

# Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan

SA Report to accompany the Regulation 14 version of the  
Neighbourhood Plan

Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

July 2024

## Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
EB: Environmental Planner	RP: Senior Environmental Planner	NCB: Technical Director	NCB: Technical Director

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Name	Position
V1.0	05.06.24	Initial version for group comment	LY	Neighbourhood Group Chair
V2.0	02.07.24	Regulation 14 consultation version	NCB	Technical Director

### Prepared for:

Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

### Prepared by:

AECOM Limited  
Portwall Place  
Portwall Lane  
Bristol BS1 6NA  
United Kingdom

[aecom.com](https://www.aecom.com)

© 2024 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited (“AECOM”) for sole use of Locality (the “Client”) in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. AECOM shall have no liability to any third party that makes use of or relies upon this document.

## Table of Contents

Non-Technical summary .....	
1. Introduction .....	1
Background .....	1
SA screening for the Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan .....	2
SA explained .....	3
Structure of this SA Report.....	3
2. Local Plan context and vision for the neighbourhood plan .....	5
3. What is the scope of the SA? .....	7
Summary of SA scoping .....	7
Key sustainability issues .....	14
SA Framework.....	15
4. Consideration of reasonable alternatives through the SA .....	20
Defining reasonable alternatives .....	20
Appraisal of options for the focus for growth in the neighbourhood area .....	20
Appraisal findings .....	20
Summary of appraisal findings .....	30
Developing the preferred approach for the Neighbourhood Plan .....	32
5. Appraisal of the Regulation 14 version of the neighbourhood plan .....	33
LPNP policies .....	33
Approach to the appraisal .....	34
Air quality .....	34
Biodiversity and geodiversity .....	35
Climate change .....	36
Historic environment.....	37
Landscape.....	38
Land, soil and water resources .....	39
Population and community .....	40
Health and wellbeing .....	42
Transportation .....	42
Conclusions.....	43
6. What are the next steps? .....	46
Appendix A Updated policy context .....	47

# Non-Technical summary

## Background

AECOM has been commissioned to lead on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the emerging Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan (the LPNP).

The LPNP is being prepared under the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012) and in the context of the local planning framework of the New Forest District Council and the New Forest National Park Authority. Once 'made' the LPNP will have material weight when deciding on planning applications in the neighbourhood area, as part of the local development framework.

SA is a required process for considering and communicating the likely effects of an emerging plan, and alternatives, with a view to avoiding and mitigating potential negative effects and maximising potential positive effects.

This Non-Technical Summary (NTS) provides a summary of the SA Report for the LPNP. It is published alongside the Plan under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012, as amended).

## Structure of the SA Report

SA reporting essentially involves answering the following questions in turn:

1. What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?
  - including in relation to 'reasonable alternatives'.
2. What are the SA findings at this stage?
  - i.e., in relation to the draft plan.
3. What happens next?

Each of these questions is answered within the SA Report and summarised within this NTS.

## What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?

### Housing numbers to deliver through the LPNP

The current Local Plan for the District comprises the *Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy* which was adopted in 2020 and sets the planning strategy for the area up until 2036, and the *Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management*, which was adopted in 2014 and sets out more detailed policies including identifying specific sites for new development.

Policy STR5 within *Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy* indicates that in the region of 200 additional homes should be brought forward in the neighbourhood area; either as allocations within Local Plan Part 2 or via neighbourhood plan allocations. In this context, there are two sites within the Local Plan Part 2 that are expected to contribute approximately 24 homes, with a residual target of 176 homes expected to come forward during the Neighbourhood Plan period.

## Defining reasonable alternatives

Whilst work on the LPNP has been underway for some time, the aim here is not to provide a comprehensive explanation of work to date, but rather to explain work undertaken to develop and appraise reasonable alternatives.

Specifically, there is a need to explore the strategic factors that have a bearing on the establishment of reasonable alternative approaches (i.e., in relation to the level and distribution of growth). These factors are then drawn together to arrive at reasonable alternatives.

## Appraisal of options for the focus for growth in the neighbourhood area

In recognition of the availability of site options within the neighbourhood area, the SA has considered the relative sustainability merits of taking forward a brownfield or greenfield approach to development.

To support the choice of a development strategy for the LPNP, the SA process has assessed the following options as reasonable alternatives:

- **Option A:** Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations.
- **Option B:** Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations.

The appraisal considers the relative sustainability merits of each option. Findings are presented as a commentary on effects. To support the appraisal findings, the options have been ranked in terms of their sustainability performance against the relevant SA theme. It is anticipated that this will provide the reader with a likely indication of the relative performance of the options in relation to each theme considered.

The full assessment findings are presented in **Table 4.1** to **Table 4.9** within the main body of the SA Report. A summary of the findings is presented in **Table NTS1** below and the accompanying paragraphs. This provides an indication of how the sites have performed in relation to each of the SEA themes.

**Table NTS1: Rankings of sustainability performance against each SA theme**

SA theme		Rank of preference	
		Option A	Option B
Air quality	Option Rank	1	2
	Significant effects?	No	No
Biodiversity and geodiversity	Option Rank	1	2
	Significant effects?	Yes - positive	Yes - mixed
Climate change	Option Rank	1	2
	Significant effects?	Uncertain	Uncertain
Historic environment	Option Rank	2	1

SA theme		Rank of preference	
		Option A	Option B
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes - mixed</b>	No
Landscape	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	No	<b>Yes - negative</b>
Land, soil, and water resources	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes - positive</b>	No
Population and community	Option Rank	2	<b>1</b>
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes – mixed</b>	<b>Yes - mixed</b>
Health and wellbeing	Option Rank	?	?
	Significant effects?	Uncertain	Uncertain
Transportation	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	No	No

**Overall, Option A is found to be most favourable in relation to air quality.** This reflects the focus of development on brownfield sites that are located within proximity to key community infrastructure and have better access to active and sustainable transport opportunities. Additionally, growth through Option A would be unlikely to lead to the removal of existing green features and infrastructure which currently act as pollutant absorbers. It is noted that no significant effects are anticipated through either option.

**In terms of biodiversity and geodiversity, Option A is found to be the most favourable of the two options.** This is due to development being focused on sites at further distance from ecological designations, and the potential for the sites to enhance ecological connections within the town (although it is recognised that some brownfield sites may already have a high ecological value in their current form). On this basis, significant positive effects are anticipated through Option A given the potential to deliver a number of benefits for biodiversity and geodiversity. Mixed effects are concluded likely for Option B given that new development would likely be delivered in proximity to designated sites for biodiversity and would likely overlap with SSSI IRZs. Mixed effects are also concluded due to greenfield sites have the potential to improve or expand the existing biodiversity network, especially if there is an overall with Network Expansion Zones. However, this is dependent on the design of any schemes which come forward.

**When considering climate change, the assessment concludes that Option A performs more favourably in comparison to Option B** as it would support an overall limitation of emissions via delivering development in more accessible locations with respect to public transport. Whilst both sites could result in an

increase in flood risk across the neighbourhood area, Option B would facilitate growth on greenfield sites, increasing non-permeable areas and potentially exacerbating surface water run-off issues and wider flood risk concerns. Although it is acknowledged that larger greenfield sites could potentially mitigate flood risk issues via appropriate drainage. Additionally, growth through Option A could allow for climate change mitigation and adaptation techniques that could benefit the wider built-up area. Uncertain effects are concluded most likely through either option at this stage.

**Overall, Option B is found to be most favourable when considering the historic environment.** This is due to the limited potential of greenfield development to negatively impact upon designated features, their setting, and their special qualities. This extends to the three conservation areas within the neighbourhood area. It is recommended that consultation with Historic England is undertaken for either option to ensure development proposals seek to implement sensitive and appropriate design – this will help mitigate any adverse impacts to heritage features and historic areas within proximity to the chosen sites. Significant mixed effects are anticipated for Option A; this reflects the concentration of heritage assets and areas within Lymington that could be impacted by brownfield development.

**In terms of landscape, Option A is found to be most favourable.** This is due to its reduced potential to impact upon sensitive landscape designations and areas (such as the New Forest National Park and the Bournemouth Green Belt), as well as its potential to bring forward positive effects for local landscape and townscape character within the settlement. Significant effects are not anticipated through Option A; however, Option B has the potential for significant adverse effects from urban sprawling and impacts to the special qualities of nationally important landscapes.

**When considering land, soil and water resources, Option A is considered to be most favourable.** Whilst growth through this option could result in the need for remediation of land before development goes forward, it would avoid the potential loss of productive agricultural quality land and support the most efficient re-use of land within the neighbourhood area. Significant positive effects are therefore anticipated if Option A is taken forward.

**Overall, Option B is found to be more favourable in terms of population and community.** This is due to the greater potential greenfield development has to deliver economic and employment opportunities and provide a good mix of different housing types and tenures. Significant mixed effects are concluded likely at this stage through both options; this reflects the fact that effects are partially dependent on design schemes and the specific locations of development. It also reflects the different constraints and opportunities brownfield and greenfield sites experience. **In terms of health and wellbeing, it is difficult to distinguish between both options as there are constraints and opportunities with each approach.** Impacts are largely dependent on the design of any schemes which come forward.

**Finally, Option A is found to be preferable in terms of transportation.** This is due to a reduced impact brownfield development would have upon experienced congestion issues, and the greater potential for integration into the sustainable and active transportation networks. Significant effects are not anticipated through either option.

## Developing the preferred approach for the LPNP

The preferred approach has been informed by the findings of the site assessments undertaken for the LPNP, community consultation events, and the SA findings presented above. **Specifically, the Regulation 14 version of the LPNP takes a brownfield-first approach to growth within the neighbourhood area – as proposed through Option A.**

The LPNP has taken a proactive approach in identifying available brownfield sites within the town centre environment that could contribute to meeting the residual housing requirements. In this respect, the LPNP has a strong aspiration and focus to revitalise the town centre environment by facilitating the delivery of high-quality design through the regeneration of previously developed land. However, at this stage of plan making the LPNP does not seek to allocate any of these brownfield sites for development. This is due to the New Forest District Council undertaking a review of the Local Plan; as significant changes have occurred since its adoption in 2020. As the review is at a very early stage, Lymington Town Council have agreed to address any additional housing delivery and allocations under a future LPNP review – this is to ensure there is no duplication of planning processes with the Local Plan review.

However, Lymington Town Council recognises the opportunities presented by the identified brownfield sites, and are supportive (in principle) of redevelopment proposals at these locations where they align with the Lymington and Pennington Design Code and wider LPNP policies.

## What are the SA findings at this stage?

The pre-submission version (Regulation 14 version) of the LPNP presents 13 planning policies for guiding development in the neighbourhood area. These were developed following extensive community consultation and evidence gathering.

Utilising the SA Framework of objectives and assessment questions developed during the earlier scoping stage of the SA, the SA Report presents the findings of the assessment as a commentary of effects under each SA theme. **Chapter 5** within the main body of the SA Report presents the detailed findings of the appraisal. The conclusions are presented below.

Overall, no potential significant negative or positive effects have been identified through the policy appraisal of the LPNP. However, the policy appraisal has identified a number of broad positive effects associated with several SA themes. This reflects the strong focus that the LPNP has on supporting development proposals which are sensitive to the environmental constraints within the neighbourhood area. With specific reference to each SA theme:

**Major positive effects are concluded likely for the landscape SA theme through the provisions of the LPNP.** This is due to the support of growth on brownfield sites; this reduces the potential for development to impact on the most sensitive landscapes within the neighbourhood area. It also presents the opportunity to improve townscape character. Major positive effects are also anticipated due to the high-quality design focus of the wider LPNP policies, which contribute to enhancing landscape and townscape character and quality.

**Major positive effects are also anticipated for the population and community SA theme.** This is due to the support of brownfield regeneration, which would allow



for potential new residents and development to integrate with the existing community. It also reflects the focus of the plan on protecting existing and delivering new community infrastructure, which will benefit residents of the neighbourhood area by ensuring their needs continue to be provided for.

**Overall, major positive effects are also concluded likely for the health and wellbeing SA theme.** This is due to the high-quality design focus of the LPNP, which includes the safeguarding and enhancement of key infrastructure that supports healthy lifestyles.

**Minor positive effects are anticipated for the biodiversity and geodiversity SA theme under the LPNP.** This reflects the support of brownfield redevelopment through the LPNP; which focuses growth away from undeveloped areas with a likely greater biodiversity and geodiversity value (given the proximity to designated sites). It also reflects the provisions of the policies – including seeking high quality design, the safeguarding of specific features, and enhancing the natural environment. These provisions contribute towards improving ecological connectivity within the neighbourhood area and delivering net gains for nature.

