

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRESUBMISSION STAGE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

HAZELBURY BRYAN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AREA

Prepared by: Dorset Planning Consultant Ltd, on behalf of Hazelbury Bryan Parish Council

Version: Pre-Submission Stage

Date of publication: March 2018

Non-Technical Summary

This non-technical summary explains the scope and main findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Hazelbury Bryan Neighbourhood Plan, at its pre-submission draft stage.

The assessment has been undertaken to comply with the SEA Regulations. It is subject to consultation with the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England, the public and any other interested parties. It considers the likely effects of the plan on the environment, and its evaluation includes an assessment of reasonable alternatives. It also considers appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures.

As a first step, various plans and programmes were reviewed and information collected on the environmental characteristics of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The review included an appraisal of the National Planning Policy Framework, the adopted North Dorset Local Plan, and key documents that informed the scope of the Local Plan's own sustainability appraisal. The views of the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England were also sought on the proposed scope of the SEA.

The key environmental issues that may be relevant for the SEA were identified as:

- the potential for biodiversity interest to be harmed by development given the possible presence of protected species and important habitats
- the potential impact on the Dorset AONB, although unlikely, should remain a consideration
- the potential for development to harm the significance of heritage assets, particularly given the potential extensive nature of such assets' setting
- the potential for flood risk to new or existing development as a result of siting within a flood risk area or increased run-off
- the potential for harm as a result of re-using contaminated sites, proximity to existing unneighbourly uses (most notably the sewage treatment works)
- the potential impact on health and wellbeing, in terms of opportunities for housing, employment and improved community facilities
- the potential impact on health and wellbeing, in terms of safe access and reducing reliance on use of a motor car
- the potential sterilisation of minerals resources may also be material if large sites are proposed.

These issues formed the basis of the sustainability objectives. The sustainability objectives were then used in the assessment of the potential options for site allocations. This showed that, with the exception of Sites 14 and 15, none of the reasonable alternative options were likely to cause significant environmental harm, although further investigation at the next stage will be necessary to confirm this. Similarly none of the proposed rejected alternatives appear to perform markedly better than the more favoured options, in terms of their performance against the sustainability objectives. Tables 5 and 6 in the full report provide a full explanation of the above scoring (see page 16 onwards).

The options consultation identified a strong public preference for the two brownfield sites: Site 11 – Martin Richard's Tractors UK site, Back Lane, Kingston (whether or not including the 'community benefit' of the displaced business relocating locally) and Site 7 – Former Frank Martin's Agricultural Depot, Stockfield Drove, Kingston. Site 12 Land adjoining King Stag Mill, which had been proposed to accommodate Martin Richard's Tractors UK displaced employment site was also well supported. A single plot development in Pidney (site 13) and Site 2 – Higher field to rear of Village Hall, Partway Lane, Partway were also broadly supported (provided the latter deliver community benefits in terms of the improved parking for the village hall and footpath link). The remaining sites were either more marginal in terms of positive support, or showed a clear lack of public support. The Antelope Field (Site 8) was therefore considered further as a reasonable alternative option.

The sites included in the draft plan were selected by the Neighbourhood Plan working group based on the consideration of a range of factors including the level of community support, sustainability (as demonstrated in this report) and ratings against the criteria used for the initial site assessments. Collectively the two brownfield sites (Sites 7 and 11) provide sufficient land to meet the local needs for housing development as assessed (18 - 25 dwellings on sites yet to be consented as of March 2018, for the period to 2031). The inclusion of the employment option (Site 12) and a single plot (Site 13) help provide for a wider range of needs. Site 2 was the only site that had not achieved an initial 'green' ranking against the initial site assessment criteria, mainly due to its location to the rear of the generally linear pattern of development in Partway and possible harm to occupants (linked to use of the hall and parking) - and given the public support for the site to secure the community benefits it was clear that these were felt by the public to outweigh these concerns, and the site had scored comparably well in the options stage sustainability criteria (although in recognition of its possible landscape harm an adjustment has been made to its score against this criteria). On balance, taking all factors into account, it was felt appropriate to be included as the reserve option. The Antelope Field (Site 8) was considered as a reasonable alternative option, but was not found to be preferable from a sustainability viewpoint, particularly due to the likely heritage impact (although less than substantial). As such there is no reason to suggest that it should have been taken forward in the draft plan instead or in addition to the other site allocations.

This Environmental Report has now appraised all the policies included in the pre-submission plan, to provide a more holistic overview of the plan's likely environmental impact. The suggestions made as part of this latest review have been included in the plan, with the exception of the suggestion to include a policy requirement in HB17 and 18 that alternative serviced employment land of equivalent size is provided elsewhere in the parish, to avoid a net loss of employment land. However it is noted that Policies HB21 and HB22 together provide a range of opportunities for such provision to be made, and that site 7 has not been in active employment use for some time. As such, the omission is not considered likely to be significant, but would benefit from being monitored.

No significant adverse impacts were identified in regard to the policies proposed for inclusion in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. The alternative options considered did not perform better in terms of their overall sustainability. The collective (cumulative) impact of the plan was also considered, by reviewing the potential impacts in one table (shown below, key on following page).

This analysis indicates the overall positive environmental sustainability impacts that will be produced as a result of the plan. Adverse impacts are largely avoided by the inclusion of appropriate mitigation

within the policies, and ensuring that the overall level of development would not create a significant shift in the character of the hamlets.

It is also suggested that the monitoring arrangements are based on the following indicators:

- Overall provision of new dwellings
- Number of affordable homes approved per annum
- Recorded road safety accidents (annual)
- Number of objections raised by Conservation Team or Landscape Officer in relation to areas of hardstanding
- Net gain / improvement in infrastructure provision
- Net gain / loss in employment land

Comments are welcome on this report, as part of the pre-submission consultation.

Sustainability Assessment – Cumulative Impacts

SEA objective	Biodiversity, fauna & flora	Landscape	Cultural heritage	Soil, water and air pollution	Climatic factors:	Housing, jobs and community	Safe and accessible	Minerals safeguarding
Policy HB1. Local Landscape Character	✓✓	✓✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-
Policy HB2. Protecting Local Wildlife	✓✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
Policy HB3. Local Green Spaces	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	-	-	✓	✓	-
Policy HB4. Key Rural Views	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-
Policies HB5-12. Locally Distinctive Development	-	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-
Policy HB13. Settlement Boundaries & Gaps	-	✓	-	-	-	✓	-	-
Policy HB14. Supporting Community Facilities	-	-	-	-	-	✓✓	✓✓	-
Policy HB15. Amount / Location of Dwellings	✓	✓	✓	👤	👤	✓✓	✓	-
Policy HB16. Dwelling Types	-	-	-	-	-	✓✓	-	-
Policy HB17. Site 11	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	👤	-
Policy HB18. Site 7	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓✓	👤	-
Policy HB19. Site 13	-	-	-	-	-	✓	👤	-
Policy HB20. Site 2	-	✗	-	-	👤	✓✓	✓✓	-
Policy HB21. Economic Development	-	-	-	-	-	✓	👤	-
Policy HB22. Site 12	-	-	-	👤	👤	✓✓	👤	-
Policy HB23. Parking Provision	-	✗	✗	-	-	-	✓✓	-
Policy HB24. Highway Infrastructure	-	-	-	-	-	👤	✓✓	-

- Key:
- ✓✓ significant positive impact likely
 - ✓ positive impact likely
 - neutral impact likely
 - ✗ adverse impact likely
 - ✗✗ significant adverse impact likely
 - 👤 impact uncertain but unlikely to be significantly adverse
 - 👤👤 impact uncertain but potentially significantly adverse