

1.0 NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.1 Horsham District Council is working towards producing a Local Development Framework. (LDF) This framework will contain a range of Documents which will set out the policies for land-use planning in the District.
- 1.2 A key aim of the Local Development Framework is to ensure that it contributes to sustainable development. This means balancing social, environmental and economic needs both now and in the future. To help ensure that the Local Development Framework Documents are sustainable a process called Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken and has incorporated the legal requirements of the “Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004”. This non technical summary sets out a summary of the findings of the assessment process.

THE CORE STRATEGY AND SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS OF LAND

- 1.3 The Core Strategy (2007) has been developed taking into account the requirements of a wide range of documents, from international to local level. Documents include the national Planning Policy Statements, the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 and the Horsham District Community Strategy. The combination of these requirements led to the development of the following Core Strategy Spatial Objectives as follows:
- 1) To protect and enhance the diverse character and local distinctiveness of the District
 - 2) To balance the need for protection of the natural, built and historic environment (including the natural resources) of the District with need to allow the continued evolution of both the countryside and the character and environment of settlements
 - 3) To ensure that new development in the District is of high quality
 - 4) To enable the provision (building) of a sufficient number of dwellings (homes) to meet the requirements of regional planning policy by 2018 including that specified by the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 -2016
 - 5) To provide for business and employment development needs, particularly for existing local businesses
 - 6) To meet the diverse needs of the communities and businesses in the District
 - 7) To promote and enhance community leisure and recreation facilities, and to assist in the development of appropriate tourism and cultural facilities
 - 8) To enhance the vitality and viability of Horsham town centre and the centres of the smaller towns and villages in the District
 - 9) To reduce the expected growth in car based travel by seeking to provide choice in modes of transport wherever possible

METHODOLOGY

- 1.4 To undertake the sustainability appraisal of the Core Strategy, the Council first collected ‘baseline’ data about the District as it is today on social, environmental and economic issues. This information was used to identify the sustainability issues which are affecting the District. These were then used to develop sustainability objectives and indicators which were used to judge how successful the Core Strategy is in achieving sustainable development. These objectives and indicators were developed in consultation with internal and external organisations.

- 1.5 The Sustainability Objectives were used to assess the sustainability of the different options for the Core Strategy. The results of this assessment helped to inform which options were incorporated into the Core Strategy documentation. The effects of the selected Core Strategy policies were then assessed to identify the positive and negative effects of the different policies. Where negative impacts were identified, mitigation measures to prevent or lessen the impact of the policy were suggested, in order to reduce any adverse effects arising from the proposals.

BASELINE DATA

- 1.6 'Baseline' data was collected about the District for a range of economic, social and environmental matters. The data helped us to understand how the District is at the present time and also how things may change in the future without a Local Development Framework. The overall findings can be summarised as follows:

1.7 Economic

The District economy is generally strong with low unemployment levels. In future there is the potential for the low levels of unemployment to lead to skills shortages. One part of the economy that is not as buoyant as other sectors is the rural economy, which has declined in recent years.

1.8 Social

Generally, the District has low levels of deprivation. Education levels are good and life expectancy is higher than the national average. Some pockets of deprivation do exist, and one particular problem facing the District is the difficulty faced by residents living in rural areas without a car reaching the services and facilities they need.

1.9 Environment

Overall the District has a high quality environment. It has two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the High Weald and the Sussex Downs. It also has a range of habitats some of which are designated for their nature conservation importance. Levels of pollution are also low, although this has the potential to change in the future if traffic levels rise. There are, however, threats to the environment as a result of changing land management techniques, development pressures and climate change.

SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN HORSHAM DISTRICT

- 1.10 The baseline information and the plans and policies influencing the LDF helped inform the sustainability issues affecting the District. These are as follows:

- Pressure for housing development, high house prices and lack of affordable housing.
- Access to services and facilities can be difficult for those in rural areas without transport.
- New services and facilities will need to be provided in areas of population growth
- Car ownership and use is high, contributing to congestion and climate change. At the same time public transport in the District is fairly limited.
- Whilst crime levels are low overall, fear of crime is an issue.
- Development pressure is threatening the character, biodiversity and historical features in the District.
- Development in the District can contribute to, and be affected by, climate change. The potential for increased flooding is of concern.
- Increasing demand for raw resources, including energy and water.
- The need to continue to recycle and the problem of fewer locations to dispose of waste.

- The need to maintain the high and stable economy.
- The need to enhance the economy in rural areas.
- The need to maintain and enhance town and village centres.

THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK

1.11 In order to assess how the plans and policies in the Core Strategy contribute to sustainability, a set of Sustainability Objectives were developed. In addition a set of indicators was devised, which will be used to measure how the documents contribute to Sustainable Development once the plans are finally agreed. The Objectives and Indicators are as follows:

Table One: Sustainability Objectives and Indicators

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR
Social Progress which meets the needs of everyone	
1. To ensure that everyone has access to good quality affordable homes that meets their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of affordable homes built each year • Proportion of affordable housing / commuted payment on qualifying residential schemes • % of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes built as a proportion of the total • The number / percentage of people in housing need
2. To ensure that everyone has access to the health, education, leisure and recreation facilities they require	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of applications with S106 agreements for infrastructure and community improvements completed • Number of applications resulting in the extension, improvement or loss of facilities
3. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of developments where advice from the Police is sought and followed.
Effective Protection of the Environment	
4. To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The condition of landscape areas • Type and percentage of planning permissions granted for new development in the Strategic Gaps • Condition of SSSIs.
5. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of applications with S106 agreements for enhancements to biodiversity • Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance including • change in priority habitats and species (by type) • change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value • Number of listed buildings lost as a result of development
6. To conserve and enhance the historical and cultural environment of the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of archaeological sites and historical parks and gardens lost or damaged as a result of development • Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award system
7. To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of redevelopment proposals which result in the clean-up of contaminated sites • Number of Air Quality Management Zones • Number of rivers in Horsham District meeting river quality targets
8. To reduce car journeys and promote alternative methods of transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications with S106 agreements for public transport improvements • Parking Provision in residential developments

9. To reduce the risk of flooding
- **Prudent Use of Natural Resources**
- 10 To make the most efficient use of land by prioritising brownfield land for development
- 11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the re-use and recycling of other materials.
- 12 To ensure that rates of energy and water consumption are as efficient as possible.
- 13 To seek to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, in particular by encouraging the provision and use of renewable energy.
- **Maintenance of High and Stable Levels of Economic Growth and Employment**
- 14 To maintain the high and stable economy of the District
- 15 To seek to enhance areas where there are inequalities in the economy, particularly the rural economy.
- 16 To maintain and enhance the vitality of Horsham town and village centres
- Number of development proposals which incorporate sustainable urban drainage schemes
 - Numbers of planning permissions granted / refused on grounds of flood risk
 - Number of homes built on previously developed land in towns and villages
 - Percentage of new dwellings completed at
 - less than 30 dwellings per hectare (dph)
 - between 30-50 dph
 - above 50 dph
 - Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard
 - Number of developments using reclaimed materials in construction
 - Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard
 - Number of developments incorporating water and energy efficiency measures
 - Number of developments incorporating energy efficiency measures
 - Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard
 - Number of homes / developments linked to a combined heat and power system
 - Vacancy rates on employment sites
 - Amount of employment land lost to residential development
 - Number of rural diversification schemes permitted
 - Amount of employment floorspace permitted
 - Amount of new retail floorspace created
 - Number of retail units converted to other uses

COMPATIBILITY OF OBJECTIVES

- 1.12 The sustainability objectives were compared with each other and the LDF objectives to determine whether there are any areas where the objectives conflict. Identification of these conflicts meant that when assessing Core Strategy, possible ways forward to prevent or reduce the conflicts could be found.
- 1.13 The results from this assessment indicated that most of the objectives were compatible with each other, or had a neutral effect. The main areas where objectives are not compatible are those which result in the need for development (e.g. provision of housing) against objectives which need to limit development in some way (e.g. protection of landscape character).