**Minor positive effects are also anticipated for the climate change SA theme.** This is due to focus of the LPNP on safeguarding and enhancing features that contribute to flood risk management and carbon capture and storage, including green infrastructure, as well as providing opportunities for active transport engagement. The conclusion also reflects the building standards included through the LPNP, which helps to ensure new development will adapt to changes in climate, and the flood risk and management considerations.

**The historic environment SA theme is likely to experience positive effects through the application of LPNP policies.** This reflects the potential for brownfield redevelopment to enhance the setting of specific heritage features and areas within the town centre environment, as well as the high-quality design focus of the wider policies and Design Code document.

**Furthermore, minor positive effects are concluded most likely for land, soil, and water resources.** Again, this is due to the support of brownfield regeneration through the LPNP; focusing growth away from undeveloped areas that could be of higher quality agricultural land. This conclusion also reflects the focus of the LPNP on safeguarding blue and green infrastructure, which contributes to the quality of land, soil, and water resources.

**Broadly neutral effects are concluded most likely for the air quality SA theme.** This reflects the limited potential for the LPNP to impact upon the baseline, given it does not allocate sites for development. It also reflects the support of the LPNP for the regeneration of sites within the Lymington settlement boundary, which may help to limit emissions linked to transport in the neighbourhood area. The provision of green infrastructure, the protection of green spaces, and the active transportation opportunities also informs this conclusion.

**Finally, minor positive effects are also considered likely for the transportation SA theme.** This is due to the plan supporting growth on sites that will integrate well with the active and sustainable transport network; reducing the need to use private vehicles to access key infrastructure.

## What happens next?

### Plan finalisation

Following Regulation 14 consultation, responses will be considered in finalising the LPNP and SA for submission. Following submission, the LPNP and supporting evidence will be published for further consultation, and then subjected to Independent Examination. At Independent Examination, the LPNP will be considered in terms of whether it meets the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans and is in general conformity with the Local Plan.

If the examination leads to a favourable outcome, the LPNP will then be subject to a referendum, organised by the New Forest District Council, and the New Forest National Park authority. If more than 50% of those who vote agree with the LPNP, then it will be 'made'. Once 'made', the LPNP will become part of the Development Plan for the New Forest area, covering the defined neighbourhood area.

### Monitoring

The SEA regulations require '*measures envisaged concerning monitoring*' to be outlined in this report. This refers to the monitoring of likely significant effects of the LPNP to identify any unforeseen effects early and take remedial action as appropriate.

It is anticipated that monitoring of effects of the LPNP will be undertaken by the New Forest District Council and the New Forest National Park authority.

# 1. Introduction

## Background

- 1.1 AECOM has been commissioned to undertake an independent Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan (hereafter referred to as the 'LPNP'). The LPNP is currently being prepared as a Neighbourhood Plan under the Localism Act 2011<sup>1</sup>, and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012<sup>2</sup>.
- 1.2 The LPNP is being prepared in the context of the New Forest District Council's Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy<sup>3</sup>, and Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management<sup>4</sup>. As part of the neighbourhood area lies within the New Forest National Park, the LPNP also has due regard to the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016-2036<sup>5</sup>.
- 1.3 It is noted that New Forest District Council are beginning the process of reviewing the adopted Local Plan. This is primarily due to a number of significant changes having occurred in the area that the Local Plan review will look to address, including with respect to national policy objectives, the climate and ecological emergency, and the levelling-up agenda<sup>6</sup>.
- 1.4 The most recently published Local Development Scheme confirms that the initial evidence base scoping and commissioning is underway. Issues and Options consultation (Regulation 18 consultation) is scheduled for summer 2024<sup>7</sup>.
- 1.5 Key information relating to the LPNP is presented in **Table 1.1** below.

**Table 1.1: Key facts relating to the LPNP**

Name of Responsible Authority	Lymington & Pennington Town Council
Title of Plan	Lymington & Pennington Neighbourhood Plan ('LPNP')
Subject	Neighbourhood Plan
Purpose	<p>The LPNP is being prepared as a Neighbourhood Development Plan under the Localism Act 2011 and Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The LPNP will be in general conformity with the New Forest District Council's Local Plan Part 1 2016-2036, and Local Plan Part 2, as well as the New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016-2036.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan will be used to guide and shape development within the neighbourhood area.</p>

<sup>1</sup> UK Government (2011): [Localism Act 2011](#)

<sup>2</sup> UK Government (2012): [The Neighbourhood Planning \(General\) Regulations 2012](#)

<sup>3</sup> New Forest District Council (2020): [Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy](#)

<sup>4</sup> New Forest District Council (2014): [Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management](#)

<sup>5</sup> New Forest National Park (2019): [New Forest National Park Local Plan 2016-2036](#)

<sup>6</sup> New Forest District Council (2024): [Reviewing our Local Plan](#)

<sup>7</sup> New Forest District Council (2024): [Local Development Scheme](#)

Timescale	To 2036
Area covered by the plan	The neighbourhood area covers the area administrated by Lymington & Pennington Town Council in Hampshire.
Summary of content	The LPNP will set out a vision, strategy, and range of policies for the neighbourhood area.
Plan contact point	Louise Young, Neighbourhood Group Chair Email: <a href="mailto:CEO@lymandpentc.org.uk">CEO@lymandpentc.org.uk</a>

## SA screening for the Lymington and Pennington Neighbourhood Plan

1.6 A Neighbourhood Plan requires SA where it is likely to have significant environmental effects. In this respect, Neighbourhood Plans are more likely to be screened in as requiring an SA if both the following apply:

- 1) the Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared within an area with significant environmental constraints, such as, for example, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and designated heritage assets; and
- 2) the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to allocate sites for development<sup>8</sup>.

1.7 The LPNP has been screened is by the New Forest District Council and the New Forest National Park Authority as requiring an SA. This is due to the Neighbourhood Plan seeking to encourage proposals for housing and employment development in an area with significant environmental and heritage constraints. This includes (but is not limited to):

- The New Forest National Park.
- The New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- The Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC.
- The Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar and Special Protection Area (SPA).
- The Solent Maritime SAC.
- The Bournemouth Green Belt; and
- Historic environment designations.

1.8 In light of this outcome, an SA process is being undertaken to meet the specific requirements prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations).

<sup>8</sup> DLUHC (2022): [Planning newsletter](#)

## SA explained

- 1.9 SA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the impacts of an emerging plan, and potential alternatives in terms of key sustainability issues. The aim of SA is to inform and influence the plan-making process with a view to avoiding and mitigating negative impacts. Through this approach, the SA for the LPNP seeks to maximise the developing plan's contribution to sustainable development.
- 1.10 SA is undertaken to address the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations) which transpose into national law the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive<sup>9</sup>. It also widens the scope of the assessment from focussing on environmental issues to further consider social and economic issues.
- 1.11 Two key procedural requirements of the SEA Regulations are that:
1. When deciding on 'the scope and level of detail of the information' which must be included in the SA Report there is a consultation with nationally designated authorities concerned with environmental issues; and
  2. A report (the 'SA Report') is published for consultation alongside the Draft Plan (i.e. the draft LPNP) that presents outcomes from the SA (i.e. discusses 'likely significant effects' that would result from plan implementation) and reasonable alternatives.
- 1.12 This 'SA Report' is concerned with item '2' above.

## Structure of this SA Report

- 1.13 This document is the SA Report for the LPNP and hence needs to answer all four of the questions listed below with a view to providing the information required by the SEA Regulations. Each of the four questions is answered in turn within this report, as follows:

**Table 1.2: Questions that must be answered by the SA Report to meet the regulatory requirements<sup>10</sup>**

SA Report question		In line with the SEA Regulations, the report must include... <sup>11</sup>
What's the scope of the SA?	What is the plan seeking to achieve?	An outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan.

<sup>9</sup> UK Government (2001): [Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment](#)

<sup>10</sup> UK Government (2004): [The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004](#)

<sup>11</sup> NB this column does not quote directly from Schedule II of the Regulations. Rather, it reflects a degree of interpretation.

SA Report question	In line with the SEA Regulations, the report must include... <sup>11</sup>
What is the sustainability 'context'?	Relationship with other relevant plans and programmes. The relevant environmental protection <b>objectives</b> , established at international or national level. Any existing environmental <b>problems</b> which are relevant to the plan including those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.
What is the sustainability 'baseline'?	The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan. The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected. Any existing environmental <b>problems</b> which are relevant to the plan including those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.
What are the key issues and objectives?	Key <b>problems/issues</b> and <b>objectives</b> that should be a focus of (i.e., provide a 'framework' for) assessment.
What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?	Outline reasons for selecting the <b>alternatives</b> dealt with. The likely significant effects associated with <b>alternatives</b> . Outline reasons for selecting the preferred approach in-light of <b>alternatives</b> appraisal/a description of how environmental objectives and considerations are reflected in the current version of the plan.
What are the assessment findings at this stage?	The likely significant effects associated with <b>the Regulation 14 version of the plan</b> . The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing <b>the Regulation 14 version of the plan</b> .
What happens next?	The next steps for the plan making / SA process.

## 2. Local Plan context and vision for the neighbourhood plan

### Local Plan context for the Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.1 The LPNP is being prepared in the context of the New Forest District Council's development framework.
- 2.2 The current Local Plan for the District comprises the *Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy* which was adopted in 2020 and sets the planning strategy for the area up until 2036, and the *Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management*, which was adopted in 2014 and sets out more detailed policies including identifying specific sites for new development.
- 2.3 The Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy document identifies Lymington as a town within the settlement hierarchy (see Policy STR4). This indicates it is a centre that offers access to a wide range of employment opportunities, as well as community facilities and services. The Local Plan includes two strategic development sites within the neighbourhood area, for housing. This includes the Land at Milford Road, Lymington site, which is allocated for approximately 185 new homes (see Policy SS5), and the Land to the east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington site – which is allocated for approximately 100 new homes (see Policy SS6).
- 2.4 Policy STR5 within Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy indicates that outside of these strategic site allocations, around 200 additional homes should be brought forward in the neighbourhood area; either as allocations within Local Plan Part 2 or via neighbourhood plan allocations. In this context, there are two sites within the Local Plan Part 2 that are expected to contribute approximately 24 homes, with a residual target of 176 homes expected to come forward through the plan period.

### Vision, aims and objectives for the LPNP

- 2.5 The vision for the LPNP captures the community's views and aspirations for the neighbourhood area as expressed through the neighbourhood planning process. It forms the basis on which the neighbourhood objectives and proposed policies have been formulated.
- 2.6 The vision is as follows:

---

“

- *A flourishing town with a younger, economically active population.*
  - *A thriving town centre utilising its heritage, marine and tourism appeal to differentiate itself from other towns in the forest.*
  - *A green town well connected to the surrounding coast, countryside, and National Park.*
-

- 
- *A self-contained town able to meet all its community health, education, and recreational needs.*
  - *A delightful town of distinct local areas, streets and rural lanes successfully blending the old with the new; and*
  - *A sustainable town that contains its impacts on the high-quality biodiversity and green belt that surround it.*
- 

## Vision statement for the LPNP



---

2.7 The vision is accompanied by seven objectives:

1. Minimise the effects of development on the Green Belt and the National Park by focussing development in the town centre.
2. Successfully integrate major developments into the town.
3. Prioritise housing types to suit the needs of younger households and local families.
4. Increase town centre leisure and cultural space to encourage visitors and the local community into the town.
5. Raise design standards of new development to reinforce local character and to address climate change and nature recovery.
6. Protect green assets and improve connectivity to the wider rural hinterland.
7. Increase provision of smaller business offices / workshops to meet local needs.



## 3. What is the scope of the SA?

### Summary of SA scoping

- 3.1 The SEA Regulations require that: *‘When deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information that must be included in the report, the responsible authority shall consult the consultation bodies’*.
- 3.2 In England, the consultation bodies are Natural England, the Environment Agency, and Historic England<sup>12</sup>.
- 3.3 The purpose of scoping was to outline the ‘scope’ of the SA through setting out the following information:
  - A context review of the key environmental and sustainability objectives of national, regional, and local plans and strategies relevant to the LPNP.
  - Baseline data against which the LPNP can be assessed.
  - The key sustainability issues for the LPNP; and
  - An ‘SA Framework’ of objectives against which the LPNP can be assessed.
- 3.4 The full SA Scoping Report is available on the Neighbourhood Plan website and accompanies the evidence base for the LPNP at Regulation 14 consultation.<sup>13</sup>
- 3.5 Responses received on the Scoping Report, and how they were addressed, have been summarised below.

