPS4.</p>		

'Transport and Accessibility' chapter (including Development Management policies section)

Option TA1 – Public transport, A: New development should be located/designed to optimise high quality public transport accessibility		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although not related to the creation of new facilities, high quality public transport accessibility should improve access to essential services and facilities, particularly for those without a car.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	High quality public transport accessibility can help reduce social exclusion for those without access to a car.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Improved access to job opportunities would result from high quality public transport accessibility. Also benefits to the vitality and viability of town centres by encouraging shoppers and business to towns.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Generally positive effect, but depends on extent of modal shift that can be achieved – given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely. Best opportunities are at Yeovil, Chard and some of the other Market Towns.	+

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential negative effect of bus priority measures (e.g. road widening, bus lanes) on townscape – sympathetic design should mitigate this effect.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative effect of bus priority measures (e.g. road widening, bus lanes) on historic environment, particularly in town centres which are mostly designated Conservation Areas – sympathetic design should mitigate this effect.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The promotion of public transport should help minimise CO2 emissions from traffic, but given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in public transport use are probably unlikely. Best opportunities are at Yeovil, Chard and some of the other Market Towns.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Impact on air quality should be minimised through promotion of public transport – particularly an issue at Yeovil with the Air Quality Management Area encompassing the town.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Not directly relevant to this objective – new development should avoid areas of biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	0
Conclusion: There are many positive benefits resulting from locating and designing new development to optimise high quality public transport accessibility. Potential negative effect on townscape and historic environment, although uncertain until more site specific proposals.		

Option TA1, B: Protect and improve public transport routes/hubs and support the creation of new ones where possible		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Although not related to the creation of new facilities, the protection and improvement of public transport routes/hubs should help improve access to essential services and facilities, particularly for those without a car.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Improved public transport can help reduce social exclusion for those without access to a car.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Better public transport links can improve accessibility to employment opportunities. The improvement of public transport routes/hubs can also promote the vitality and viability of town centres by encouraging shoppers and business to towns.	+

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Generally positive effect, but depends on extent of modal shift that can be achieved – given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely. Potential opportunities for improving public transport hubs are the regeneration of Yeovil bus station, re-opening of Chard Junction railway station, and other opportunities at some of the other Market Towns should be encouraged.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential negative effect e.g. through building Park and Ride sites, but sensitive design and landscaping should be recommended to mitigate this adverse effect, and addressed specifically in draft Policy EQ2.	? / -
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative effect of public transport hubs on historic environment, particularly in town centres which are mostly designated Conservation Areas – sympathetic design is recommended to mitigate this effect and addressed specifically in draft Policy EQ2.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The promotion of public transport should help minimise CO2 emissions from traffic, but given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in public transport use are probably unlikely. Best opportunities are at Yeovil, Chard and some of the other Market Towns.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Impact on air quality should be minimised through promotion of public transport – particularly an issue at Yeovil with the Air Quality Management Area encompassing the town.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Not directly relevant to this objective – new public transport hubs should avoid areas of biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	0
Conclusion: Similarity with Option A yields similar (largely positive) appraisal results, although focus on public transport routes/hubs means negative effects on townscape, historic environment, and biodiversity are more likely, but this will depend on location.		

Option TA2, Walking and cycling A: Protect and improve existing cycling and pedestrian routes		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Access to services and facilities by walking and cycling will be improved.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Better walking and cycling links can help reduce social exclusion for those without access to a car.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The provision of walking and cycling routes should encourage healthy lifestyles. Minimising car use will also benefit health through lower air pollution.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Better accessibility to work by walking and cycling.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Generally positive effect, but depends on extent of modal shift that can be achieved – given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential to enhance landscape if new walking/cycling routes form part of 'green infrastructure'.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Depends on location in relation to historic environment.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Walking and cycling provision should help minimise CO2 emissions from traffic, but given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Impact on air quality should be minimised through promotion of walking and cycling – particularly an issue at Yeovil with the Air Quality Management Area encompassing the town.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Not directly related to this objective – new walking/cycling links should avoid areas of biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	0
Conclusion: Many positive benefits, mostly shared with Option TA1 on promoting public transport, with the additional positive effect of improved health and well being as there is a greater opportunity to walk and cycle.		

Option TA2, Walking and cycling B: Provide cycle and pedestrian routes to link new development with new/existing services		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Directly encourages access to services and facilities by walking and cycling.	++
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Better walking and cycling links can help reduce social exclusion for those without access to a car.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The provision of walking and cycling routes should encourage healthy lifestyles. Minimising car use will also benefit health through lower air pollution.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Better accessibility to work by walking and cycling.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Generally positive effect, but depends on extent of modal shift that can be achieved – given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential to enhance landscape if new walking/cycling routes form part of 'green infrastructure'.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Depends on location in relation to historic environment – therefore uncertain.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The provision of walking and cycling links should help minimise CO2 emissions from traffic, but given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Impact on air quality should be minimised through provision of walking and cycling links – particularly an issue at Yeovil with the Air Quality Management Area encompassing the town.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Not directly related to this objective – new walking/cycling links should avoid areas of biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	0
Conclusion: Many positive benefits, mostly shared with Option TA1 on promoting public transport, with the additional positive effect of improved health and well being if people are encouraged to walk and cycle.		