IDENTIFICATION AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

- 1.14 As part of the preparation of the Core Strategy, a range of possible plan options were developed. This included the 'do-nothing' option of not meeting needs. The options were assessed against the sustainability objectives to determine the most sustainable option. As part of this assessment, preliminary recommendations were also made as to how the options could be improved and made more sustainable. A summary of the findings is set out in the table below, together with how the recommendations were incorporated into the preparation of policies.

Table Two: Summary of Assessment of the Core Policy Options

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected Core Strategy	Further information / Comments
<p>Landscape Character a) Devise a strategy which protects the landscape character of the District b) Devise a strategy which protects and enhances the landscape character of the District c) Do not protect landscape over that which we are statutorily required to</p>	b	b	Protecting and enhancing the landscape character enables landscape across all of the District to be protected rather than specific areas. It also allows existing areas to be improved.
<p>Settlement Coalescence a) Develop a strategy which retains the pattern of settlements in the District b) Do not protect the settlement pattern of the District</p>	a	a	Protecting settlement form helps protect the environment and town and village centres remain viable
<p>Protection and Evolution of the District a) Develop a strategy which enables development and change to occur in any location. b) Develop a strategy which limits all development and change c) Develop a strategy which enables some development and change but protects and enhances urban and rural areas and designated sites and features</p>	c	c	Option c is most sustainable as it balances the need for protection with change
<p>Built-up area boundaries a) Control development by defining built-up area boundaries around settlements which have some access to services and facilities b) Do not define built-up area boundaries</p>	a	a	Controlling development will help protect the environment and ensure that settlements remain a focus for the provision of services and facilities

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected Core Strategy	Further information / Comments
<p>Environmental Quality a) Do we develop a strategy which protects the environment including reducing waste and energy consumption, addresses climate change and renewable energy, and protects and enhances water quality and conserves water supplies b) Does the strategy not consider the environmental quality of development?</p>	a	a	Option a is most sustainable as it protects the environment and is also likely to benefit the economy by maintaining a high quality environment in which to live and work
<p>Flooding a) Do not develop in current floodplains b) Do not develop in likely future floodplains</p>	b	b	Option b is more sustainable as it protects the current and future environment, society and economy.
<p>Design of Development a) Develop a strategy which controls the design and appearance of development to ensure it is of a high quality b) Do not develop a strategy which considers the design and appearance of development</p>	a	a	A strategy which controls the design and appearance of development has positive or neutral effects on all sustainability objectives. Option b has more negative effects
<p>Brownfield developments a) Develop all brownfield sites including those in rural areas b) Limit development of brownfield sites to settlements which have a defined built-up area boundary c) Limit development of brownfield sites to settlements which have a defined built-up area boundary unless there is an overriding local issue.</p>	b	c	All development could be damaging to biodiversity, the historic environment and land and townscape character depending on its exact location. On balance it is considered that the most sustainable option is to limit development to brownfield sites within built-up areas (option b). Option c was however put forward as part of the Core Strategy as there are some rural brownfield sites in the District which may need redevelopment to help restore them
<p>Urban Extensions a) Place all greenfield development at large scale urban extension sites b) Locate most greenfield development at large scale open extensions and at smaller villages to help meet a specific local need</p>	b	b	Enabling development in smaller villages as well as at urban extensions would be more positive as it would help ensure retention of services and facilities in all locations across the District and also help the rural economy. It is therefore considered that option b is the most sustainable and this approach has been followed in the Core Strategy.

