



South Bucks Local Development Framework

# Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum (2)

February 2011



South Bucks  
District Council

---

## South Bucks Core Strategy

### Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum (2) (February 2011)

#### Introduction

- 1.1 A Sustainability Appraisal Report was prepared to accompany publication of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy (March 2010). The Report summarised the sustainability appraisal work undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy, and considered the likely significant social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the proposed Core Policies.
- 1.2 Representations were invited on the Proposed Submission Core Strategy for a six week period between 31<sup>st</sup> March and 12<sup>th</sup> May 2010. A total of 62 representors made a total of 221 representations. Officers reviewed these representations, and in submitting the Core Strategy in July 2010, proposed some minor changes to the Core Strategy.
- 1.3 An [Addendum Sustainability Appraisal Report](#) (July 2010) was prepared, which considered whether any of the suggested changes would have any significant sustainability implications - that would alter the conclusions drawn in the Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Proposed Submission Core Strategy (March 2010). The conclusion from this work was that whilst two of the proposed changes to the Core Strategy would serve to slightly soften or strengthen some of the previously identified significant effects - the general direction of travel, and therefore the headline significant effects, remained as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2010).

#### Further Proposed Changes

- 1.4 During the Examination of the Core Strategy, the Council put forward further changes to the Core Strategy in two separate schedules. These further Proposed Changes were considered by the independent Inspector who presided over the Core Strategy Examination.
- 1.5 The Inspector published her Report on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2011. She found the Core Strategy to be 'sound', subject to a limited number of changes needed to meet legal and statutory requirements. These changes were listed in Appendix A of her Report (and related Appendix 1) (i.e. the Changes that go to Soundness). Importantly, the Inspector commented that none of these changes should materially alter the substance of the Plan and its policies, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes undertaken (see paragraph 4 of the Inspector's Report). The Council concurs with this view,

but for completeness, Table 1 below briefly considers all of the changes listed in Appendix A of the Inspector’s Report - in terms of whether they have any significant sustainability implications.

1.6 In line with the first Addendum Report, it is not considered that the further minor changes (listed at Appendix B of the Inspector’s Report) warrant further sustainability appraisal work.

**Table 1 - Sustainability Appraisal Review (Changes that go to Soundness)**

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
Table 1 PC1	Update the figures in Table 1 [of the Core Strategy] - see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> <sup>1</sup> .	<p>The changes to Table 1 reflect the latest housing monitoring data and the use of net SHLAA figures. The overall amount of housing development <u>anticipated</u> in the District is slightly lower - although the actual amount of development will depend upon which sites come forward for development (including whether development occurs on the Opportunity Sites).</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Third Para of ‘Community Needs’ section PC2	<p>Amend the first sentence to read: “... (with approximately 1,000<del>400</del><sup>20</sup> dwellings completed over the ten year period)”</p> <p>After “(with approximately 1,000 dwellings completed over the ten year period)” - add a footnote reference, with the footnote to read:</p> <p>“Assuming the Opportunity Sites come forward in the period 2011-21, approximately 1,400 dwellings are likely to be completed over this ten year period”.</p>	<p>The minor changes reflect the latest housing monitoring data and the use of net SHLAA figures. A slightly reduced scale of housing development is anticipated in the ten year period 2011-21 - although the actual amount of development will depend upon which sites come forward for development (and when).</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 1 of the Inspector’s Report lists a number of tables and graphs showing the housing land supply position, updated to 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010. Table 1 shows the housing distribution overview.

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
Para 2.1.10 Appendix 5 PC3	Replace "2022/23" with " <u>2023/24</u> " in the first sentence.  Also, update the introductory paragraph of Appendix 5 (as amended), to read: "...the lower end of the 2,200-2,800 dwelling range in <del>2022/23</del> <u>2023/24</u> ...."	These minor changes reflect the latest housing monitoring data and the use of net SHLAA figures.  <b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b>
Para 2.2.8 PC4	Amend the first sentence to read: "...plan period (approximately <del>230</del> 243 dwellings), than in any..."	These changes reflect the latest housing monitoring data and the use of net SHLAA figures.  <b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b>
Table 3 PC5	Update the figures in Table 3 - see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> .	
"Beaconsfield Box" PC6	Replace the figure "430" with " <u>440</u> " in the first sentence.	
Table 4 PC7	Update the figures in Table 4 - see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> .	
Table 5 PC8	Update the figures in Table 5 - see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> .	
Table 6 PC9	Update the figures in Table 6 - see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> .	
Para 2.2.30 (Rest of the District box) PC10	Replace the figure "1,440" with " <u>1,380</u> " in the first sentence. Replace the figure "1,140" with " <u>1,170</u> " in the second sentence.	
Para 3.2.2 - Table 7 PC11	Update Table 7 to provide housing land supply data as of 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2010 and net SHLAA figures. See <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> .	
Para 3.2.4 PC12	Replace the figure "611" with " <u>443</u> " and "2,731" with " <u>2,698</u> " in the first sentence.	
Core Policy 1 PC13	Amend the second sentence to read: "At least <u>80%</u> of this development will be accommodated on Previously Developed Land."	