**Table 3.1: Consultation responses received on the SA scoping report**

Consultation Response	How the Response was Considered and Addressed
<b>Historic England</b>	
<i>Response received from Principal Advisor on October 20<sup>th</sup> 2017</i>	
The nature of the locally-led neighbourhood plan process is that the community itself should determine its own agenda based on the issues about which it is concerned. At the same time, as a national organisation able increasingly to draw upon our experiences of neighbourhood planning exercises across the country, our input can help communities reflect upon the special (heritage) qualities which define their area to best achieve aims and objectives for the historic	<p>Comment noted. Since scoping was carried out in 2017 a number of Historic England documents have been published which seek to inform plan making. These documents have been an essential source of reference during the SA process.</p> <p>An updated list of policies, plans and strategies is included in Appendix A of this SA Report.</p>

<sup>12</sup> In-line with Article 6(3) of the SEA Directive, these consultation bodies were selected because ‘by reason of their specific environmental responsibilities, [they] are likely to be concerned by the environmental effects of implementing plans and programme’.

<sup>13</sup> Including the context review and baseline data for the neighbourhood area, for each SA theme.

## Consultation Response

## How the Response was Considered and Addressed

environment. To this end information on our website might be of interest: <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

In addition, general guidance on Sustainability Appraisal and the historic environment is set out in Historic England's publication "Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and The Historic Environment": <http://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-environ-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/>

Turning to our specific comments, we welcome the inclusion of the historic environment as a theme but suggest treating landscape and the historic environment as separate matters. Both are substantial matters in their own right, worthy of separate consideration as they are subject to different issues. Taking the two together could lead to the masking of effects on one or the other.

However, we welcome the inclusion of both designated and non-designated sites and areas, the setting of heritage assets ("cultural" is unnecessary as "heritage assets" are an accepted term as defined by the NPPF) and archaeological assets in the "Focus of Theme".

We do not consider the number or location of listed buildings or the designation of the Conservation Areas to be sustainability "issues" as such, but part of the baseline (the National Heritage List for England has 261 listed building entries for Lymington and Pennington parish). The potential effects of new development on those heritage assets are, however, as recognised in the Scoping Report, a potential issue.

The third "key message" from the National Planning Policy Framework in sub-section 5.2 is a requirement for Local Plans rather than Neighbourhood Plans. If, however,

Comment noted. The landscape and historic environment themes have been included as separate themes for the purposes of the SA. Assessment findings are presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of this SA Report.

Comment noted. The key issue has been updated to reflect this.

Comment noted. The key message relating to local plans has been removed, given this is a neighbourhood plan SA.

## Consultation Response

## How the Response was Considered and Addressed

this reference is to be retained then reference could also be made to the requirement in paragraph 157 of the Framework for local plans to “*contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment*” (paragraph 157).

We welcome the reference to the requirement of paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework that “*neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area...based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics*”.

However, has there been a characterisation of the Plan area to provide that “*understanding and evaluation*” outside of the Lymington Conservation Areas? Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan.

We therefore suggest a characterisation study as a precursor to neighbourhood plans as such a study can help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. If no such characterisation exists then this should be identified as a gap in the baseline.

Although not “policy” as such, it might also be worth citing the National Planning Practice Guidance’s advice that Neighbourhood Plans should include enough information, where relevant, “*about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale*” and “*about*

Whilst a specific characterisation study has not been undertaken for the neighbourhood area, the supporting Lymington and Pennington Design Guidelines and Code document positively contributes to the understanding of the historic character. It includes a local character analysis, which considers the contributions of heritage features, views, and landmarks.

Impacts to the historic environment resulting from plan policies and proposals, including the character and setting of heritage assets and areas, has been considered and appraised within Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 of this SA Report.

Comment noted. The Planning Practice Guidance has been an essential source of reference during the SA process.

Potential impacts to the historic environment, including non-designated heritage assets and features listed on the HER (where available to access), have been considered within Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 within this SA Report.

## Consultation Response

## How the Response was Considered and Addressed

*local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions”.*

We therefore consider that there should be a reference to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record and Hampshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment in sub-section 5.3.1. Is there a list of locally important buildings? If not, then this should also be identified as another gap in the baseline, and this should be a project to contribute to the evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan. (Advice on preparing a local list can be found on Historic England’s website, the link to which is in the Appendix to this letter).

The preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan is the perfect opportunity to undertake an Appraisal and to identify management recommendations – has there been any or is there any ongoing loss of character through inappropriate development, inappropriate alterations to properties under permitted development rights, loss of vegetation or insensitive street works?

Whilst it is correct that there are no assets within the parish identified as being at risk on the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register, the Register does not include Grade II secular buildings outside London. Has there been a survey of Grade II listed buildings in the Plan area to ascertain whether any are at risk of neglect, decay or other threats? If not, this should be identified as a gap in the baseline. Again, the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan is an opportunity for such a survey to be undertaken.

We welcome the proposed sustainability objectives in sub-section 5.4 of the Report. However, we would prefer the first assessment question to be “*Conserve and enhance the significance of buildings and structures of architectural or*

Potential impacts to the character of the neighbourhood area resulting from plan policies and proposals is considered through the plan appraisal section of this SA Report (see Chapter 5).

The Lymington and Pennington Design Guidelines and Code also has a strong focus on the preservation of character in the neighbourhood area.

Comment noted. The Lymington and Pennington Design Guidelines and Code also has a strong focus on the preservation of character in the neighbourhood area.

Comment noted. The SA Framework has been updated to reflect these comments.

## Consultation Response

## How the Response was Considered and Addressed

*historic interest, both designated and non-designated, and their setting”.*

We would prefer the fifth assessment question to be “*Conserve and enhance the special interest, character and appearance of the three Conservation Areas and their settings*”. We would welcome an additional assessment question “*Conserve and enhance archaeological remains, including historic landscapes*”.

We would expect the Scoping Report to set out the indicators or measures by which the policies and proposals of the Plan can be assessed against the objectives and sub-objectives. The Historic England advice on Strategic Environmental Assessments and the Historic Environment contains a range of possible indicators for assessing and monitoring the performance of the policies and proposals of the Plan against a historic environment objective. Not all of these will be relevant, but we suggest that the following be considered:

- the number and percentage of different heritage assets at risk;
- the percentage of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval; and
- the percentage of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies were developed and implemented.

Comment noted. The suggested indicators have been considered during the assessment of the draft plan (presented in Chapter 5 of this SA Report).

### Environment Agency

*Response received from Senior Planning Advisor on October 26<sup>th</sup> 2017*

We recommend an objective is included to protect and enhance the environment. Indicators should relate to the environmental constraints in your local area. This may include water quality, and biodiversity.

The SA Framework of objectives and assessment questions has been designated to consider the extent to which the policies and proposals in the draft Plan would seek to protect and enhance the environment (against a range of indicators).

We also recommend your SA takes account of relevant policies, plans and strategies including your local Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, flood risk strategies

Comment noted. The recommended policies, plans and strategies have been an essential source of evidence to inform the SA process and plan making.

Consultation Response	How the Response was Considered and Addressed
<p>(<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/flood-risk-management-current-schemes-and-strategies</a>), and the South East River Basin Management Plan (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan</a>)</p> <p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage, and Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a>.</p>	<p>An updated list of policies, plans and strategies is included in Appendix A of this SA Report.</p>
<p>Page 22 under SA objective “support the resilience of the NP area to the potential effects of climate change including flooding” you have stated that the option will “<i>ensure inappropriate development takes place in areas at higher risk of flooding</i>”.</p> <p>We would suggest that the wording is amended as it contradicts National Planning Policy. Wording along the lines of “<i>opportunities to reduce flood risk and put the most vulnerable development in lower flood risk area</i>” would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Comment noted – the SA Framework has been updated as appropriate.</p>
<p>New Forest District Council and the New Forest National Park Authority are currently in the process of producing a joint Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and this should be used to inform the emerging SA, ensuring that flood risk and climate change is fully taken into account when considering allocation options and in the preparation of plan policies, including policies for flood risk management to ensure that flood risk is not increased.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The latest available evidence has been an essential source of reference to inform the SA and plan making.</p>

## Consultation Response

## How the Response was Considered and Addressed

### Natural England

*Response received from representative of New Forest Team on October 16<sup>th</sup> 2017*

#### Section 3.3

The list of designations in the report is not entirely accurate / complete. For helpfulness sake the following designated sites appear to fall within the NDP area:

- New Forest SSSI
- New Forest SAC
- Lymington River Reedbeds SSSI
- Solent and Southampton Water SPA
- Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar
- Lymington River SSSI
- Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary SSSI
- Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC
- Solent Maritime SAC

Comment noted. Thank you for providing this list, it is most helpful. The effects of the LPNP on these designations has been considered in this SA report, specifically within the appraisal findings presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

#### Section 3.4

It would be desirable if the report focussed a little more on ecological connectivity. There is a risk that in some situations, development on land of limited biodiversity value in its own right can lead to the creation of islands of biodiversity, permanently severed from other areas. We thus suggest adding 'ensure current ecological networks are not compromised, and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced?'

Comment noted. The extent to which plan policies and proposals consider opportunities to encourage ecological connectivity and net gains has been considered within the plan appraisal section of this SA Report (see Chapter 5).

The suggested assessment question has been added into the biodiversity and geodiversity section of the SA Framework.

#### Section 8.4

Whilst there is a question relating to access to the countryside, there is none relating to impacts on existing recreational assets (quality and extent) so we suggest adding further wording in that section such as 'and avoids impacts on the quality and extent of existing recreational assets, such as informal or formal footpaths / rights of way?'

Commented noted. This suggested assessment question has been added to the health and wellbeing section of the SA Framework.

- 3.6 Since the publication of the SA Scoping Report in September 2017, it is acknowledged that there have been several emerging policy drivers and evidence base documents which have informed the SA and plan making. An updated policy context is contained within **Appendix A** in this SA Report.



## Key sustainability issues

### Air quality

- There are no Air Quality Management Areas and no Air Quality Action Plans in place within the neighbourhood area.
- Recent monitoring has indicated elevated levels of nitrogen dioxide in some locations in the neighbourhood area.

### Biodiversity and geodiversity

- Internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites are present in the neighbourhood area.
- The majority of the built-up area of the neighbourhood area is within SSSI Impact Risk Zones for either the New Forest SSSI, Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary SSSI or Lymington River Reedbeds SSSI.
- Biodiversity Action Plan Habitats are present throughout the neighbourhood area supporting a range of species, including protected species.
- The neighbourhood area has a rich geodiversity resource which should be protected and enhanced.

### Climate change

- New Forest District has had slightly higher per capita emissions totals than that of both the South East of England and England as a whole since 2005.
- New Forest District has also seen a greater reduction in emissions when compared with the South East and England.
- The potential effects of climate change on the neighbourhood area are varied. As such there is a need to improve the resilience of the neighbourhood area by supporting and encouraging adaptation strategies.

### Historic environment

- The neighbourhood area has a rich historic environment, including three Conservation Areas and 261 Listed Buildings. New development that comes forward through the LPNP could negatively impact upon these important features directly or indirectly, through changes to their special qualities and their settings.
- New development has the potential to lead to beneficial and adverse effects on the historic environment, including through affecting the setting of cultural heritage assets and landscape / townscape quality.
- New development could lead to pressures on non-designated sites and townscapes, including from the loss of key built and natural features.
- Improvement in access to and enhancement of, historic environment assets and enhancements to local distinctiveness through high quality development has potential for positive benefits for tourism.

### Landscape

- The New Forest National Park and Bournemouth Green Belt covers a significant percentage of the undeveloped land surrounding the existing built-up areas. This will likely limit the type and scale of development which could come forward at these locations during the plan period.



- Ten district landscape character areas have been identified within the neighbourhood area, containing locally important landscape and townscape features which reflect their distinctiveness and contribute towards a sense of place.

### **Land, soil, and water resources**

- A detailed agricultural land classification assessment has been undertaken in the neighbourhood area, with a number of areas of land classified as Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land. These are areas of land classified as the 'best and most versatile' for agricultural purposes.
- Small areas of Source Protection Zones cover parts of the neighbourhood area. Additionally, an area in the west of the neighbourhood area is within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone, which extends beyond its boundaries.

### **Population and community**

- Population growth within the area has the potential to impact upon the capacity of existing community infrastructure.
- A higher proportion of residents are over 60 years of age when compared to district, regional and national averages.
- The neighbourhood area has an ageing population. An ageing population has implications for community and service provision in the neighbourhood area.
- The current gap between lower incomes and high house and rental prices mean there is a need for affordable homes.