Option TA2, Walking and cycling C: New development should be located/designed to prioritise the needs of pedestrians and cyclists over cars		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	The prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists in the location and design of new development should mean access to services and facilities by walking and cycling will be improved.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Better walking and cycling links can help reduce social exclusion for those without access to a car.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	The prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists in the location and design of new development should encourage healthy lifestyles. Minimising car use will also benefit health through lower air pollution.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Better accessibility to work by walking and cycling through prioritising these modes in the design and location of new development.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Generally positive effect, but depends on extent of modal shift that can be achieved – given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential to enhance landscape if new walking/cycling routes form part of wider proposals for 'green infrastructure'. Generally uncertain until locations are known.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Depends on location in relation to historic environment.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The prioritisation of walking and cycling should help minimise CO2 emissions from traffic, but given high levels of car ownership and rural nature of much of the district, significant increases in modal shift are probably unlikely.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Impact on air quality should be minimised through prioritisation of walking and cycling – particularly an issue at Yeovil with the Air Quality Management Area encompassing the town.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Not directly related to this objective – new walking/cycling links should avoid areas of biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	0
Conclusion: Many positive benefits, mostly shared with Option TA1 on promoting public transport, with the additional positive effect of improved health and well being if people are encouraged to walk and cycle.		

Option TA2 E: I&O consultation raised an alternative option that merits SA: “it will not always be appropriate to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over the car as this would distort the reality of life in a rural district”. Therefore do not prioritise pedestrians and cyclists over the car is appraised here

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Less opportunity to walk or cycle to services and facilities if these modes are not prioritised.	-
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Potential to reduce opportunities for deprived persons without access to a car.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Limiting opportunities for people to walk and cycle could discourage healthy lifestyles.	-
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Potential that walking and cycling links to employment opportunities will be limited.	-
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	If walking and cycling links are not prioritised, increased use of the car is likely to occur leading to congestion.	--
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Increased car use through not prioritising walking and cycling could increase CO2 emissions.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Increased car use through not prioritising walking and cycling could increase air pollution – an important issue for Yeovil Air Quality Management Area, where walking and cycling should be encouraged in particular.	-
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Mostly negative effects through not prioritising the needs of walkers and cyclists – clearly less sustainable than the other options in TA2.		

Option TA3 – Traffic demand management measures		
a) Traffic demand management measures		
A. Congestion charging		
B. Workplace parking levies		
C. Parking strategies, including charges		
D. Management of road space including bus priority.		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	These demand management measures (Option D in particular) could improve public transport access to services and facilities by discouraging car use.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	These demand management measures should discourage car use and therefore potentially increase use walking/cycling which would have health benefits.	+

5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Although access to work by alternatives to the car would be encouraged, the more stringent demand management measures could have negative effects on the local economy e.g. additional costs deterring businesses from locating in South Somerset, costs of workplace charging to existing businesses, congestion charging deterring visits to the towns and therefore affecting town centre vitality and viability. Less congestion would benefit local economy.	--
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	These more strict demand management measures should minimise car traffic growth and encourage alternative travel modes.	++
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Bus priority measures have the potential to impact upon townscape – sensitive design should mitigate any adverse impacts.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Depending on location, bus priority measures have the potential to impact upon the historic environment e.g. many town centres are designated Conservation Areas – sensitive design should mitigate any adverse impacts.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	CO2 emissions should be limited by minimising the growth of car traffic.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Fewer vehicles on the road should minimise air pollution.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: The more stringent demand management measures should bring several environmental benefits, but given the rural nature of the district, with relatively few alternatives to the car (particularly outside Yeovil) there are likely to be negative effects on the local economy associated with the more stringent traffic demand management measures.		

Option TA3 – Traffic demand management measures

b) Ways of improving travel choice

- E. Measures to improve travel choice
- F. Travel plans and travel awareness
- G. Car clubs/car sharing
- H. School and education travel planning
- I. Visitor plans
- J. Public transport information systems.

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Access to services and facilities by non-car modes will be promoted.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Social exclusion will be reduced for those without access to a car and travel choice is improved.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Measures to improve travel choice through the provision secure cycle facilities should encourage healthy lifestyles.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Access to work by walking, cycling and public transport will be improved. Less congestion should benefit the local economy.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	The implementation of measures to improve travel choice should minimise car traffic growth and encourage alternative travel modes.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	CO2 emissions should be limited by minimising the growth of car traffic.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Fewer vehicles on the road should minimise air pollution.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0

14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Several positive benefits arising from improving travel choice, and promotion of alternatives to the car. Less stringent than the 'harsher' (e.g. congestion charging, workplace parking levies) demand management measures should mean positive economic benefit, rather than the negative effects associated with the more stringent measures.		