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
		<p>on previously developed land is likely to fall, the proposed change will not directly impact upon where development takes place.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Para 3.2.14 PC14	Delete the last two sentences of para 3.2.14. Replace with: <u>"In order to encourage mixed communities, in accordance with PPS3, a mix of dwelling types and sizes will be required on larger developments."</u>	<p>This change more accurately reflects the intended implementation of Core Policy 2.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Core Policy 2 PC15	<p>In the first sentence of the second paragraph, delete "or 0.16 hectares and above,".</p> <p>In the first sentence of the third paragraph, delete "or 0.16 hectares and above,".</p> <p>Delete the second sentence of the second paragraph, and replace it with: -</p> <p><u>"The mix of housing provided will vary from site to site but the aim should be to provide a range of types and sizes that take account of the existing housing mix in the area."</u></p>	<p>The Council considers that there is no benefit to be gained from including these additional size thresholds in Core Policy 2. The overall conclusion from the Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2010) remains pertinent - 'Core Policy 2 will provide residents with the opportunity of living in a decent home by encouraging a range of housing types and sizes, appropriate to local needs'.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Core Policy 3 PC16	<p>Amend the first sentence of the second paragraph to read: -</p> <p><u>"...of 0.16 hectares and above (irrespective of where there is a net gain in the number of dwellings) should be affordable..."</u></p>	<p>This change clarifies that affordable housing would only be sought where there is a net gain in dwellings.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
Page 71, Core Policy 10 PC17	<p>Amend the second sentence of the second paragraph to read: -  <u>“In limited circumstances, including</u> where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the permitted purpose<sup>70</sup> ...”</p> <p>Also amend the footnote attached to these words as follows:</p> <p><u>“In seeking to demonstrate that there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the permitted purpose, the applicant will need to have undertaken a prolonged period of unsuccessful marketing, using details approved by the District Council.”</u></p> <p>Amend the third paragraph to read:</p> <p><u>“The change of use of employment land and floorspace (B Use Class) to retail use <del>will not be permitted</del> (outside of the District and Local Centres defined in Core Policy 11) <u>will only be permitted in limited circumstances - where there is evidence that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact upon nearby District and Local Centres, and there are no sequentially preferable alternative sites available.</u>”</u></p>	<p>These changes aid clarity and add to the flexibility of Core Policy 10 - whilst ensuring that it complies with PPS4.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Core Policy 11 PC18	<p>In the first sentence of the third paragraph, after the words “set out below”, insert <u>“(or as updated in a future Retail and Town Centre Study)”</u>.</p>	<p>This change adds to the flexibility of Core Policy 11.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Core Policy 12 PC19	<p>In the final sentence, replace the word “targets” with <u>“requirements”</u>.</p>	<p>This change provides flexibility to amend aspects of the Sustainable Energy policy in the light of new evidence and technological advances.</p>

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
		No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).
Para 3.6.8 PC20	Amend the final sentence to read: "The Council accepts the general principle of retaining the same overall quantum of floorspace through any redevelopment scheme, but will need to be satisfied that the height, massing and distribution of the proposed development <u>has no greater impact (and preferably a lesser impact) than existing development on the openness of the Green Belt</u> <del>reduces the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and the purposes of including land within it.</del>	This change ensures consistency with national guidance and Core Policy 14.  No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).
Core Policy 14 PC21	Amend the penultimate bullet to read: " <u>Demonstrate, prior to the granting of planning permission, that the necessary infrastructure can be put in place within agreed timescales, prior to development commencing including...</u> "	This change provides clarification on infrastructure delivery.  No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).
Core Policy 15 PC22	Amend the last bullet to read: " <u>Demonstrate, prior to the granting of planning permission, that the necessary infrastructure can be put in place within agreed timescales prior to development commencing.</u> "	This change provides clarification on infrastructure delivery.  No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).
Para 3.6.33 PC23	Amend the penultimate sentence to read: -  "In the longer term, should proposals come forward for <del>comprehensive</del> <u>significant development or redevelopment of</u> <del>on</del> the Thorney Business Park, the Council would look for a significant reduction in the HGV movements (generated by the site) <u>through Iver Village and Richings Park, either through</u>	These changes provide clarification on the aims of Core Policy 16. The key aim is to deliver a reduction in HGV movements through Iver Village and Richings Park, which could be achieved in various ways, including through the provision of a new access road. Whilst a new access road might even provide for an increase in HGV movements to and from the site (although not through Iver Village and