### **Health and wellbeing**

- The majority of residents within the neighbourhood area report their health to be 'very good', or 'good'. However, the level of reported 'very good' health is slightly below local, regional, and national averages.
- Comparatively, slightly more residents report 'bad' health or 'very bad' health than district, South East or national averages.
- An ageing population has the potential to increase pressures on healthcare services.

### **Transportation**

- Key routes in the neighbourhood area and the town centre can experience congestion issues during peak periods, including during summer months.
- The neighbourhood area is well connected by rail services and there are a number of bus services running in the area.
- There is a need for continued enhancements to public transport and walking and cycling networks in the neighbourhood area to help manage growth.

## **SA Framework**

- 3.7 The SA Framework provides a way in which environmental effects can be defined and subsequently analysed based on standard 'tests'. Each proposal within the current version (i.e., the Regulation 14 version) of the LPNP will be assessed consistently using the Framework.

**Table 3.2: The SA Framework**

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Assessment questions to consider for the allocations / proposals within the LPNP</b>
<b>Air quality</b>	
Improve air quality in the neighbourhood area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling, and public transport?</li> <li>• Implement measures (such as appropriate planting and provision of green infrastructure) which will help support air quality in the neighbourhood area?</li> <li>• Encourage development which reduces the need to travel?</li> </ul>
<b>Biodiversity and geodiversity</b>	
Protect and enhance all biodiversity and geological features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support continued improvements to the status of the European designated sites of significance within and / or adjacent to the neighbourhood area boundary, including the Solent and Southampton Water SAC, Solent and Southampton Water SPA, and the New Forest SPA and SAC?</li> <li>• Support the status of the nationally designated sites of significance within and / or adjacent to the neighbourhood area boundary, including the Hurst Castle and Lymington River Estuary SSSI, the New Forest SSSI and the Lymington River Reedbeds SSSI?</li> <li>• Protect and enhance semi-natural habitats, as well as priority habitats and species?</li> <li>• Achieve biodiversity and environmental net gains, and support the delivery of ecosystem services?</li> <li>• Support enhancements to multifunctional green infrastructure networks?</li> <li>• Ensure current ecological networks are not compromised, and future improvements in habitat connectivity are not prejudiced?</li> <li>• Protect and enhance sites of geodiversity interest?</li> <li>• Support access to, interpretation and understanding of biodiversity and geodiversity?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate change</b>	
Reduce the level of contribution to climate change made by activities within the neighbourhood area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the number of journeys made, and reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport?</li> <li>• Increase the number of new developments meeting or exceeding sustainable design criteria?</li> <li>• Generate energy from low or zero carbon sources, or reduce energy consumption from non-renewable resources?</li> <li>• Encourage and facilitate energy efficient and sustainable design within new development?</li> </ul>

SA Objective	Assessment questions to consider for the allocations / proposals within the LPNP
Support the resilience of the neighbourhood area to the potential effects of climate change, including flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that opportunities to reduce flood risk are taken where appropriate, and reduce the risk posed to development that is considered vulnerable?</li> <li>• Improve and extend green infrastructure networks in the plan area to support adaptation to the potential effects of climate change?</li> <li>• Sustainably manage water run-off, reducing surface water runoff (either within the plan area or downstream)?</li> <li>• Increase the resilience of biodiversity in the plan area to the effects of climate change, including enhancements to ecological networks?</li> </ul>
<b>Historic environment</b>	
Protect, maintain, and enhance the historic environment resource within the neighbourhood area, including the historic environment and archaeological assets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and enhance the significance of buildings and structures of architectural or historic interest, both designated and non-designated, and their setting?</li> <li>• Support the integrity of the historic setting of key buildings of cultural heritage interest?</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance local diversity and character?</li> <li>• Support access to, interpretation and understanding of the historic environment?</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance the special interest, character and appearance, and the setting of the three Conservation Areas?</li> <li>• Protect the integrity of the historic setting of key monuments of cultural heritage, as listed by the Hampshire HER?</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance archaeological remains, including historic landscapes?</li> </ul>
<b>Landscape</b>	
Protect and enhance the character and quality of landscapes and townscapes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the 'Special Qualities' of the New Forest National Park?</li> <li>• Protect and / or enhance local landscape character and quality of place?</li> <li>• Identify and protect locally important viewpoints which contribute to landscape character and a sense of place?</li> <li>• Conserve and enhance landscape and townscape features?</li> <li>• Support the green belt designation present in the area?</li> </ul>
<b>Land, soil, and water resources</b>	
Ensure the efficient and effective use of land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the use of previously developed land?</li> <li>• Identify and avoid the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land, which in the neighbourhood area may comprise Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land?</li> <li>• Avoid any negative impacts on mineral and waste infrastructure?</li> </ul>

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Assessment questions to consider for the allocations / proposals within the LPNP</b>
Promote sustainable waste management solutions that encourage the reduction, re-use and recycling of waste.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the amount of waste produced?</li> <li>• Support the minimisation, reuse, and recycling of waste?</li> <li>• Maximise opportunities for local management of waste in order to minimise export of waste to areas outside?</li> <li>• Encourage recycling of materials and minimise consumption of resources during construction?</li> </ul>
Use and manage water resources in a sustainable manner.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support improvements to water quality?</li> <li>• Minimise water consumption?</li> <li>• Protect groundwater resources?</li> <li>• Provide adequate infrastructure provision for water supply and sewerage?</li> </ul>
<b>Population and community</b>	
Support a more balanced age profile by 2036.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable enough working age people to live and work in Lymington and Pennington to balance the age profile?</li> <li>• Encourage younger people and families to stay in the area?</li> </ul>
Cater for existing and future residents' needs as well as the needs of different groups in the community, and improve access to local, high-quality community services and facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the development of a range of high quality, accessible community facilities?</li> <li>• Encourage and promote social cohesion and encourage active involvement of local people in community activities?</li> <li>• Minimise fuel poverty?</li> <li>• Improve the availability and accessibility of key local facilities, including specialist services for disabled and older people?</li> </ul>
Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in good quality, secure affordable housing, and ensure an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types, and tenures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide housing which is affordable and attractive to younger people and families and meet the identified need?</li> <li>• Support the provision of a range of house types and sizes?</li> <li>• Promote the provision of affordable housing which provide the security of meeting longer term needs?</li> <li>• Support enhancements to the current housing stock?</li> <li>• Meet the housing needs of an increasing population of over 65s?</li> <li>• Encourage older age groups to down size to meet their changing needs while freeing up larger family homes?</li> <li>• Provide quality and flexible homes that meet people's needs?</li> <li>• Promote the use of sustainable building techniques, including use of sustainable building materials in construction?</li> <li>• Provide housing in sustainable locations that allow easy access to a range of local services and facilities?</li> </ul>
Support the future adaptation and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a greater quality and variety of retail and leisure opportunities?</li> </ul>

SA Objective	Assessment questions to consider for the allocations / proposals within the LPNP
<p>evolution of Lymington town centre to create a thriving social, retail and leisure destination for all.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the evening economy?</li> <li>• Support the visitor economy of the neighbourhood area?</li> </ul>
<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	
<p>Improve the health and wellbeing of residents within the Lymington &amp; Pennington neighbourhood area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote accessibility to a range of leisure, health, and community facilities, for all age groups?</li> <li>• Align to the priority areas outlined in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment?</li> <li>• Provide and enhance the provision of community access to green infrastructure, in accordance with Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards?</li> <li>• Promote the use of healthier modes of travel?</li> <li>• Improve access to the countryside for recreational use?</li> <li>• Avoid impacts on the quality and extent of existing recreational assets, such as informal or formal footpaths / rights of way?</li> <li>• Provide safe accessibility around the town?</li> <li>• Respond to an increase in the neighbourhood area's older population through attracting younger people to the area?</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation</b>	
<p>Promote sustainable transport use and reduce the need to travel.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support the objectives within the Hampshire Local Transport Plan to encourage the use of more sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>• Encourage a shift to more sustainable forms of travel, and enable sustainable transport infrastructure enhancements?</li> <li>• Help reduce congestion in the town centre and other key hotspots?</li> <li>• Improve local connectivity and pedestrian and cycle movement?</li> <li>• Facilitate working from home and remote working?</li> <li>• Improve road safety?</li> <li>• Reduce the impact on residents from the road network?</li> <li>• Reduce the impact of the transport sector on climate change?</li> </ul>

## 4. Consideration of reasonable alternatives through the SA

### Introduction

- 4.1 In accordance with the SEA Regulations, an Environmental Report ('SA Report') must include:
- An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with; and
  - The likely significant effects on the environment associated with alternatives / an outline of the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of alternatives appraised.
- 4.2 The 'narrative' of plan-making / SA up to this point is told within this part of the SA Report. Specifically, how the SA process to date has informed the consideration of different approaches for key elements of the LPNP.
- 4.3 The following sections therefore describe how the SA process to date has informed the preferred strategy for the neighbourhood area and potential locations for development.

### Defining reasonable alternatives

- 4.4 Whilst work on the LPNP has been underway for some time, the aim here is not to provide a comprehensive explanation of work to date, but rather to explain work undertaken to develop and appraise reasonable alternatives.
- 4.5 Specifically, there is a need to explore the strategic factors that have a bearing on the establishment of reasonable alternative approaches (i.e., in relation to the level and distribution of growth). These factors are then drawn together to arrive at reasonable alternatives.

### Appraisal of options for the focus for growth in the neighbourhood area

- 4.6 In recognition of the availability of site options within the neighbourhood area, the SA has considered the relative sustainability merits of taking forward a brownfield or greenfield approach to development.
- 4.7 To support the choice of a development strategy for the LPNP, the SA process has assessed the following options as reasonable alternatives:
- **Option A:** Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations.
  - **Option B:** Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations.

### Appraisal findings

- 4.8 Utilising the SA Framework of objectives and assessment questions developed during the earlier scoping stage of the SA, the appraisal has been presented through the nine SA themes which have been scoped into the assessment.

4.9 The appraisal considers the relative sustainability merits of each option. Findings are presented as a commentary on effects. To support the appraisal findings, the options have been ranked in terms of their sustainability performance against the relevant SA theme. It is anticipated that this will provide the reader with a likely indication of the relative performance of the options in relation to each theme considered.

4.10 **Table 4.1** to **Table 4.9** below present the findings of the appraisal of the options for each of the SA themes.

**Table 4.1: Appraisal findings - air quality**

Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The latest air quality annual status report indicates there are no declared air quality management areas within the New Forest District Council area. Pollutants of concern are nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter, and sulphur dioxide – associated with traffic and local industrial activity. Whilst air quality has generally improved across the authority area, monitoring within the neighbourhood area has previously demonstrated there are areas of elevated nitrogen dioxide pollution.</p> <p>Brownfield development through Option A will likely bring forward new housing within proximity to existing services and facilities. This has the potential to reduce the reliance on private vehicles to access local amenities, thus reducing pollutant emissions linked to additional traffic. Additionally, given brownfield sites are more likely to be well integrated into the existing settlement, it is likely development would be located within closer proximity to active and sustainable transport infrastructure, such as bus stops and public rights of way. Again, this would be of benefit, as it would likely encourage new residents to engage with active and sustainable transport opportunities, which would link to a reduction in private vehicles and associated traffic emissions. Greenfield development through Option B is likely to bring forward growth in locations further away from the existing facilities and services. As such, it could lead to a greater reliance on private vehicles to access local amenities. Additionally, greenfield development may not be as well integrated with the existing active and sustainable transport networks. Given this, Option B would be more likely to increase the air pollutant levels linked to traffic and transport.</p> <p>Furthermore, brownfield sites present the opportunity to bring forward a good level of green infrastructure, given the sites have been previously developed and likely have lower amounts of existing green features. As such, development through Option A would likely be able to contribute benefits to air quality through increased pollutant absorption – linked to the design of the chosen scheme and incorporation of green infrastructure. In contrast, the development of greenfield sites through Option B</p>	1	2



### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

could result in the loss of green features that contribute to cleaning the air. However, it is noted that greenfield sites can be less limited in terms of size. As such, development could bring forward greater levels of new green infrastructure linked to the design of a scheme.