Additional option:

I&O consultation raised the comment that none of the demand management measures should be introduced and instead better roads should be provided. This is contrary to national and regional policy and likely to have negative effects on all objectives; therefore it is not a 'reasonable alternative' option that warrants appraisal.

'Health and well being' chapter (including Development Management policies section)

Option HW1 and HW2 were screened out as explained on page 1.

'Environmental Quality' chapter (including Development Management policies section)

Code for Sustainable Homes: Option EQ1 – A. meeting Level 1 of the Code for Sustainable Homes		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Fuel poverty could be reduced due to slightly lower costs involved in running a home because of more energy efficient dwellings – CO2 emissions should be 10% lower.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Limited additional cost (0 – 1% increase in construction cost) of achieving this level is unlikely to inhibit housing delivery.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Code includes credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes, but Level 1 is not dependent on achieving these credits.	? / 0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Credits for including a 'Home User Guide' to enable home owners/occupiers to understand and operate their home efficiently may not be incorporated at this level.	?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with 'Secured by Design New Homes' may not be incorporated at this level.	? / 0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness. However limited effect at this Code level.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Cycle storage is required under the 'energy and CO2 emissions' category in the Code, but may not be incorporated at this level.	? / 0

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	10% reduction in CO2 emissions (above existing Building Regulations) is required to achieve Level 1. Sustainable construction required including water efficiency measures, although limited effect at this Code level.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction in construction waste is mandatory at all Code levels. Reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants is also credited; however, limited impact at Code level 1.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site.	+
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Code rewards ecological enhancement measures, but limited effect at this level.	0
Conclusion: This option has positive effects on reducing contribution to climate change, minimising pollution/waste production and flood risk, and reducing (fuel) poverty. Many objectives are uncertain, as achievement of many aspects may not be required to achieve level 1 – the potential benefits across the range of objectives are limited/neutral due to Code level 1 not requiring significant improvements when compared to the higher Code levels.		

Option EQ1 – B. meeting Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Fuel poverty could be reduced due to improved energy efficiency and therefore lower costs involved in running a home.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Construction cost increase of 3 – 4% could be a potential negative effect if housing delivery is reduced as a result, although publicly funded homes are already required to achieve Code level 3. Most of the cost of meeting the Code is due to the energy requirements, which are being implemented through the Building Regulations regardless.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Code seeks to improve health and well being by including credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes. Some of these points are likely to be required in order to achieve Level 3.	? / +
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Education and skills of homeowners/occupiers could potentially be improved by inclusion of a 'Home User Guide' to improve understanding and operation of their home efficiently.	?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with 'Secured by Design New Homes' could be required at this level.	? / +

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new and skilful building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness. These skills will be required to achieve level 3 e.g. ensuring a 25% reduction in CO2 emissions.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Use of bicycles is encouraged through credits for adequate and secure cycle storage facilities and included within 'energy and CO2 emissions' criterion of the Code for Sustainable Homes.	? / +
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	A range of sustainable construction techniques will be required that will reduce climate change and vulnerability to its effects. 25% reduction on CO2 emissions required to meet level 3. Water efficiency measures are mandatory to achieve necessary reductions in water use.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction construction waste is mandatory at all Code levels. Reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants is also credited.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site.	+
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	The Code rewards ecological protection and enhancement measures that may be required to achieve level 3.	? / +
Conclusion: More positive effects than Option 1 due to the higher sustainability standards necessary to achieve level 3, particularly on CO2 emissions. However, uncertainty on some of the objectives where it is not mandatory to meet standards.		

Option EQ1 – C. meeting Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Potential for significant reduction in fuel poverty due to highly energy efficient homes. Mandatory to comply with all Lifetime Homes principles meaning must be accessible to everybody and easily be adapted to meet the needs of future occupants, which could help reduce social exclusion.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Potential negative effect on housing delivery due to significantly higher costs involved in achieving Code level 6 – research shows cost increases of 30 – 40% to achieve level 6. However, most of the cost of meeting the Code is due to the energy requirements, which are being implemented through the Building Regulations regardless. The long term impact of increased costs should reduce as the economy adapts and high levels become 'the norm'.	-

4. Improve health and well being	Code seeks to improve health and well being by including credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes. Level 6 is likely to require achieving all of these credits.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Education and skills of homeowners/occupiers could potentially be improved by inclusion of a 'Home User Guide' to improve understanding and operation of their home efficiently.	?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with 'Secured by Design New Homes' are likely to be required at level 6.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new and skilful building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness. The skills required to achieve level 6 will be considerable, such as building a 'zero carbon' home.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Use of bicycles is encouraged through credits for adequate and secure cycles storage facilities, which are likely to be required to achieve level 6.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	High standards of energy efficiency and use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy technologies will ensure dwellings are 'zero carbon'. Stringent water efficiency measures required.	++
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction construction waste is mandatory at all levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Level 6 is also likely to require a reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants.	+
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site.	+
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Measures to ensure the protection and enhancement of ecology are likely to be required at level 6.	+
Conclusion: As one would expect, there are numerous positive sustainability effects in achieving the highest level of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The only negative is the likely reduction in housing delivery due to the high costs involved in achieving Code level 6. However these costs are likely to reduce over time as the Building Regulations are improved and this high standard of sustainable construction becomes commonplace, and technology, supply chains and building skills improve.		