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected Core Strategy	Further information / Comments
<p>Location of Urban Extensions a) Should urban extensions be around bigger settlements (Horsham / Crawley) prior to smaller settlements of Billingshurst and / or Southwater b) Should development of urban extensions be a combination of larger and smaller settlements</p>	a	a	Larger settlements have a greater range of existing services and employment in addition to what would be provided by new development. It was also considered that the number of car journeys is likely to be less if development is nearer to the larger settlements as they are closer to employment and services. It was considered that option a is more sustainable, and this option has been incorporated into the core strategy. Option b was found to be the least unsustainable option.
<p>Horsham Urban Extension Should location be located a) West of Horsham, solely inside the A24 b) West of Horsham partially inside A24 and to the South of Broadbridge Heath c) North of Broadbridge Heath d) another location around Horsham</p>	b	b	Although damaging to the environmental objectives, it is less damaging to the environment than other locations around Horsham, with more limited impact on nature conservation and historic sites and landscapes. This option has therefore been selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy
<p>Employment Provision a) Accommodate 210,000m² employment land within Horsham District b) Accommodate some of the 210,000m² employment land in Crawley Borough, linked through any development West of Crawley development</p>	b	a	Although option b is more sustainable, option a has been selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy to ensure that necessary employment development can be provided West of Crawley. Measures to ensure that enough employment is provided in Horsham District will be necessary.
<p>Existing Employment Sites a) Allow the conversion of employment sites to housing development b) Protect all employment sites from conversion to housing development c) Protect economically viable employment sites in BUABs.</p>	c	c	Option c was found to be most sustainable as it ensures that the employment sites are retained in settlements, but enables sites which are not viable to evolve.
<p>Rural Diversification a) Enable all rural diversification proposals to take place b) Enable diversification schemes providing the character of the area is retained c) Do not allow rural diversification schemes</p>	b	b	Option b was found to be most sustainable as it enables diversification schemes to take place which support the rural economy whilst still helping to protect the environment.

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected Core Strategy	Further information / Comments
<p>Developer Contributions</p> <p>a) Seek contributions from developers to help fund community facilities</p> <p>b) Don't seek contributions from developers</p>	a	a	Option a ensures that community facilities and services are provided as a result of development.
<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>a) Seek 30% affordable housing on all developments</p> <p>b) Seek 40% affordable housing on all developments</p> <p>c) Vary the level of affordable housing depending on the size and location of the site</p> <p>d) Do not set a requirement for the provision of affordable housing</p>	b	c	Option c has been selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy as there are practical and economic difficulties in bringing about 40% affordable housing on all sites. Option c was found to be the most adaptable approach, and could help in providing suitable sites for key worker homes, but mitigation of some of the uncertainty that varying the level of affordable housing can bring is necessary
<p>Communities and people with specific needs</p> <p>a) Develop a strategy which enables the needs of specific communities and people to be met</p> <p>b) Do not develop a strategy to meet the needs of specific communities and people</p>	a	a	Option a was found to be the most sustainable option. This option would also ensure that adequate health and community facilities are provided for specific groups. Not doing so (option b) would prevent people finding accommodation that meets their requirements.
<p>New and existing facilities</p> <p>a) Develop a strategy which enables the provision of new leisure and recreation facilities where needed.</p> <p>b) Protect existing facilities in their current state</p> <p>c) Allow partial development of existing facilities to bring about their enhancement</p> <p>d) Do not provide new or enhance existing facilities.</p>	A combination of a & c	A combination of a & c	A combination of these options provides facilities in all areas of the District and helps to reduce any problems that pursuing only one or other option would generate.
<p>Tourism</p> <p>a) Develop a strategy to enable tourism development</p> <p>b) Do not consider tourism</p>	Uncertain – depends on exact nature of tourism proposals	a	The impact of tourism on the environment could be positive or negative depending on the type and nature of the proposed development. Option a has been selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy, but the issues will need to be considered carefully to avoid adverse environmental effects.
<p>Maintain the balance of services in town and village centres</p> <p>a) Resist change of use from retail to other uses</p> <p>b) Allow retail properties to change use</p>	a	a	Option a (preventing loss of retail uses) would help maintain the balance of services and was therefore included in the Core Strategy.