**Table 4.2: Appraisal findings - biodiversity and geodiversity**

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The Lymington and Pennington neighbourhood area overlaps with numerous internationally and nationally designated sites. The majority of the existing built-up area also intersects with SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) associated with these sites. Therefore, consultation with Natural England is likely to be required irrespective of whether Option A or Option B is selected as the preferred approach for the LPNP.</p> <p>Reflecting the biodiversity value provided by the habitat coverage and designated sites, much of the neighbourhood area is covered by National Habitat Networks and as such has potential to support biodiversity improvements, for example through the restoration and connection of habitats. In this respect, the regeneration of brownfield sites within the built up area will likely include a biodiversity focus through the design and layout of the scheme – for example, planting of tree and plant species, and incorporating hedgerow boundaries. This will not only improve biodiversity value on the sites, but will also contribute to improving wider biodiversity connectivity by integrating the brownfield sites into the biodiversity network.</p> <p>Additionally, growth through Option A would also focus development within areas that are likely to be located away from the important designations. This reduces the potential for negative impacts to these sites. However, it is important to acknowledge that brownfield sites can often have an ecological value, and as such development could also result in the loss of this value in the absence of sensitive design and mitigation. It is also important to take in consideration the size of sites; brownfield sites are likely to be smaller than greenfield sites, and as such have a lower potential to deliver significant net gains for nature on site.</p> <p>Growth through Option B would focus on greenfield development. This has the potential to be a negative impact for biodiversity and geodiversity given it would result in growth on</p>	1	2



### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

new, undeveloped sites – which may contain sensitive ecological features. This may negatively impact on wider biodiversity connectivity by removing infrastructure that contributes to the biodiversity network across the neighbourhood area. However, it is also noted that greenfield development has the potential to bring forward a greater level of green infrastructure enhancements (depending on the size of individual sites and the design scheme). This would positively contribute to the wider biodiversity network in the neighbourhood area, especially if greenfield sites are located within Network Enhancement Zones which have been identified by the National Habitat Network.		
---	--	--

**Table 4.3: Appraisal findings - climate change**

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>With respect to the climate change SA theme, the extent to which options would encourage opportunities to tackle the climate crisis and enhance the resilience of the neighbourhood area to the potential effects of climate change are key considerations.</p> <p>Growth through either option will contribute to an increase in the carbon emissions released from the neighbourhood area, due to an intensification of land use and activity.</p> <p>The extent to which the Neighbourhood Plan has the potential to support climate change resilience is dependent (in part) on a distribution strategy which promotes development at locations in closer proximity to the existing services and facilities in the neighbourhood area. It is also dependent on the extent to which mitigation and adaptation measures are incorporated into the design of new development areas. In this respect, growth through Option A will bring forward development largely within the built up part of the neighbourhood area – and as such will be closer to existing services and facilities. This would help to limit emissions, as residents would be able to avoid using vehicles to access key infrastructure. Additionally, brownfield development through Option A is more likely to be located within proximity to existing sustainable transport opportunities – further reducing emissions linked to transportation by offering viable alternatives to private vehicle use.</p>	1	2

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

In comparison, growth through Option B would likely be located a distance from the town centre, as greenfield site options are primarily located outside of the existing built-up areas. As such, the use of private vehicles could increase through this option – as vehicles may be necessary to access key infrastructure. However, it is noted that greenfield development has the potential to deliver new footpaths and cycleways as part of the development design; which may help to facilitate new access points for sustainable transportation. Therefore, growth through Option B could also support a reduction in emissions through extending and enhancing the active and sustainable transport networks. Furthermore, a focus on greenfield land through Option B could deliver coordinated infrastructure across sites within proximity to one another – such as a decentralised energy network. This would be highly beneficial, as it could allow for greater climate mitigation and adaptation infrastructure to come forward.

Flood risk could increase through either option, linked to growth and additional development in the neighbourhood area. There are significant risks both within and outside of the settlement boundaries, associated with the River Lymington and Avon Water (and their tributaries). It is noted, however, that this increase in risk would likely be greater through Option B as this would deliver a greater proportion of new development on undeveloped land – increasing the potential coverage of impermeable materials (and associated run-off). However, impacts will be dependent on the location and scale of new development areas, and the extent to which suitable drainage and natural features are incorporated into the design of schemes.

### Table 4.4: Appraisal findings - historic environment

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
There are three conservation areas within the neighbourhood boundary, as well as 260 listed buildings, and a scheduled monument. As such, growth through either option has the potential to impact upon the historic environment – linked to development being located within proximity to designated heritage assets and areas. It is noted that whilst non-designated heritage assets will be present within the neighbourhood area, the number and their location is uncertain.	2	1

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

<p>This reflects a lack of local historic environment records available to examine.</p> <p>A brownfield focus through Option A will see development come forward largely within the built up areas of Lymington where most of the designated features and areas are located. As such, development through a brownfield focus under Option A has the potential to have a greater concentration of effects on the historic environment. However, well planned and considerate development could enhance the contribution of brownfield sites to the historic setting of the town. In contrast, development that does not appropriately consider the historic environment could detract from the setting of heritage features and influence the interpretation and experience of specific features within the conservation areas. In this way, there is a need to seek well designed development proposals to reduce the potential for negative impacts through Option A.</p> <p>In contrast, Option B seeks to bring forward development on greenfield sites. Similarly to Option A, impacts to the historic environment could arise where changes to the setting and special qualities of features occur – both positive and negative. However, it is more likely that greenfield development would be located at further distance from heritage assets and areas. The existing development within the town may also provide a visual buffer to the sites, and there may be opportunities to deliver appropriate planting and natural boundaries to facilitate screening (particularly on larger greenfield site options).</p>		
---	--	--

**Table 4.5: Appraisal findings - landscape**

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The neighbourhood area is partially within the New Forest National Park, and a large proportion of land outside of the designation is within the Bournemouth Green Belt. As such, greenfield development opportunities are likely to be limited and growth through Option B has the potential to significantly impact upon the integrity of these designations. Greenfield development will result in the expansion of the settlement into the open countryside that serves as the setting of the National Park. Additionally, the development of land within and in proximity to the Bournemouth Green Belt would likely contribute to the closing of landscape gaps – for example, between</p>	1	2

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

<p>Lymington and Lower Pennington (to the south), and between Lymington and Everton (to the west).</p> <p>Whilst development through Option B would involve the settlement of Lymington to expand in to sensitive landscape areas, it may also bring forward opportunities. Proposals for larger greenfield sites have the potential to adopt sensitive design measures that can help deliver green infrastructure enhancements. This could include tree planting and hedgerow usage – which not only helps to screen the development, but also contributing to landscape character by improving views.</p> <p>Comparatively, development through Option A would help to limit potential impacts upon the New Forest National Park and the Bournemouth Green Belt, given development would be focused within the existing built-up area. This may include via reducing visual impacts to these sensitive landscape areas. This approach would also help to contain any effects from urban sprawling, preventing landscape character erosion in more sensitive and open areas. Additionally, growth through Option A would have the potential to positively impact upon the townscape character of Lymington, through regenerating older and redundant sites / buildings and delivering public realm improvements. This would contribute to an enhanced level visual amenity for the settlement by regenerating sites and structures that may detract from the character of Lymington (in their current form).</p>		
---	--	--

**Table 4.6: Appraisal findings - land, soil, and water resources**

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The agricultural land classification assessment indicates parts of the neighbourhood area are underlain with Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land – which is some of the best and most versatile land suitable for agricultural activity. Additionally, a small area in the northern extent of the neighbourhood area is within source protection zones, and part of the western area is within a nitrate vulnerability zone.</p> <p>In the context of the above, growth through Option A would help to safeguard soil and water resources. Comparatively, Option B may potentially result in the permanent loss of areas of best and most versatile land for agricultural purposes which cannot be mitigated. However, whilst Option A promotes an efficient use of</p>	1	2

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

land, it is noted that brownfield sites can require remediation to make them suitable for regeneration and development.

There are two main water resources within the neighbourhood area: Lymington River on the eastern neighbourhood boundary, and Avon Water on the western neighbourhood boundary. Growth on greenfield sites through Option B has the potential to increase non-permeable surfaces in the neighbourhood area, which could cause run-off into these two water resources. However, this is dependent on the location of development, and the green infrastructure strategy incorporated into the design of schemes.

## Table 4.7: Appraisal findings - population and community

### Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

### Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The extent to which the options would help to facilitate new homes of a range of types and tenures, encourage and enhance accessibility and connectivity to services and facilities, and support community vitality, are key considerations with respect to the population and community theme. This is considered below.</p> <p>Option A will bring forward development that is situated closer to existing community infrastructure in the town. As such, it is likely new development would be closer to existing economic and employment opportunities, and local services and facilities, – thus allowing for a good level of access for new residents. Additionally, Option A would help to facilitate community integration between new and existing residents, given development would be located within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Comparatively, whilst growth through Option B would likely bring forward development that is further away from existing economic and employment opportunities, and local services and facilities, this approach may deliver housing on larger site options which could incorporate a greater mix of homes (including affordable homes) in comparison to brownfield site options. However, this is perhaps less likely for greenfield site options within the New Forest National Park or Bournemouth Green Belt, given the development control measures in place for these sensitive landscape areas. There might also be viability concerns for sites brought forward via Option A, including multiple ownership issues and potential contamination</p>	2	1

---

**Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations**
**Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations**


---

from former uses, and there may be fewer opportunities to deliver a suitable mix of housing types and tenures on some of the smaller brownfield site options.		
---	--	--

---

**Table 4.8: Appraisal findings - health and wellbeing**


---

**Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations**
**Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations**


---

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The extent to which the options would contribute to the enhancement of health and wellbeing, including through the provision of new infrastructure and opportunities to engage with physical activity, are key considerations in relation to this theme. This is considered below.</p> <p>Growth through a brownfield focus (Option A) will bring forward development within proximity to existing services and facilities. This is of benefit, as it means there would be a greater level of access and connectivity to community infrastructure. In contrast, greenfield development will bring forward growth that is a distance from existing community infrastructure, which may contribute less towards improving access and connectivity within the neighbourhood area. However, it is noted that greenfield development (Option B) may increase the viability of delivering new infrastructure - due to the size and capacity of larger greenfield site options. This could improve connectivity and access to infrastructure and support wellbeing.</p> <p>Facilitating growth through Option A will safeguard sensitive areas of countryside which surrounds the town, including locations which may sit within the New Forest National Park or Bournemouth Green Belt. This will help to protect open and green spaces that support active lifestyles and promote physical and mental health. However, it is noted this would be dependent on the ability of residents to access and connect to these spaces from the town. This may be more readily achievable via greenfield sites (Option B).</p>	?	?

---

**Table 4.9: Appraisal findings - transportation**

Option A: Support housing growth via brownfield site allocations

Option B: Support housing growth via greenfield site allocations

Discussion of potential effects and relative merits of options	Rank of preference	
	A	B
<p>The neighbourhood area has a good level of sustainable transportation opportunities. However, it is noted that the road network can experience congestion issues in peak periods, especially around the town centre. The extent to which the options would facilitate and encourage access and connectivity to public transport options is a key consideration for the transportation SA theme.</p> <p>Option A will encourage development to come forward in parts of the neighbourhood area with existing access to sustainable and active transportation opportunities. Additionally, given the likely proximity of brownfield sites to the town centre, this may help to limit the use of private vehicles to access local services and facilities. Option A would therefore help to tackle traffic issues within the neighbourhood area, reducing the likelihood of exacerbating existing congestion issues.</p> <p>In contrast, Option B would bring forward development on greenfield land that is likely be a distance from active and sustainable transportation infrastructure. Given this, it is likely Option B may increase private vehicular travel – which could contribute to elevated levels of traffic and congestion. However, it is also noted that greenfield development has the potential to facilitate new active and sustainable transport opportunities – for example, new public rights of way or sustainable transport infrastructure. This is dependent on the design of any schemes which are brought forward.</p>	1	2



## Summary of appraisal findings

**Table 4.10: Rankings of sustainability performance against each SA theme**

SA theme		Rank of preference	
		Option A	Option B
Air quality	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	No	No
Biodiversity and geodiversity	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes - positive</b>	<b>Yes - mixed</b>
Climate change	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	Uncertain	Uncertain
Historic environment	Option Rank	2	<b>1</b>
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes - mixed</b>	No
Landscape	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	No	<b>Yes - negative</b>
Land, soil, and water resources	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes - positive</b>	No
Population and community	Option Rank	2	<b>1</b>
	Significant effects?	<b>Yes – mixed</b>	<b>Yes - mixed</b>
Health and wellbeing	Option Rank	?	?
	Significant effects?	Uncertain	Uncertain
Transportation	Option Rank	<b>1</b>	2
	Significant effects?	No	No

### 4.11 Overall, Option A is found to be most favourable in relation to air quality.

This reflects the focus of development on brownfield sites that are located within proximity to key community infrastructure and have better access to active and sustainable transport opportunities. Additionally, growth through Option A would be unlikely to lead to the removal of existing green features and infrastructure which currently act as pollutant absorbers. It is noted that no significant effects are anticipated through either option.