Option EQ1 – Code for Sustainable Homes		
A. a single dwelling upwards		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0

2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Greater opportunity to reduce fuel poverty due to lower costs involved in running a home because of more energy efficient dwellings.	+ / ?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional cost of requiring Code for Sustainable Homes for all dwellings could potentially affect viability and therefore inhibit housing delivery.	- / ?
4. Improve health and well being	Code includes credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes which would improve health and well being.	+ / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Credits for including a 'Home User Guide' in the Code to enable home owners/occupiers to understand and operate their home efficiently could improve education and skills. Potential to improve workers' skills through requiring Code standard.	+ / ?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with 'Secured by Design New Homes' are part of the Code.	+ / ?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness.	+ / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Cycle storage is required under the 'energy and CO2 emissions' category in the Code which should promote cycling.	+ / ?
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	CO2 reductions required in the Code, as are sustainable construction methods such as water efficiency that will help with adaptation to climate change.	+ / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction in construction waste is mandatory at all Code levels, and reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants is also credited.	+ / ?
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	The Code encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site.	+ / ?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Ecological enhancement measures are rewarded in the Code.	+ / ?
Conclusion: Requiring achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes for all new homes has numerous sustainability benefits, although as the actual level of the Code is not prescribed there is general uncertainty in predicting the effects.		

Option EQ1 – Code for Sustainable Homes
B. 5 – 14 dwellings

SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Greater opportunity to reduce fuel poverty due to lower costs involved in running a home because of more energy efficient dwellings – less opportunity than option A due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional cost of requiring Code for Sustainable Homes could potentially affect viability and therefore inhibit housing delivery, although setting a threshold could provide the ‘economies of scale’ to offset this effect.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Code includes credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes which would improve health and well being.	+ / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Credits for including a ‘Home User Guide’ in the Code to enable home owners/occupiers to understand and operate their home efficiently could improve education and skills. Potential to improve workers’ skills through requiring Code standard.	+ / ?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with ‘Secured by Design New Homes’ are part of the Code.	+ / ?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness.	+ / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Cycle storage is required under the ‘energy and CO2 emissions’ category in the Code which should promote cycling.	+ / ?
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	CO2 reductions required in the Code, as are sustainable construction methods such as water efficiency that will help with adaptation to climate change.	+ / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction in construction waste is mandatory at all Code levels, and reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants is also credited.	+ / ?
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	The Code encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site.	+ / ?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Ecological enhancement measures are rewarded in the Code.	+ / ?
Conclusion: Requiring achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes has numerous sustainability benefits, although fewer than Option B due to the higher threshold that will apply before application of the Code is mandatory. As the actual level of the Code is not prescribed there is general uncertainty in predicting the effects.		

Option EQ1 – Code for Sustainable Homes		
C. 15 dwellings or more		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Greater opportunity to reduce fuel poverty due to lower costs involved in running a home because of more energy efficient dwellings – less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional cost of requiring Code for Sustainable Homes could potentially affect viability and therefore inhibit housing delivery, although setting a threshold of 15 dwellings or more should provide the ‘economies of scale’ to offset this effect.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Code includes credits for daylighting, sound insulation, private space and Lifetime Homes which would improve health and well being – less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Credits for including a ‘Home User Guide’ in the Code to enable home owners/occupiers to understand and operate their home efficiently could improve education and skills – less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory. Potential to improve workers’ skills through requiring Code standard.	+ / ?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Security credits for complying with ‘Secured by Design New Homes’ are part of the Code.	+ / ?
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	The Code encourages use of locally sourced materials and new building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness – less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Cycle storage is required under the ‘energy and CO2 emissions’ category in the Code which should promote cycling – less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	CO2 reductions required in the Code, as are sustainable construction methods such as water efficiency that will help with adaptation to climate change– less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	An increase in recycling/composting, and reduction in construction waste is mandatory at all Code levels, and reduction of nitrogen oxides and global warming potential of insulants is also credited– less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory	+ / ?