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected Core Strategy	Further information / Comments
<p>Expansion to meet the identified long term need a) Meet the need for expansion by providing new facilities b) Meet the need through expansion of existing facilities c) Meet the need through enabling the provision for new facilities and expansion of existing d) Do not meet the identified need</p>	b	c	<p>Option c) enabling expansion of existing facilities and provision of new development, has been selected for inclusion in the Core Strategy as expansion of existing facilities may not always be possible in practical terms. Where new development does occur, mitigation of any adverse effects will be necessary.</p>
<p>Reducing demand a) Reduce the need to travel by enhancing and locating development close to existing facilities b) Do not take into account travel needs when locating development</p>	a	a	<p>Option a would help prevent some environmental degradation, and existing facilities would benefit financially from the developments. Not accounting for travel needs could lead to new and possibly unnecessary development which would be a source of environmental degradation. In addition, it could increase the dependence and the distances travelled by car.</p>
<p>Public Transport networks a) Provide improvements to public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes as part of new development in the district b) Do not improve public transport or cycle and pedestrian routes</p>	a	a	<p>Option a would help provide access to services for those without a car and could have potential benefits to the environment by reducing the emission of air pollutants and greenhouse gases and has been included in the Core Strategy.</p>

ASSESSMENT OF THE CORE STRATEGY DOCUMENT

- 1.15 Following the assessment of the Core Strategy options, the options selected formed the basis of policies. These policies were then appraised, examining how each of the policies would affect the various sustainability objectives. In addition, the effects of the different policies acting was considered. This process was undertaken continuously throughout the process of policy preparation.
- 1.16 In brief, the assessment of the Core Strategy policies found there was generally a positive effect on the social and economic sustainability objectives, but less positive environmental effects. From the findings of the assessment it was possible to suggest ways in which the sustainability of the two documents could be improved. This included clarification of wording, or the identification of issues which need consideration at a later stage, for example as part of Local Development Framework document to be produced at a later date.
- 1.17 A summary of the results of the appraisal of the Core Strategy together with the improvements made as a result of the assessment are set out in the tables below.

Table 3: Summary of findings and mitigation following the sustainability appraisal of the Core Policies.

Core Policy	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated
CP1 – Landscape and Townscape Character	Policy mainly helps meet environmental objectives, although historical character not mentioned. Policy could restrict the ability to provide services and facilities and the economy.	Aspects of character, including historic environment discussed in supporting text of policy. Opportunities for enhancement also set out in supporting text. Other policies help provide for change which could otherwise be prevented by policy.
CP2 Environmental Quality	Policy helps meet the environmental objectives, but could restrict the ability to provide necessary development. The economy could also benefit through high quality environment being maintained. Reduction of waste is omitted from the policy.	The need to enhance as well as maintain the environment has been further emphasised. Reduction of waste has been added to the policy. The environmental issues mentioned are relatively brief, and further detail on e.g. flooding will be provided through DC policies and future SPD.
CP3 – Improving the Quality of New Development	Policy is beneficial in meeting nearly all sustainability objectives as good design can help mitigate against problems such as loss of biodiversity although there was no direct mention of the historic environment. It also provides a pleasant environment in which to live and work which is beneficial to society and the economy.	References to the ability of design to provide environmental mitigation have been improved. Protection of the historic environment will be covered more fully in the General Development control policy document.
CP4 – Housing Provision	Policy would be beneficial to the economy by ensuring a continued workforce. Policy would harm environmental and social objectives as it does not mention affordable homes etc.	Affordable homes, infrastructure policies mitigate against lack of affordable housing etc in policy. Environmental effects mitigated through CP1, 2 and 3.