- 4.12 In terms of biodiversity and geodiversity, Option A is found to be the most favourable of the two options.** This is due to development being focused on sites at further distance from ecological designations, and the potential for the sites to enhance ecological connections within the town (although it is recognised that some brownfield sites may already have a high ecological value in their current form). On this basis, significant positive effects are anticipated through Option A given the potential to deliver a number of benefits for biodiversity and geodiversity. Mixed effects are concluded likely for Option B given that new development would likely be delivered in proximity to designated sites for biodiversity and would likely overlap with SSSI IRZs. Mixed effects are also concluded due to greenfield sites have the potential to improve or expand the existing biodiversity network, especially if there is an overall with Network Expansion Zones. However, this is dependent on the design of any schemes which come forward.
- 4.13 When considering climate change, the assessment concludes that Option A performs more favourably in comparison to Option B** as it would support an overall limitation of emissions via delivering development in more accessible locations with respect to public transport. Whilst both sites could result in an increase in flood risk across the neighbourhood area, Option B would facilitate growth on greenfield sites, increasing non-permeable areas and potentially exacerbating surface water run-off issues and wider flood risk concerns. Although it is acknowledged that larger greenfield sites could potentially mitigate flood risk issues via appropriate drainage. Additionally, growth through Option A could allow for climate change mitigation and adaptation techniques that could benefit the wider built-up area. Uncertain effects are concluded most likely through either option at this stage.
- 4.14 Overall, Option B is found to be most favourable when considering the historic environment.** This is due to the limited potential of greenfield development to negatively impact upon designated features, their setting, and their special qualities. This extends to the three conservation areas within the neighbourhood area. It is recommended that consultation with Historic England is undertaken for either option to ensure development proposals seek to implement sensitive and appropriate design – this will help mitigate any adverse impacts to heritage features and historic areas within proximity to the chosen sites. Significant mixed effects are anticipated for Option A; this reflects the concentration of heritage assets and areas within Lymington that could be impacted by brownfield development.
- 4.15 In terms of landscape, Option A is found to be most favourable.** This is due to its reduced potential to impact upon sensitive landscape designations and areas (such as the New Forest National Park and the Bournemouth Green Belt), as well as its potential to bring forward positive effects for local landscape and townscape character within the settlement. Significant effects are not anticipated through Option A; however, Option B has the potential for significant adverse effects from urban sprawling and impacts to the special qualities of nationally important landscapes.
- 4.16 When considering land, soil and water resources, Option A is considered to be most favourable.** Whilst growth through this option could result in the need for remediation of land before development goes forward, it would avoid the potential loss of productive agricultural quality land and support the most

efficient re-use of land within the neighbourhood area. Significant positive effects are therefore anticipated if Option A is taken forward.

- 4.17 **Overall, Option B is found to be more favourable in terms of population and community.** This is due to the greater potential greenfield development has to deliver economic and employment opportunities and provide a good mix of different housing types and tenures. Significant mixed effects are concluded likely at this stage through both options; this reflects the fact that effects are partially dependent on design schemes and the specific locations of development. It also reflects the different constraints and opportunities brownfield and greenfield sites experience. **In terms of health and wellbeing, it is difficult to distinguish between both options as there are constraints and opportunities with each approach.** Impacts are largely dependent on the design of any schemes which come forward.
- 4.18 **Finally, Option A is found to be preferable in terms of transportation.** This is due to a reduced impact brownfield development would have upon experienced congestion issues, and the greater potential for integration into the sustainable and active transportation networks. Significant effects are not anticipated through either option.

## Developing the preferred approach for the Neighbourhood Plan

- 4.19 The preferred approach been informed by the findings of the site assessments undertaken for the LPNP, community consultation events, and the SA findings presented above. **Specifically, the Regulation 14 version of the LPNP takes a brownfield-first approach to growth within the neighbourhood area – as proposed through Option A.**
- 4.20 The LPNP has taken a proactive approach in identifying available brownfield sites within the town centre environment that could contribute to meeting the residual housing requirements. In this respect, the LPNP has a strong aspiration and focus to revitalise the town centre environment by facilitating the delivery of high-quality design through the regeneration of previously developed land. However, at this stage of plan making the LPNP does not seek to allocate any of these brownfield sites for development. This is due to the New Forest District Council undertaking a review of the Local Plan; as significant changes have occurred since its adoption in 2020. As the review is at a very early stage, Lymington Town Council have agreed to address any additional housing delivery and allocations under a future LPNP review – this is to ensure there is no duplication of planning processes with the Local Plan review.
- 4.21 However, Lymington Town Council recognises the opportunities presented by the identified brownfield sites, and are supportive (in principle) of redevelopment proposals at these locations where they align with the Lymington and Pennington Design Code and wider LPNP policies.

## 5. Appraisal of the Regulation 14 version of the neighbourhood plan

### Introduction

5.1 The aim of this chapter is to present appraisal findings and recommendations in relation to the Regulation 14 version of the LPNP. This chapter presents:

- An appraisal of the current version (i.e., the Regulation 14 version) of the LPNP under the identified nine SA theme headings.
- Consideration of potential cumulative effects; and
- The overall conclusions at this current stage.

### LPNP policies

5.2 To support the implantation of the vision statement for the LPNP, the Regulation 14 version of the plan puts forward 13 policies to guide new development within the neighbourhood area. These are contained within below.

**Table 5.1: Policies within the LPNP**

Policy Number	Policy Name
LP1	A Spatial Strategy For The Town
LP2	Lymington Town Centre
LP3	Key Regeneration Opportunities In The Town Centre
LP4	Pennington Shopping Parades
LP5	Walkable Neighbourhoods
LP6	High Quality Design
LP7	Meeting The Needs Of Local Young People
LP8	Green Infrastructure And Nature Recovery Network
LP9	Safer Lanes Network
LP10	Active And Healthy Travel
LP11	Net Zero Carbon Building Design
LP12	Urban Greening And Canopy Cover
LP13	Digital Communication Infrastructure

## Approach to the appraisal

- 5.3 For each theme, 'significant' effects of the Regulation 14 version of the LPNP on the baseline are predicted and evaluated. Account is taken of the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Regulations. For example, the probability, duration, frequency, and reversibility of the effects as far as possible. These effect 'characteristics' will be described within the assessment, as appropriate.
- 5.4 Every effort is made to identify / evaluate effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high-level nature of the LPNP. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and the nature of future planning applications. Because of the uncertainties involved, there is a need to exercise caution when identifying and evaluating significant effects to ensure all assumptions are explained. In many instances, given reasonable assumptions, it is not possible to predict 'significant effects', but it is possible to comment on merits (or otherwise) of the draft plan in more general terms.
- 5.5 Finally, it is important to note that effects are predicted taking account of the criteria presented within Schedule 1 of the SEA Regulations. For example, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency, and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are also considered, i.e., the potential for the LPNP to impact an aspect of the baseline when implemented alongside other plans, programmes, and projects. These effect 'characteristics' are described within the assessment as appropriate.

## Air quality

- 5.6 There are no air quality management areas within or in proximity to the neighbourhood area. Whilst air quality in the New Forest area has improved over recent years, historic monitoring within Lymington and Pennington has demonstrated there are localised hotspots of poorer air quality. Nevertheless, the potential for the LPNP to impact upon air quality is limited given it does not seek to allocate sites for development.
- 5.7 Policy LP1 outlines the spatial strategy focus on brownfield land reuse and development within the settlement boundary. This links to policy LP3 – which highlights five key sites within the settlement boundary where development would be supported (in principle) if applications were to come forward during the plan period. By focusing potential development on areas close to existing community services and facilities, air quality effects are likely to be minimised – due to a reduced need to use private transportation to gain access. Furthermore, development would likely be positioned closer to the sustainable transport network; encouraging a further reduction in pollutant emissions linked to transportation by providing viable alternatives to private vehicles.
- 5.8 Reducing private vehicle transportation is the focus of policy LP9 and policy LP10, which seek to protect the Safer Lanes Network within the neighbourhood area and improve active travel provision across the neighbourhood area. This promotes engagement with active transportation by providing safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists. This is echoed in policy LP10, which indicates opportunities to improve the safe active travel provision should be taken. This will likely lead to a reduction in air pollutant emissions linked to transportation through lowering private vehicle use for localised journeys.

- 5.9 Policies with a focus on green infrastructure will also have secondary benefits for air quality. Policy LP8 seeks to protect key green infrastructure, including ancient woodland, and trees and hedgerows. This benefits air quality through safeguarding current levels of photosynthesis; an enhancement of the network would likely lead to improved levels of pollutant capture and clean air release. Policy LP12 provides the same benefits through seeking to retain and enhance the canopy cover on development sites.
- 5.10 As such, at this stage, broadly neutral effects are concluded most likely under the LPNP. This reflects the LPNP not allocating sites for development but outlining support for potential sites within the settlement boundary. This may help to reduce the reliance on private transportation to access key services and facilities. The conclusion also reflects the policies encouraging active transportation and protecting green infrastructure (which act as natural pollutant absorbers in the environment).

## **Biodiversity and geodiversity**

- 5.11 There are a range of biodiversity and geodiversity designations present within and in proximity to the neighbourhood area. This includes a Ramsar site, an SPA site, and several SACs and SSSIs. As such, much of the neighbourhood area overlaps with SSSI Impact Risk Zones. However, as the LPNP does not seek to allocate sites for development, consultation with Natural England can likely be avoided, and significant effects are not anticipated. Additionally, there are a few important Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats. As such, much of the neighbourhood area is covered by Network Expansion Zones, Network Enhancement Zone 1, and Network Enhancement Zone 2. These areas are seen as having a greater potential to bring forward biodiversity improvements.
- 5.12 The spatial strategy under policy LP1 outlines a brownfield first approach to development, and policy LP3 presents several brownfield sites that the town council would support (in principle) for redevelopment. None of these potential sites are within proximity to important habitats; as such, if these sites came forward during the plan period their regeneration is unlikely to negatively impact upon biodiversity and geodiversity in the neighbourhood area. The focus on brownfield development helps to prevent growth coming forward on undeveloped land (which may have a greater biodiversity value given these areas are within proximity to designated sites), whilst improving the wider biodiversity connectivity through landscaping, green infrastructure provision, and tree planting (design scheme dependent). These feature as codes within the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidelines and Codes document (policy LP6). Furthermore, policy LP1 focuses on enhancing the natural environment and contributing to nature recovery outside of the settlement boundary. This will help to improve biodiversity provision and connectivity throughout the neighbourhood area.
- 5.13 The LPNP has specific policies that relate to biodiversity and geodiversity. Policy LP8 is concerned with designating a green infrastructure and nature recovery network to promote ecological connectivity. This will involve protecting and enhancing key green infrastructure – including habitats, specific features, and green spaces. This is a benefit for biodiversity and geodiversity, as it maintains connectivity and safeguards important refuge areas. Furthermore, policy LP8 indicates development proposals within / adjacent to

this network will need to contribute to its maintenance and enhancement and embed green infrastructure. These stipulations work to safeguard and enhance connectivity and refuge areas, and support nature recovery. This is also a benefit under policy LP12, which is concerned with achieving future canopy cover on development sites – thus increasing biodiversity connectivity through retaining existing trees and planting new ones. Finally, policy LP9 is concerned with protecting lanes within the neighbourhood area – including through the retention of tree and hedgerow frontages. This provides a positive effect for biodiversity by protecting features that contribute to connectivity.

- 5.14 As such, at this stage minor positive effects are concluded likely for biodiversity and geodiversity. This reflects the focus of the LPNP policies on enhancing the natural environment, and safeguarding key features that contribute to biodiversity value and connectivity.