13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	The Code encourages effective management of surface water and development in low flood risk areas. Mandatory for peak rate of run-off into watercourses is no greater for the developed site than it was for the pre-development site– less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Ecological enhancement measures are rewarded in the Code– less opportunity than option A and B due to higher threshold for making the Code mandatory.	+ / ?
Conclusion: Requiring achievement of the Code for Sustainable Homes has numerous sustainability benefits, although fewer benefits than Options A and B due to the higher threshold that will apply before application of the Code is mandatory. As the actual level of the Code is not prescribed there is general uncertainty in predicting the effects.		

Option EQ2 – BREEAM		
A. BREEAM 'pass'		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Higher quality buildings could benefit deprived areas. Lower running costs for new non-domestic buildings.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	BREEAM incorporates measures to improve working and living environments.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Potential to improve the skills of workers by requiring BREEAM standard although limited effects in achieving 'pass'.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	New building techniques (e.g. greater energy efficiency, integration of renewables), which could improve local business development and enhance competitiveness. Studies suggest increased occupancy rates, higher rents and higher building values for buildings that meet BREEAM standards. Limited effects in achieving 'pass'.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	More energy efficient buildings will reduce CO2 emissions. Climate change adaptation methods such as water efficiency will also be positive.	+

12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Most objectives are not directly related to BREEAM standards; generally positive findings for those that are related although limited effects to achieve BREEAM 'pass'.		

Option EQ2 – BREEAM		
B. BREEAM 'good'		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Higher quality buildings could benefit the regeneration of deprived areas. Lower running costs for new non-domestic buildings.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	BREEAM incorporates measures to improve working and living environments.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Potential to improve the skills of workers by requiring BREEAM standard.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional cost of achieving BREEAM standard could inhibit non-residential development, although studies show only an increase of 0.2 – 0.4% to achieve 'good'. Studies suggest demonstrate the benefits of increased occupancy rates, higher rents and higher building values for buildings that meet BREEAM standards.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	More energy efficient buildings should reduce CO2 emissions. Climate change adaptation methods such as water efficiency will also be positive.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Most objectives are not directly related to BREEAM standards; generally positive findings for those that are related although limited effects to achieve BREEAM 'good'.		

Option EQ2 – BREEAM		
C. BREEAM 'very good'		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Higher quality buildings could benefit the regeneration of deprived areas. Lower running costs for new non-domestic buildings.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	BREEAM incorporates measures to improve working and living environments.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Potential to improve the skills of workers by requiring BREEAM standard.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional cost of achieving BREEAM standard could inhibit non-residential development, studies suggest an increase of up to 5.7% of capital cost to achieve 'very good'. However, studies demonstrate the benefits of increased occupancy rates, higher rents and higher building values for buildings that meet BREEAM standards.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	More energy efficient buildings should reduce CO2 emissions. Climate change adaptation methods such as water efficiency will also be positive.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Most objectives are not directly related to BREEAM standards. More positive than options A and B.		

Option EQ2 – BREEAM		
D. BREEAM ‘excellent’		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Higher quality buildings could benefit the regeneration of deprived areas. Lower running costs for new non-domestic buildings. Likely to be particularly positive at ‘excellent’ standard.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	BREEAM incorporates measures to improve working and living environments. Likely to be particularly positive at ‘excellent’ standard.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Potential to improve the skills of workers by requiring BREEAM standard.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional cost of achieving BREEAM standard could inhibit non-residential development, studies suggest an increase of up to 7% of capital cost to achieve ‘excellent’. However, studies also demonstrate the benefits of increased occupancy rates, higher rents and higher building values for buildings that meet BREEAM standards – particularly in achieving ‘excellent’.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	More energy efficient buildings should reduce CO2 emissions. Climate change adaptation methods such as water efficiency will also be positive. Likely to be particularly positive at 'excellent' standard.	++
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Several significantly positive sustainability effects in achieving BREEAM 'excellent' – clearly the most positive of the four options considered. The additional costs of achieving 'excellent' could impact on viability, but this is largely offset by higher occupancy rates, rents and buildings values.		

Option EQ3 – Proportion of renewable energy		
A. None		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	No opportunity to reduce domestic fuel bills under this option.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	No impact on housing supply is envisaged under this option.	0
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	No potential for job opportunities aligned with renewable energy generation will be created.	-
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Renewable energy generation will not be encouraged under this option.	--
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Mostly neutral effects, but no positive effects are identified under this option of not requiring renewable energy generation as part of new development. Some negative effects are likely in relation to the economy and reducing poverty, and a significant negative effect is identified in reducing contribution to climate change.		

Option EQ3 – Proportion of renewable energy		
B. At least 10% renewable energy generation		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The provision of renewable energy could reduce fuel bills.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Slight increase in construction costs could mean fewer homes built.	?
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Potential economic opportunities arising from renewable energy requirement through diversification of local economy.	+
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential impact on landscape – depends on location so currently uncertain.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative impact – depends on location so currently uncertain.	?

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Renewable energy requirement will reduce carbon dioxide emissions.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Potential negative impact – uncertain until locations are known.	?
Conclusion: Mostly neutral but some slight positive effects on reducing contribution to climate change, the local economy and reduction in poverty.		