Core Policy	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated
CP5 – Built-up areas and Previously Developed Land	This policy was found to perform well against the economic and social objectives, but with the exception of brownfield land, less well in environmental terms, with loss of biodiversity, and increased waste a potential issue.	Policy wording helps minimise adverse effects, e.g. to townscape character. Policy also talks about resources and assets which covers environmental issues and has been further clarified following the results of the sustainability appraisal. Environmental effects also mitigated through other policies.
CP6 – Strategic Location West of Crawley	This policy was assessed as having negative environmental effects. The wording of the policy does not specifically refer to affordable housing and service provision which could result in these objectives not being met. The development could also have an adverse impact on the towns and village centres in Horsham District by drawing away trade.	The policy refers to development principles which include the need for affordable housing / services and facilities. Further mitigation of effects will come through a future Area Action Plan (AAP) which will have a further SA/SEA and at the planning application stage where an EIA will be necessary. These studies will need to include examination of nature conservation, open space and character, flooding and roads in detail.
CP7 – Strategic Location – West of Horsham	This policy was found to have negative effects on the environmental and resource objectives, but having a more positive effect on the economy and social objectives by providing affordable housing and more services.	Further work is needed on assessing precise effects, but this will be achieved as part of the future “Development Brief” SPD which will have its own SA/ SEA and at the planning application stage where an EIA will be necessary. These studies will need to include examination of flooding and road network issues in detail.
CP8- Small Scale Greenfield sites	This policy was found to have negative effects on the environmental and resource objectives, but was more positive in social and economic terms as development helps to maintain services and facilities and the local economy.	The wording of the policy helps minimise adverse effects on character and environment by requiring enhancements. Specific policies allocating these sites will include mitigation measures against negative impacts which may otherwise occur.
CP9 – Managing the release of housing land	This policy had limited additional effect on many objectives, but was positive in ensuring that development was at a steady rate enabling homes and services to be provided across the plan period. A managed release of land may also help the implementation of environmental mitigation measures.	
CP10 – Employment provision	This policy was found to be beneficial against the economic objectives, but was damaging to the environmental objectives. Provision of employment land in west of Crawley could lead to shortages in Horsham District.	Policies CP1-3 help mitigate against environmental damage. Supporting text has been amended to clarify Crawley employment would be in addition to that needed by Horsham District.
CP11- Employment sites and premises	This policy was found to be beneficial against the economic objectives, particularly by ensuring that development is retained rather than lost to housing. Policy is damaging in terms of the environmental objectives.	Policies CP1-3 help mitigate against environmental damage. Policy wording has been amended to refer to environmental objectives.