## Climate change

- 5.15 The LPNP provides an opportunity to include policies that help to reduce carbon emissions created by new development in the area, and to adapt to the impacts of climate change. While it is recognised that there is little value in duplicating planning policies which are already set out in the Local Plan, the LPNP should focus on what could be strengthened, and respond to local considerations. This can include vulnerability to overheating, flooding or water stress impacts, car dependency, opportunities for renewable energy, sustainable design, and construction.
- 5.16 The spatial strategy under policy LP1 aims to encourage growth on brownfield sites within the neighbourhood area. Whilst the LPNP does not specifically allocate any sites, it does identify a number of brownfield locations within the settlement boundary which would be supported (in principle) for redevelopment if proposals were to come forward during the plan period (under policy LP3). Site A under policy LP3 is adjacent to an area of medium-high risk of fluvial flooding to the west; all the sites are adjacent to areas at risk of surface water flooding, but it is noted Site C and Site E have surface water flood risk within the site boundaries. As such, it is expected that any proposals which would come forward at these locations during the plan period would have specific regard to the provisions in the design codes document, which includes measures which seek to adapt to the climate crisis and minimise flood risks.
- 5.17 Policy LP6 seeks to ensure new development fully regards the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code – including guidance on sustainable urban drainage systems, tree planting, and utilising green space for flood mitigation and prevention. This links to policy LP8, which focuses on designating a green infrastructure and nature recovery network – including trees, green spaces, and water bodies. It also links to policy LP12, which focuses on urban greening and canopy cover through retaining existing and planting new trees on development sites. Safeguarding the existing green infrastructure and adding to the network will provide a level of flood mitigation through maintained and enhanced water interception.
- 5.18 Furthermore, policy LP11 contains stipulations relating to development design – indicating all development should be zero carbon ready, and reduce the energy require to heat and cool buildings. The policy also seeks to ensure all buildings are certified to a Passivhaus standard (or equivalent). Furthermore, all



planning applications will be required to undertake a whole life-cycle carbon emission assessment, and a climate change statement will need to be submitted. These stipulations focus on ensuring development is considerate of climate change works to reduce emissions as far as possible, whilst making development durable and able to withstand potential future impacts linked to climate change.

- 5.19 In terms of climate change mitigation, focusing development on brownfield land through policy LP1 and LP3 will bring forward development within proximity to existing community and sustainable transport infrastructure; thus reducing the need to use private vehicles to access key facilities. Additionally, new development in these locations would likely have access to active transportation opportunities, making these types of transportation more viable for localised journeys, and for some journeys further afield. The focus on making development easily accessible through active transportation methods is reiterated in policy LP5. This policy indicates community development in residential areas must be accessible through walking and cycling – this will help to reduce carbon emissions linked to transportation.
- 5.20 Protecting active transport opportunities is a focus of policy LP9 - through protecting the Safer Lanes Network, the LPNP encourages a continued and increased engagement with walking and cycling to access different parts of the neighbourhood area. Furthermore, the importance of sustainable travel opportunities is outlined in policy LP10, which seeks to maintain the functionality and connectivity of the sustainable and active transport network. These policies will work to reduce the carbon emissions linked to transport in the neighbourhood area, by ensuring active and sustainable transport opportunities remain safe, easily accessible, and a viable transportation alternative.
- 5.21 As such, at this stage minor positive effects are concluded likely for climate change. This reflects the focus of the LPNP policies on encouraging the redevelopment of sites within the settlement boundary, and the focus on delivering sustainable design measures which tackle the climate crisis. This will support a limitation in emissions and alleviate flood risk concerns.

## Historic environment

- 5.22 Historic environment features within the neighbourhood area include eleven Grade II\* listed structures, 249 Grade II listed structures, and one scheduled monument. According to the Hampshire Historic Environment Record (HER), there are approximately 60 features that appear on the record that also contribute to the historic environment. Additionally, there are three conservation areas located within the neighbourhood boundaries: Lymington Conservation Area, Buckland Conservation Area, and Kings Saltern Conservation Area.
- 5.23 The spatial strategy outlined in policy LP1 has implications for the historic environment, due to the focus on encouraging growth on brownfield sites and other suitable areas within the Lymington settlement boundary. Depending on scheme designs this could be beneficial for the historic environment, as regeneration and development could deliver improvements to the setting of historic features. This will positively impact upon how they are experienced in the wider historic landscape and contribute to enhancing their significance.



However, insensitive development could negatively impact on the setting and significance of features, which is notable given the concentration of heritage assets within the town. This applies to the sites identified through policy LP3 – given they are all either within or adjacent to the Lymington Conservation Area. Furthermore, Site D and Site E under policy LP3 are within close proximity to several listed structures, which increases their potential to impact upon the setting and significance of heritage assets. As such, any proposals for their redevelopment which may come forward during the plan period could either enhance to detract from the historic character and significance of the designation.

- 5.24 Policy LP6 helps to mitigate potential negative effects of development on the historic environment through the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code. This includes considering the built form of development, as well as the impacts development will have on the identity of Lymington (including heritage assets). By setting out specific design stipulations, the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code is shaping development to positively impact upon the historic environment as opposed to detracting from it. This will help to address any potential negative effects associated with the redevelopment of any brownfield sites in the town which may come forward during the plan period.
- 5.25 The wider plan policies also work to benefit the historic environment. Policy LP8 is focused on designating green infrastructure – this will benefit heritage assets by protecting features that contribute to their setting. The same can be said of policy LP12, as the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees will maintain and enhance the setting of historic features. In the same way policy LP9 works to protect the historic characteristics of lanes within the neighbourhood area. This helps to safeguard features that contribute to the setting of heritage assets, as well as maintain and enhance access to important features. Finally, the importance of heritage assets is further recognised within policy LP13, which indicates proposals for digital communication infrastructure will be required to be sensitive in location and design. This will help reduce or avoid potential harm to specific features.
- 5.26 As such, at this stage minor positive effects are concluded likely for the historic environment. This reflects the potential for brownfield sites to improve the setting of historic features and designations (dependent on the adopted scheme). It also reflects the potential for setting improvements through the wider plan policies, including increased green infrastructure provision and public realm enhancements.

## Landscape

- 5.27 The neighbourhood area is partially within the New Forest National Park; and parts of the neighbourhood area outside of the Lymington settlement boundary are within the Bournemouth Green Belt - defined to protect open spaces and prevent urban sprawl effects. As well as these landscape designations, the neighbourhood area sits within the New Forest National Character Area – and a local Landscape Character Assessment presents ten-character areas within the neighbourhood boundary. Each of these areas have specific defining features that make them unique; enhancement of these through development will have benefits for the wider landscape and townscape. On this basis, it is expected

that development will fully respect and integrate the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code into the design of schemes, in line with policy LP6. This will further ensure landscape and townscape character is maintained and enhanced through landscaping, character considerations, and development design. Further landscape and townscape impacts relating to LPNP policies are discussed below.

- 5.28 Policy LP1 seeks to encourage growth via the regeneration of brownfield sites within the town, which will help to limit potential impacts on sensitive landscape areas through avoiding building out into the open countryside. Furthermore, encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites through policies LP1 and LP3 will likely contribute to enhancing the townscape character through regenerating sites so that they improve the visual amenity of the area.
- 5.29 Additionally, policy LP1 indicates development outside of the Lymington settlement boundary will be focused on enhancing the natural environment. This will include safeguarding the integrity of the Bournemouth Green Belt and contributing to enhancing the setting of the National Park. For example, policy LP8 works to safeguard a number of green features; this protects features that contribute to landscape and townscape character by providing breaks within built up areas and providing screening effects. Policy LP8 also indicates all development proposals should embed green infrastructure into their design; additional green infrastructure will contribute to the surrounding landscape by enhancing visual amenity. This benefit is also true of policy LP12, which seeks to encourage tree canopy cover on new development sites.
- 5.30 Landscape character and quality is also considered through policy LP9 – which seeks to protect the rural characteristics of lanes across the neighbourhood area. This includes tree and hedgerow lined frontages, which help to screen development from the routeways. The special landscape and qualities of the National Park and its surrounding area are further considered through policy LP13, which seeks to ensure development proposals for digital communication infrastructure are sensitively located and designed to combat potential harm. This reduces the potential for harm through the installation of new infrastructure by ensuring visual impacts do not occur.
- 5.31 Overall, major positive effects are considered likely through the LPNP for landscape. This is due to the focus on supporting growth in locations away from the most sensitive landscape within the neighbourhood area, with the opportunity to improve townscape character via the regeneration of underutilised sites. This also reflects the wider plan policies and their potential to deliver green infrastructure and protect character, all of which contribute to enhancing landscape and townscape character and quality.

## **Land, soil and water resources**

- 5.32 The spatial strategy under policy LP1 is supportive (in principle) of a brownfield first approach to development – reusing brownfield land (including the identified available sites within policy LP3) within the settlement boundary. These two policies remove the potential for the loss of agricultural quality land around Yaldhurst and Pennington. This is due to seeking development on sites within the built-up area of Lymington, which have little to no chance of being best and most versatile land.

- 5.33 Encouraging growth at brownfield sites supports the efficient use of land through the reuse of existing structures whilst rejuvenating previously developed land. Whilst there may be a greater potential for ground contamination on brownfield land, and therefore a need for remediation works prior to development, development provides an opportunity to improve soil quality in these locations, decreasing the likelihood of pollutants in the soil contaminating groundwater sources and nearby waterbodies.
- 5.34 Land and soil resources are further considered through policy LP8; as designating a green infrastructure and nature recovery network will safeguard a number of natural features. This will help to protect the integrity of the soil quality on which these features sit (and safeguard the ecosystem services which soil resources provide). This policy also extends to protecting water bodies for their contribution to the green infrastructure and nature recovery network; thus helping to maintain water quality. Policy LP12 works in a similar way – outlining the need for a future canopy cover on sites outside the Lymington settlement boundary. This retention of existing trees, and the planting of new ones, will help protect soil resources under the features.
- 5.35 Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely through the LPNP in relation to land, soil, and water resources. This reflects the focus of the plan on supporting growth at brownfield locations which have a lower likelihood of being productive agricultural land. This will encourage the most efficient use of previously developed land in the town. It also reflects the provision of the wider plan policies, which work to safeguard important green and blue infrastructure. This will help to further protect the quality of land, soil, and water resources.

## Population and community

- 5.36 The LPNP has taken a proactive approach in identifying available brownfield sites within the town centre environment that could contribute to meeting the residual housing requirements. In this respect, the LPNP has a strong aspiration and focus to revitalise the town centre environment by facilitating the delivery of high-quality design through the regeneration of previously developed land. However, at this stage of plan making the LPNP does not seek to allocate any of these brownfield sites for development. This is due to the New Forest District Council undertaking a review of the Local Plan; as significant changes have occurred since its adoption in 2020. As the review is at a very early stage, Lymington Town Council have agreed to address any additional housing delivery and allocations under a future LPNP review – this is to ensure there is no duplication of planning processes with the Local Plan review.
- 5.37 However, Lymington Town Council recognises the opportunities presented by the identified brownfield sites, and are supportive (in principle) of redevelopment proposals at these locations where they align with the Lymington and Pennington Design Code and wider LPNP policies. This is further discussed within **Chapter 4** of this SA Report.
- 5.38 With further reference to the above, policy LP3 outlines support for the redevelopment of five brownfield sites within the settlement centre – which could collectively deliver around 200 new homes in sustainable locations. The provision of additional housing could contribute to closing the gap between lower incomes and local house prices, as a proportion of these potential new homes could come forward as affordable housing. This includes housing for

younger people and first-time buyers. The needs of younger, local people are also considered under policy LP7 – which indicates residential development proposals will be expected to provide a mix of types and sizes to address the local housing need. This will be beneficial to the population and community, as the policy is ensuring the housing types reflect the local need and allow for younger people to remain in the neighbourhood area as opposed to seeking properties elsewhere. This could help to grow the proportion of younger people in the neighbourhood area and keep communities / family units together.

- 5.39 The spatial strategy under policy LP1 benefits population and community by outlining support for new development within the settlement of Lymington (including the sites under policy LP3), with the aim of enhancing and sustaining the viability and vitality of the town centre. The focus of sustaining local centres and their uses will help to ensure community infrastructure is easily accessible within the neighbourhood area. It also helps to encourage a range of community services and facilities to meet the needs of the entire population across the different age groups. This is also an economic benefit, as encouraging the provision of community infrastructure will help to support localised employment and spending. This will contribute to keeping funds within the neighbourhood area and boosting economic prosperity / viability. This principle is reiterated in policy LP2, which highlights the need for development proposals to make direct and proportionate contributions to projects and town centre improvements.
- 5.40 The vitality of the neighbourhood area is also considered through policy LP4, which aims to protect local shopping frontages. It ensures commercial, business, and services are safeguarded – especially where proposals to change the use of buildings come forward. This helps to maintain the existing community infrastructure provision of the neighbourhood area. It also helps to safeguard the local economy by ensuring businesses and employment opportunities are retained as far as possible. Access to services and facilities is also the main focus of policy LP5, outlines support for new community infrastructure in several residential areas. This support will be given where development schemes will strengthen the mix and balance of facilities that cater for everyday needs. In this way, the policy is ensuring community infrastructure continues to meet the needs of the local community.
- 5.41 Policy LP13 is concerned with bringing forward digital communication infrastructure, which will support new businesses and residential development within the neighbourhood area. This will benefit population and community, as it ensures digital infrastructure is able to support an increase in users without compromising the connectivity of existing residents and businesses. This will help to safeguard current levels of economic activity, and allow for a greater level of working from home for those employed in more flexible and / or remote working jobs.
- 5.42 Overall, major positive effects are anticipated through the LPNP for population and community. This is due to the focus of the plan on supporting growth in the most accessible and sustainable locations within the neighbourhood area, protecting community infrastructure (and access to it), safeguarding levels of activity and business, and supporting high-quality regeneration opportunities within the town centre environment.