Option EQ3 – Proportion of renewable energy		
C. At least 20% renewable energy generation		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The provision of renewable energy could reduce fuel bills – slightly higher than Option B.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional construction costs has the potential to inhibit housing supply.	- / ?
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Potential economic opportunities arising from renewable energy requirement through diversification of local economy. Additional construction cost of incorporating renewable energy could potentially inhibit new buildings for economic development.	+ / ?
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential impact on landscape – depends on location so currently uncertain.	?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative impact – depends on location so currently uncertain.	?

11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Renewable energy requirement of at least 20% will reduce carbon dioxide emissions.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Potential negative impact – uncertain until locations are known.	?
Conclusion: Mostly neutral but some positive effects on reducing contribution to climate change, the local economy and reduction in poverty – more positive than Option B. Negative effect of increased construction costs potentially inhibiting housing supply.		

Option EQ3 – Proportion of renewable energy		
D. At least 50% renewable energy generation		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The provision of at least 50% renewable energy should reduce fuel bills.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional construction costs to achieve 50% renewable energy is likely to reduce housing delivery in the short term. In the medium-long term, changes to Building Regulations will mean new homes will be ‘zero carbon’ from 2016.	-
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Potential economic opportunities arising from renewable energy requirement through diversification of local economy. Additional construction cost of requiring renewable energy to such a high level is likely to reduce delivery of new buildings for economic development.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Not relevant to this objective.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential negative impact on landscape and townscape – some uncertainty depending on location but requiring at least 50% renewable energy generation is considered likely to have negative effect.	-

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative impact – some uncertainty depending on location but requiring at least 50% renewable energy generation is considered likely to have negative effect.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Proportion of at least 50% renewable energy will reduce carbon dioxide emissions.	++
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Potential negative impact – some uncertainty depending on location but requiring at least 50% renewable energy generation is considered likely to have negative effect.	-
Conclusion: Mostly neutral but significant positive effect on reducing contribution to climate change, and positive effect on reducing poverty. Mixed effect on the local economy with benefits from diversification of the local economy, but also negative due to increased construction costs. Increased construction costs are also likely to inhibit housing supply.		

Option EQ3b – threshold for requiring renewable energy		
A. For all development		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Greater opportunity to reduce energy costs and therefore fuel poverty by applying renewable energy generation requirement to all development.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional cost of requiring renewable energy for all development could inhibit housing delivery.	-
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional construction cost of requiring renewable energy for all development could inhibit delivery of economic development. Potential economic opportunities arising from renewable energy requirement through diversification of local economy.	-
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential negative impact on landscape and townscape – some uncertainty depending on location but requiring renewable energy generation to all new development is considered likely to have negative effect.	-

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential negative impact on historic environment – some uncertainty depending on location but requiring energy generation to all new development is considered likely to have negative effect.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	The application of the renewable energy requirement to all development will reduce carbon dioxide emissions.	++
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Uncertain depending on location of renewable energy schemes in relation to biodiversity/geodiversity interest.	?
Conclusion: There is a significant positive effect of reducing contribution to climate change by requiring renewable energy generation to apply to all development, but several negative effects related to the delivery of housing and economic development. Also likely to be negative impacts on landscape and townscape and the historic environment.		

Option EQ3b – threshold for requiring renewable energy		
B. Only in 'larger scale development'		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Opportunity to reduce energy costs and therefore fuel poverty by applying renewable energy generation requirement to all development.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Additional cost of requiring renewable energy for larger scale development could inhibit housing delivery, although the 'economies of scale' associated with larger development should offset this.	0
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Additional cost of requiring renewable energy for larger scale development could inhibit delivery of economic development, although the 'economies of scale' associated with larger development should offset this.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Potential impact on landscape and townscape – some uncertainty depending on location.	?

10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Potential impact on historic environment – some uncertainty depending on location.	?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Reduction on CO2 emissions through requiring renewable energy, although as this only applies to 'larger scale' development, less positive than option A.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: The application of the renewable energy requirement to 'larger scale' development has mostly neutral impacts. The threshold of 'larger scale' development means there is a less positive effect on reducing the contribution to climate change, although potential negative impacts on the delivery of housing and economic development are lower under this option.		