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
Core Policy 16 PC24	<p><u>land use, use of the rail and canal access or provision of a new access road.</u>"</p> <p>Amend the last paragraph to read:</p> <p>Any proposals for significant development or redevelopment on the Thorney Business Park should deliver a significant reduction in <u>the number of</u> <u>HGV movements (generated by the site) through Iver Village and Richings Park, either through</u> <del>land use, use of the rail and canal access or provision of a new access road.</del> ."</p>	<p>Richings Park) any such proposals would need to be subject to further, more detailed assessment, to consider the potential adverse impacts, including on Burnham Beeches SAC.</p> <p>The ability of the Policy to address any adverse environmental impacts associated with new development is strengthened by the change in wording from 'comprehensive' to 'significant'.</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>
Paras 3.6.37- 3.6.39 PC25	<p>Replace paragraphs 3.6.37-3.6.39 with:</p> <p><u>"3.6.37 The redevelopment of sites in the Green Belt will normally be inappropriate development, unless for a limited range of uses<sup>88</sup>. Inappropriate development will not be supported unless the applicant can demonstrate that there are very special circumstances justifying development in the Green Belt. The applicant will also need to comply with the relevant community consultation requirements, as set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement - although it will not normally be appropriate to prepare a development brief for such sites, as national and local Green Belt policy severely limits the range of development options available.</u></p> <p>3.6.38 <del>Alternatively, and if necessary, the Council may need to</del> <u>If necessary, the Council may give consideration to identifying additional Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, through preparation of a subsequent DPD.</u></p> <p>3.6.39 For the avoidance of doubt, development briefs will</p>	<p>These changes clarify that it would be inappropriate to require Development Briefs on Green Belt sites (unless they are designated as Major Developed Sites).</p> <p><b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b></p>

Core Strategy Page / Para	Proposed Change	Commentary - Sustainability Implications
	normally be required on sites of 1 hectare or more ( <u>on land excluded from the Green Belt</u> ), although in certain circumstances (for example, where a site is in a particularly sensitive setting) a development brief may need to be prepared for smaller sites” .	
Core Policy 17 PC26	Amend the first sentence of Core Policy 17 to read: “Should other significant sites come forward for development <u>on land excluded from the Green Belt</u> , a Development Brief will normally need to be prepared, prior to submission of a planning application.	This change clarifies that it would be inappropriate to require Development Briefs on Green Belt sites (unless they are designated as Major Developed Sites).  <b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b>
Para 4.1.10 PC27	Insert new sentence at the end of paragraph 4.1.10 to read:  <u>“If, on the other hand, there is a significant over supply of housing (insert footnote) as assessed against the housing targets in the Spatial Strategy and Core Policy 1, the Council will seek to put in place actions to manage this oversupply” .</u>  New footnote:  <u>“PPS3: Housing, indicates at paragraph 64 that more than a 10-20% over supply could be considered ‘significant’ .”</u>	These changes clarify that management action will also be needed if there is an over supply of housing as well as an under supply. This change will support the Spatial Strategy (in relation to protection of the Green Belt) and Core Policy 8: Built and Historic Environment.  <b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b>
Appendix 5 PC28	Update the Housing Trajectory figures and table to provide housing land supply data as of 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2010. Also to incorporate the net SHLAA figures (see <a href="#">Appendix 1</a> ).	These changes reflect the latest housing monitoring data and the use of net SHLAA figures.  <b>No change in the significant SA effects (as noted in the Sustainability Appraisal Report - March 2010, and Addendum Report - July 2010).</b>

## Conclusion

- 1.7 The changes to the Core Strategy, required by the Inspector, do not impact upon the likely significant effects of the Plan.
- 1.8 Whilst some of the changes serve to slightly soften or strengthen some of the previously identified significant effects - the general direction of travel, and therefore the headline significant effects, remain as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report (March 2010).

---



**South Bucks**  
District Council

Capswood, Oxford Road  
Denham  
Buckinghamshire  
UB9 4LH

Tel: 01895 837200

<http://www.southbucks.gov.uk/>