Core Policy	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated
CP12 – Affordable Housing	This policy has a positive or neutral effect on most of the objectives, particularly in providing homes and also to the economy.	
CP13 – Infrastructure Requirements	Provision of services performed well against the social and economic objectives, although access to services not specifically mentioned in policy. Performance against the environmental objectives was poorer as new development could harm character, biodiversity, pressure on water supplies etc.	Access to services discussed to some extent in supporting text and also in CP20 (e). Reference has been enhanced. Specific effects from provision of services depends on each proposal. Mitigation and further information on issues such as water supply to be provided in site specific polices and future planning obligations DPD.
CP14 – Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and services	This policy had positive effects on the social and economic objectives, but effects on the environment were uncertain as it depends on the nature of each proposal – some could be provision of nature conservation site, others result in loss of land.	Effects on the environment will in particular need to be considered on a site by site basis – mitigation measures need to be included as part of site specific allocations as appropriate or through individual planning applications.
CP15 – Rural Strategy	The policy was found to have a positive effect in reducing inequalities in the rural economy, helping both in economic terms and meeting social needs. There is, however, the potential for the environmental objectives to be adversely affected.	Effects on the environment are mitigated through policies CP1 -3 and also through policy wording which requires environmental improvements and reduced impacts on the countryside and minimising increases in traffic.
CP16 – Inclusive Communities	This policy has a positive or neutral effect on most of the objectives, particularly in providing homes and specific elements of the community, and also to the economy. Other effects on the sustainability objective were found to be negative, essentially as a result of the rural location of gypsy sites	How specific needs will be taken into account will have to be assessed on a case by case basis in consultation with the Housing Department. For gypsies and travellers mitigation measures will need to be incorporated as part of a future DPD which will have a separate SA/SEA. This document will need include consider environmental issues and transport.
CP17 – Vitality and viability of Existing Centres	The policy was generally found to have a positive effect on the economy and access to services and facilities. The policy had a negative impact on environmental objectives including loss of townscape character.	Mitigation of environmental effects is provided in policies CP1-3, but further reference to townscape character has been mentioned in more detail. Further control / information could be provided in the development control policy document.
CP18 – Tourism and Cultural Facilities	The effects of this policy were found to be beneficial in economic terms, but other effects were more uncertain as it depends on the exact type of facility being provided as well as its location.	Possible negative effects on the environment mitigated by policy wording e.g. not damaging environmental or historic character. Issues will need to be considered on a case by case basis with mitigation in the site specific allocations document or at the planning application stage.

Core Policy	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated
CP19 – Managing Travel Demand and Widening choice of transport	Policy is beneficial in social and economic terms although it could enhance rural inequality. Environmental effects could be positive if car travel reduced, but road building mentioned in policy is harmful to the environment.	Environmental effects are mitigated by CP1-3 and reference to environmental effects of transport has been enhanced. Locating development close to existing services could be enhanced.

Consideration of Collective Impacts

1.18 The tables above show that each policy can on its own have an impact on the environment or the economy. In addition, the effects of several policies can combine to have a much larger positive or negative effect. These collective or ‘cumulative’ impacts have been considered and the main effects identified are as follows:

- Future increases in population due to the development of strategic allocations have the potential to increase traffic and reliance on the car. This will have effects on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, the environment, and accessibility to services and facilities.
- Increased waste from the residential and employment development included in the larger developments West of Crawley and West of Horsham.
- The effects on landscape and townscape both from the development in and around settlements across the District. In addition there may be effects on the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- There may be adverse effects on waterways and rivers due to the increased amount of hard surfaces arising from development. This could increase flooding or change the natural water drainage system. Development could also harm the water quality.
- Biodiversity and the historic environment could be harmed from both the direct effects from development and from indirect effects from impacts on water quality and air quality.

Significant Effects

1.19 Once the individual and joint impacts of the policies in the Core Strategy had been identified, it was possible to decide which impacts were most significant. It is considered that the most significant effects arising from the Core Strategy are those which result from the development requirements placed upon the District.

1.20 Significant effects arising from development include potential harm to the landscape, and increased reliance on the car. More beneficial impacts include increased numbers of affordable homes, which will benefit a wide group of the population currently unable to access the type of housing they require.

Mitigation Measures

1.21 In identifying the possible effects of the Core Strategy, mitigation measures to help combat the impacts arising from the documents have been put in place. The mitigation measures are set out in Table 3, but can be summarised as follows:

- Amendment to the wording of policies
- Other policies: Different policies in the document help to counteract the negative effects of others.
- Many of the effects arising from the proposals will be given further consideration and mitigated against in other documents, such as the General Development Control Policy document.
- Suggestion of areas for further study. This has included identification of issues to be studied as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will be provided with a planning application for some proposals.

NEXT STEPS

- 1.22 It is a requirement that the effects of the Core Strategy on sustainable development are monitored. The monitoring will be undertaken on an annual basis and will be incorporated into the wider annual monitoring which is required for the Local Development Framework. The findings of this monitoring will help measure how well the plan contributes to sustainable development, and inform future reviews of the plans and policies in the Core Strategy.