Option EQ6 a) – Design – 'Building for Life'		
A. Gold standard		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Building for Life criteria includes provision of, or location near to, community facilities, and have easy access to public transport – likely to be required to achieve gold standard.	++
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Well designed housing development using Building for Life criteria can help to reduce poverty and social exclusion e.g. clear layout and design will make it easier for all members of society to find their way around.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Improved quality of new housing development by meeting 'gold' standard. Tenure and accommodation mix should reflect the needs of the local community.	++
4. Improve health and well being	One of the Building for Life criteria is provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including parks, play areas – likely to be required to achieve gold standard.	++
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Building for Life criteria include the provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including schools – likely to be required to achieve gold standard.	++
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Building for Life criteria include ensuring public spaces and pedestrian routes are overlooked and feel safe – likely to be required to achieve gold standard.	++
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Building for Life applies to new homes only, although well designed developments which are widely recognised (e.g. Poundbury) can raise the profile of a place a potentially attract new business.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Building for Life standards require easy access to public transport and the streets to be pedestrian and cyclist friendly – likely to be required to achieve gold standard.	+

9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The protection and enhancement of landscape and townscape is central to achieving much of the criteria in Building for Life e.g. architectural quality, well structured layout, distinctive character, well designed public spaces.	++
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Building for Life promotes the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment through distinctive character, architectural quality, etc.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Improvements above Building Regulations standards is rewarded by Building for Life criteria 13.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Numerous sustainability benefits would be achieved by requiring the Building for Life 'gold' standard to be achieved in new residential development, including several significant positive effects. No negative effects are identified.		

Option EQ6 a) – Design – ‘Building for Life’		
B. Silver standard		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Building for Life criteria includes provision of, or location near to, community facilities, and have easy access to public transport – good potential to be required to achieve silver standard.	+
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Well designed housing development using Building for Life criteria can help to reduce poverty and social exclusion e.g. clear layout and design will make it easier for all members of society to find their way around.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Improved quality of new housing development by meeting 'silver' standard. Tenure and accommodation mix should reflect the needs of the local community.	+
4. Improve health and well being	One of the Building for Life criteria is provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including parks, play areas – potential to be required to achieve silver standard.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Building for Life criteria include the provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including schools – potential to be required to achieve silver standard.	+
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Building for Life criteria include ensuring public spaces and pedestrian routes are overlooked and feel safe – potential to be required to achieve silver standard.	+
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Building for Life applies to new homes only, although well designed developments which are widely recognised (e.g. Poundbury) can raise the profile of a place a potentially attract new business.	0

8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Building for Life standards require easy access to public transport and the streets to be pedestrian and cyclist friendly – potential to be required to achieve silver standard.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The protection and enhancement of landscape and townscape is central to achieving much of the criteria in Building for Life e.g. architectural quality, well structured layout, distinctive character, well designed public spaces.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Building for Life promotes the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment through distinctive character, architectural quality, etc.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Improvements above Building Regulations standards is rewarded by Building for Life criteria 13.	+
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Numerous sustainability positive effects, although less potential to achieve these benefits than Option A due to lower standards required to achieve 'silver' standard.		

Option EQ6 a)– Design – ‘Building for Life’ C. a standard lower than silver or gold		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	Building for Life criteria includes provision of, or location near to, community facilities, and have easy access to public transport. At this lower standard, there is less potential to achieve this but some uncertainty as the standard is not prescribed.	+ / ?
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	The achievement of Building for Life criteria can help to reduce poverty and social exclusion, but at this lower standard there is less potential to achieve this.	+ / ?
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Building for Life seeks to improve housing quality and ensure tenure and accommodation mix meets the needs of the community.	+ / ?
4. Improve health and well being	One of the Building for Life criteria is provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including parks, play areas.	+ / ?
5. Improve education and skills of the population	Building for Life criteria include the provision of, or location near to, community facilities, including schools.	+ / ?
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	Building for Life criteria include ensuring public spaces and pedestrian routes are overlooked and feel safe.	+ / ?

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	Building for Life applies to new homes only, although well designed developments which are widely recognised (e.g. Poundbury) can raise the profile of a place a potentially attract new business.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Building for Life standards require easy access to public transport and the streets to be pedestrian and cyclist friendly.	+ / ?
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The protection and enhancement of landscape and townscape is central to achieving much of the criteria in Building for Life e.g. architectural quality, well structured layout, distinctive character, well designed public spaces.	+ / ?
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Building for Life promotes the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment through distinctive character, architectural quality, etc.	+ / ?
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	Improvements above Building Regulations standards is rewarded by Building for Life criteria 13.	+ / ?
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Generally positive outcome by encouraging the use of Building for Life standards, but less than options A and B. Also general uncertainty as the level of BfL is not prescribed.		

Option EQ6 a) – Design – ‘Building for Life’		
D. Development should not accord with Building for Life standards		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	No potential to meet to improve access to services and facilities.	-
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	No potential to reduce poverty and social exclusion.	-
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	No impact of housing quantity but potential detrimental impact on quality.	0
4. Improve health and well being	No potential to improve health and well being.	-
5. Improve education and skills of the population	No potential to improve education and skills.	-
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	No potential to reduce crime and fear of crime.	-

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	No likely significant effect on the economy.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	No potential to meet this objective.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	No potential to meet this objective.	-
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	No potential to meet this objective.	-
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	No potential to meet this objective.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Clearly the worst performing of the four options – several negative effects by not requiring new housing development to accord with Building for Life standards.		