## Health and wellbeing

- 5.43 The spatial strategy under policy LP1 seeks to encourage development within proximity to existing services and facilities through focusing growth at brownfield sites within the town. This approach would help to provide a good level of access to healthcare facilities as well as community infrastructure that supports a healthy, balanced lifestyle. Access to facilities that support physical and mental health and wellbeing is also a key consideration of policy LP5 – which indicates new community infrastructure in residential areas will be supported, including recreational and medical infrastructure.
- 5.44 The LPNP also recognises the importance of design for supporting health and wellbeing in the neighbourhood area. Policy LP6 seeks to ensure development proposals fully respect the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code document, which provides direction on how to maximise benefits for the community and for the environment. This includes codes on garden provision, and on accessible housing, to ensure health and wellbeing considerations are built into development. Considering accessibility and providing garden space allows housing development to become more adaptable for residents across their lifetimes and provides safe and private spaces to engage in activities that benefit physical and mental health.
- 5.45 Physical and mental health is further considered through policy LP8, which seeks to protect the many green spaces, children's play areas, and recreational playing fields present within the town. By doing so, the LPNP is safeguarding accessible and safe spaces within the neighbourhood area that allow residents to engage with physical activity and with each other through social activities / events - promoting healthy lifestyles and community cohesion. Policy LP9 also seeks to safeguard infrastructure that contribute to physical and mental health and wellbeing through protecting the Safer Lanes Network. This network allows residents to engage in safe physical activity through travelling from different locations within the neighbourhood area. This links to policy LP10, which seeks to ensure development sustains and enhances the active travel provision within the neighbourhood area – for the benefit of safe engagement with active travel opportunities. This promotes enhanced health and wellbeing by providing opportunities to engage with physical activity.
- 5.46 Overall, major positive effects are anticipated through the LPNP for health and wellbeing. This is due to the focus of policies on safeguarding and improving access to key infrastructure that supports healthy lifestyles. It also reflects the focus on appropriate development design to ensure residents are supported across their lifetimes, and the promotion of active transport engagement.

## Transportation

- 5.47 Policy LP1 is supportive (in principle) of growth and redevelopment on known opportunity brownfield sites within the settlement centre, including through the sites included under policy LP3. This works to encourage an uptake in active and sustainable transport engagement. This is due to the proximity of these brownfield sites to existing community and transport infrastructure. This proximity will help to limit the need to rely on private vehicles to access key community facilities within the settlement boundary and outside of the neighbourhood area, as it is easier to access sustainable and active transportation that are viable alternatives. The focus on making development



easily accessible through active transportation methods is reiterated in policy LP5; which indicates development supporting the community (for example, medical services and leisure facilities) in identified residential areas must be accessible through walking and cycling. Again, this will help to reduce the need to use private vehicles, and even public transportation, to access key facilities and locations within the neighbourhood area.

5.48 Transportation is also considered through policy LP6, which is concerned with ensuring development adheres to guidance included in the Lymington and Pennington Design Guidance and Code document. This includes guidance around connectivity and public transportation infrastructure provision to make the best use of existing transport infrastructure and improve the safety of active transportation. This will contribute to safeguarding existing active and sustainable transport opportunities, and making alternatives to private vehicle transport more attractive for localised journeys within and in proximity to the neighbourhood area.

5.49 Protecting active transport opportunities is also the focus of policies LP9 and LP10. Through protecting the Safer Lanes Network across the neighbourhood area, the LPNP encourages a continued and increased engagement with walking to access different locations within the neighbourhood area. Policy LP10 outlines the importance of sustainable and active travel opportunities, and indicates the functionality and connectivity of the sustainable and active transport network should not be harmed through development. Again, these policies will work to safeguard and promote active transportation opportunities in the neighbourhood area by protecting existing public rights of way and improving routeway safety. This contributes to ensuring active and sustainable transport opportunities remain safe, easily accessible, and a viable alternative to private vehicle transportation for new and existing development.

5.50 Overall, minor positive effects are considered likely for transportation through the LPNP. Any growth in the built-up area will contribute additional traffic to the neighbourhood area. However, the plan seeks to bring forward growth on sites that have a good level of access to active and sustainable transport opportunities. This will reduce the need to use private vehicles to access community infrastructure within and outside of the neighbourhood area.

## Conclusions

5.51 Overall, no potential significant negative or positive effects have been identified through the policy appraisal of the LPNP. However, the policy appraisal has identified a number of broad positive effects associated with several SA themes. This reflects the strong focus that the LPNP has on supporting development proposals which are sensitive to the environmental constraints within the neighbourhood area. With specific reference to each SA theme:

5.52 **Major positive effects are concluded likely for the landscape SA theme through the provisions of the LPNP.** This is due to the support of growth on brownfield sites; this reduces the potential for development to impact on the most sensitive landscapes within the neighbourhood area. It also presents the opportunity to improve townscape character. Major positive effects are also anticipated due to the high-quality design focus of the wider LPNP policies, which contribute to enhancing landscape and townscape character and quality.

- 5.53 Major positive effects are also anticipated for the population and community SA theme.** This is due to the support of brownfield regeneration, which would allow for potential new residents and development to integrate with the existing community. It also reflects the focus of the plan on protecting existing and delivering new community infrastructure, which will benefit residents of the neighbourhood area by ensuring their needs continue to be provided for.
- 5.54 Overall, major positive effects are also concluded likely for the health and wellbeing SA theme.** This is due to the high-quality design focus of the LPNP, which includes the safeguarding and enhancement of key infrastructure that supports healthy lifestyles.
- 5.55 Minor positive effects are anticipated for the biodiversity and geodiversity SA theme under the LPNP.** This reflects the support of brownfield redevelopment through the LPNP; which focuses growth away from undeveloped areas with a likely greater biodiversity and geodiversity value (given the proximity to designated sites). It also reflects the provisions of the policies – including seeking high quality design, the safeguarding of specific features, and enhancing the natural environment. These provisions contribute towards improving ecological connectivity within the neighbourhood area and delivering net gains for nature.
- 5.56 Minor positive effects are also anticipated for the climate change SA theme.** This is due to focus of the LPNP on safeguarding and enhancing features that contribute to flood risk management and carbon capture and storage, including green infrastructure, as well as providing opportunities for active transport engagement. The conclusion also reflects the building standards included through the LPNP, which helps to ensure new development will adapt to changes in climate, and the flood risk and management considerations.
- 5.57 The historic environment SA theme is likely to experience positive effects through the application of LPNP policies.** This reflects the potential for brownfield redevelopment to enhance the setting of specific heritage features and areas within the town centre environment, as well as the high-quality design focus of the wider policies and Design Code document.
- 5.58 Furthermore, minor positive effects are concluded most likely for land, soil, and water resources.** Again, this is due to the support of brownfield regeneration through the LPNP; focusing growth away from undeveloped areas that could be of higher quality agricultural land. This conclusion also reflects the focus of the LPNP on safeguarding blue and green infrastructure, which contributes to the quality of land, soil, and water resources.
- 5.59 Broadly neutral effects are concluded most likely for the air quality SA theme.** This reflects the limited potential for the LPNP to impact upon the baseline, given it does not allocate sites for development. It also reflects the support of the LPNP for the regeneration of sites within the Lymington settlement boundary, which may help to limit emissions linked to transport in the neighbourhood area. The provision of green infrastructure, the protection of green spaces, and the active transportation opportunities also informs this conclusion.



**5.60 Finally, minor positive effects are also considered likely for the transportation SA theme.** This is due to the plan supporting growth on sites that will integrate well with the active and sustainable transport network; reducing the need to use private vehicles to access key infrastructure.

## 6. What are the next steps?

### Plan finalisation

- 6.1 Following Regulation 14 consultation, responses will be considered in finalising the LPNP and SA for submission. Following submission, the LPNP and supporting evidence will be published for further consultation, and then subjected to Independent Examination. At Independent Examination, the LPNP will be considered in terms of whether it meets the Basic Conditions for Neighbourhood Plans and is in general conformity with the Local Plan.
- 6.2 If the examination leads to a favourable outcome, the LPNP will then be subject to a referendum, organised by the New Forest District Council, and the New Forest National Park authority. If more than 50% of those who vote agree with the LPNP, then it will be 'made'. Once 'made', the LPNP will become part of the Development Plan for the New Forest area, covering the defined neighbourhood area.

### Monitoring

- 6.3 The SEA regulations require '*measures envisaged concerning monitoring*' to be outlined in this report. This refers to the monitoring of likely significant effects of the LPNP to identify any unforeseen effects early and take remedial action as appropriate.
- 6.4 It is anticipated that monitoring of effects of the LPNP will be undertaken by the New Forest District Council and the New Forest National Park authority.

# Appendix A Updated policy context

**Table AA.6.1: Strategic policy context**

Document title	Year of publication
<a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</a>	2023
<a href="#">New Forest District Council - Local Plan 2016-2036 Part 1: Planning strategy</a>	2020
<a href="#">New Forest National Park Authority - Local Plan 2016-2036</a>	2019
<a href="#">New Forest District Council - Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Development Management</a>	2014
<a href="#">Planning practice guidance</a>	Various

**Table AA.6.2: Historic England**

Document title	Year of publication
<a href="#">Historic England Advice Note 11 (Second Edition): Neighbourhood Planning and the Historic Environment</a>	2022
<a href="#">Historic England: Heritage and Climate Change</a>	2022
<a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</a>	2021
<a href="#">National Model Design Code</a>	2021
<a href="#">The National Design Guide</a>	2019
<a href="#">Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal Designation and Management</a>	2019
<a href="#">A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment</a>	2018
<a href="#">Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning: The Setting of Heritage Assets</a>	2017
<a href="#">Historic England Advice Note 8: Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</a>	2016

**Table AA.6.3: Natural England and the Environment Agency**

Document title	Year of publication
<a href="#">Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide: Designing nature-rich, healthy, climate-resilient, and thriving places</a>	2023
<a href="#">UK Climate Change Risk Assessment</a>	2022
<a href="#">Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener</a>	2021
<a href="#">Environment Act</a>	2021
<a href="#">National Model Design Code</a>	2021
<a href="#">Changes to the Habitats Regulations 2017</a>	2021
<a href="#">The National Design Guide</a>	2019
<a href="#">A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment</a>	2018
<a href="#">Space for people: Targeting action for woodland access</a>	2017

Document title	Year of publication
<a href="#">Natural England's Green Infrastructure Guidance</a>	2009
<a href="#">The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations</a>	2017
<a href="#">Flood and Water Management Act 2010</a>	2010
<a href="#">Climate Change Act 2008</a>	2008

**Table AA.6.4: Other national strategies**

Document title	Year of publication
<a href="#">UK Climate Change Risk Assessment</a>	2022
<a href="#">Decarbonising Transport: A Better, Greener Britain</a>	2021
<a href="#">National Infrastructure Assessment</a>	2021
<a href="#">Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener</a>	2021
<a href="#">Waste Management Plan for England</a>	2021
<a href="#">Blueprint for a resilient economy</a>	2020
<a href="#">National Infrastructure Strategy</a>	2020
<a href="#">Health Equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 Years On</a>	2020
<a href="#">The UK Sixth Carbon Budget</a>	2020
<a href="#">The Clean Air Strategy</a>	2019
<a href="#">Future of Mobility: Urban Strategy</a>	2019
<a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance</a>	2019
<a href="#">Healthy High Streets</a>	2018
<a href="#">The National Adaptation Programme and the Third Strategy for Climate Adaptation Reporting</a>	2018
<a href="#">The Clean Growth Strategy</a>	2017
<a href="#">UK plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations</a>	2017