Option EQ6 b) Design – What other ways of improving design quality should be sought within the Core Strategy?		
A. Adopt a 'percentage for art' policy		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Public art can be an important element of regeneration opportunities.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	Potential negative impact on affordable housing delivery if funds are diverted to pay for public art.	?
4. Improve health and well being	N/A.	0
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	The provision of public art can enhance landscape and townscape.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Public art should ensure historic assets are conserved and enhanced.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A.	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Largely neutral effects as most objectives are not applicable, but positive impact on landscape and townscape and opportunity to reduce poverty and social exclusion.		

Option EQ b) Design – What other ways of improving design quality should be sought within the Core Strategy?		
B. Encourage 'Home Zones' within new residential development		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Home Zone schemes can encourage active community engagement and improve the environment of deprived areas. They can restore the balance between traffic and communities to help make streets safer, more sociable and better places to live in leading to stronger, more vibrant and diverse communities.	+
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Home Zones can promote healthy lifestyles by prioritising walkers and cyclists over cars.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Lower vehicle speeds in Home Zones can reduce traffic accidents, and encourage walking and cycling.	+
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Home Zones can enhance townscape if well designed.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	The design of Home Zones should ensure historic assets are conserved and enhanced.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A.	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	N/A.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Several positive sustainability effects would arise by encouraging Home Zones within new residential development, including improved health and well being, reduction in poverty and social exclusion, and reduced effect of traffic on the environment. It is important that Home Zones are sensitively designed in historic areas to protect the historic environment.		

Option EQ b) Design – What other ways of improving design quality should be sought within the Core Strategy?		
C. Require new development to accord with ‘Secured by Design’ principles		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	Secured by Design principles include a well designed environment and encourage positive community interaction which can help foster community spirit and community cohesion.	++
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Reduced crime and fear of crime can improve health and well being.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	The entire concept of Secured by Design is based around the concept of reducing crime and the fear of crime.	++

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	Potential conflict as Secured by Design states footpaths and cycle ways (and therefore likely walking and cycling) should only be provided if they are likely to be well used.	-
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Secured by Design encourages a well designed environment.	+
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A.	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Secured by Design does promote improved lighting to reduce crime and fear of crime, but states light pollution should be minimised, and impact on local ecology and character minimised.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Secured by Design does promote improved lighting to reduce crime and fear of crime, but states light pollution should be minimised, and impact on local ecology.	0
Conclusion: Several positive benefits would arise from the incorporation of Secured by Design principles, including significant positives of reducing crime and fear of crime and reducing poverty and social exclusion. Potential negative effect on reducing the effect of traffic as Secured by Design could reduce the potential to walk and cycle.		

Option DMEQ1 – Design – retain Local Plan Policy ST6		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Policy ST6 seeks to protect residential amenity and open space with visual and environmental value.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0
6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	No mention of incorporating 'secured by design' standards – recommended that policy is amended to reflect this.	-

7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	Policy ST6 sets out design criteria that new development should achieve, such as respecting the form, character and setting of the local environment; and protecting residential amenity. Also includes criteria to ensure there are no unavoidable losses of open spaces with visual or environmental value.	++
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	Adhering to the design criteria set out in the policy should ensure the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.	+
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	No mention of incorporating design measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change – it is recommended that this is incorporated.	-
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	Not explicitly considered in policy, but criterion on protecting residential amenity could include issues such as noise, odour and light pollution.	0
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	N/A.	0
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: Broadly positive policy, but some recommendations are made that would improve the sustainability of the policy relating to reducing crime and fear of crime, and climate change adaptation and mitigation in particular.		

Option DMEQ4 – Environmental protection and enhancement		
Include a policy addressing issues such as flood risk, impact on air quality, water quality, light pollution, noise and other potentially polluting impacts of development.		
SA objective	Commentary	Score
1. Improve access to essential services and facilities	N/A.	0
2. Reduce poverty and social exclusion	N/A.	0
3. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified needs of the community	N/A.	0
4. Improve health and well being	Ensuring issues such as air/water quality, light pollution, noise are adequately addressed will help improve health and well being.	+
5. Improve education and skills of the population	N/A.	0

6. Reduce crime and fear of crime	N/A.	0
7. Support a strong, diverse and vibrant local economy	N/A.	0
8. Reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A.	0
9. Protect and enhance the landscape and townscape	N/A.	0
10. Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment	N/A.	0
11. Reduce contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects	N/A.	0
12. Minimise pollution (including air, water, land, light, noise) and waste production	The premise of this option is to minimise pollution, although currently lacking detail on how this will be achieved – recommend further detail.	++
13. Manage and reduce the risk of flooding	Option seeks to address flood risk, although there is currently no detail as to how this will be achieved – recommend further detail.	+
14. Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N/A.	0
Conclusion: As only a few objectives are relevant, mostly neutral scores. Although there are positive scores for those objectives that do apply, it is recommended that further detail is included in order to ensure that these positive sustainability outcomes can be achieved.		