PLANNING
FOR OUR FUTURE

HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
TO 2018**

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

of the

General Development Control Polices Development Plan Document

December 2007

This document can be made available in large print or as audio tape on request. Please call (01403) 215549.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER   **PAGE**

1.0 BACKGROUND: SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Horsham District Council is working towards producing a Local Development Framework (LDF). This framework will contain a range of documents setting out the policies for land-use planning in the District. A key aim of the Local Development Framework is to ensure that it contributes to sustainable development, which means balancing social, economic and environmental needs, both now and in the future.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

1.2 The UK Government is committed to achieving sustainable development, and in its sustainable development strategy "Securing the Future" identified 5 main aims:
- Living within environmental limits
- Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society
- Achieving a sustainable economy
- Promoting Good Governance
- Using sound science responsibly

1.3 The aims of sustainable development have been incorporated into a range of laws, guidance and advice. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) places a duty on Local Authorities to carry out their functions with a view to achieving sustainable development, and the requirement for a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is set out in PPS12. In addition, the European Directive 2001/42/EC, adopted into UK law as the "Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004" requires that the environmental effects of certain plans and programmes, including land-use plans are taken into account.

1.4 The process of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment involves examining the likely effects of a plan, and considering how they contribute to environmental, social and economic well being. Where problems are identified measures to counteract them can be put into place. The process of undertaking a SA / SEA can therefore improve the overall sustainability of the plan being prepared.

1.5 The processes of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are similar and have therefore been undertaken together. For ease of reference this document will refer to both processes as a Sustainability Appraisal. There are however some differences in the two processes and Table 1 sets out where the specific requirements of the SEA directive have been met in this report.

Table 1: Schedule of SEA requirements

REQUIREMENTS OF THE DIRECTIVE	WHERE / HOW COVERED
Preparation of an environmental report: taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the content and level of detail of the plan, its stage in the decision making process, and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels the information to be given in the report is:	
An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Chapter 3
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution without implementation of the plan or programme	Chapter 4
The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Chapter 4
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directive 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC	Chapter 4
Any existing environmental protection objectives established at international, community or national level which are relevant to the programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Chapter 4
The likely significant effects on the environment, including: short, medium and long term; permanent and temporary; positive and negative; secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects on issues such as: biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and their interrelationships between the above factors.	Chapter 5, Appendix 1(available on Council's website)
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and, as fully as possible, offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme.	Chapter 5
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	Chapter 5
A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring (in accordance with regulation 17)	Chapter6
A non-technical summary of this information	Separate document
Consultation with:	
Authorities with environmental responsibility when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the environment report	Carried out at issues and options and preferred options stages
Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public to be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan and accompanying environmental report before its adoption	Undertaken as part of the plan preparation process
Other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country	Not applicable
Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision making	
Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted the public and any countries consulted must be informed and the following made available: 1) The plan or programme as adopted 2) A statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme in accordance with the requirements of the legislation 3) The measures decided concerning monitoring	Achieved by contacting all involved during document preparation, formal notices in press / on website. This includes the statement summarising how environmental considerations have been taken into account.

Monitoring of the environmental effects of the plan or programmes implementation must be undertaken	To be undertaken as part of the LDF monitoring programme, with results set out in the Annual Monitoring Report

1.6   The General Development Control Policies is one of a series of documents addressing planning issues within Horsham District. Other documents include the Core Strategy which was adopted in February 2007. This document sets out the overarching strategy for land-use planning in the District, and was subject to an SA/SEA as part of its preparation. Many of the issues and findings which have been identified and documented as part of this process are also relevant to the SA/SEA of the Development Control Policies, and this document should therefore be read **in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of The Core Strategy (2007)**.

2.0 METHODOLOGY FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

2.1   The Sustainability Appraisal of the General Development Control Policies Document was started at the same time as the preparation of the document began. The assessment process has been led by the Senior Environmental Officer based in the Strategic and Community Planning Department, but has drawn on technical information and expertise from all members of the Department. The assessment has also drawn on advice and expertise from other Departments of the Council and external organisations.

2.2   The process of Sustainability Appraisal has been iterative and continually updated. To date it has included the following stages:

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Development Control Policies – Scoping Report July 2005. This report provided a summary of the baseline data and plans and policies affecting the General Development Control Policies based on information collected as part of the Sustainability Appraisal work undertaken for the Core Strategy. The report also summarised the sustainability issues identified as affecting the District. The document also set out the Councils initial thoughts on the likely subjects which development control policies should cover, and the different options for the document. This document was made available for comment as part of the targeted Issues and Options consultation in July and August 2005.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment - Draft Report on Preferred Options for the Development Control Policies – November 2005. This report provided a summary of the baseline data and plans and policies affecting the General Development Control Policies based on information collected as part of the Sustainability Appraisal work undertaken for the Core Strategy. The report also summarised the sustainability issues identified as affecting the District. The document also set out the results of the assessment of the different options for the Development Control Policies. This document was made available for comment as part of the Preferred Options Consultation in November and December 2005.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment – Final Report on General Development Control Policies. This report updated the findings set out the draft report, following responses from the Preferred Options consultation.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the General Development Control Policies. This document updates the information in the Final report, taking into account the results of the Inspector's Report into the General Development Control Policies document. It has been published as a background document that accompanies the General Development Control Policies document.

CONSULTATION

2.3   In undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal the Council has sought to include as wide a range of views as possible, and has therefore consulted with a range of external organisations as well as other departments within the Council. The consultation has included the statutory consultees required under the SEA regulations: The Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England (formerly English Nature and the Countryside Agency) as well as organisations such as West Sussex County Council and has been independently scrutinised by the Council's Environmental Co-ordinator.

2.4   Responses to the Scoping report were received from the Environment Agency, English Heritage, West Sussex County Council and the Council's Environmental Co-ordinator. No comments were received from Natural England.

2.5   The responses identified new plans and policies that will influence the Development Control Policies. Suggestions were also made that the summary of baseline data could be strengthened and clarified.   Comments were also made on the possible options, including suggestions for additional policy areas and questioning whether the options could be broadened.

2.6   In response to these comments, the documentation was amended to reflect these changes. Further work was also undertaken on the different plan options, refining and updating them in the light of the comments received.

2.7   Relatively few comments were made in response to the draft SA/SEA report on the General Development Control policies document. Those that were generally made points of clarification rather than making specific comment on the findings of the assessment, and the relevant corrections and clarifications have been incorporated into final report, which accompanied the General Development Control Submission document. More comments were received on the text of the Development Control (DC) policies themselves, which led to some changes in the policies being made. As a result the sustainability of the policies was reappraised and the updated findings presented in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment – Final Report on General Development Control Policies.

METHODOLOGY

2.8   The methodology for each element of the Sustainability Appraisal process is set out in more detail in the following paragraphs. It should be noted that the Sustainability Appraisal General Development Control Policies document has drawn on information collected as part of the Sustainability Appraisal of The Core Strategy (2007), and further methodological information is also available in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessments of The Core Strategy (2007).

Plans and Programmes influencing the General Development Control Polcicies

2.9   Plans and Programmes influencing the LDF were identified as part of the Sustainability Appraisal for The Core Strategy. This was achieved by conducting interviews with the staff producing the Core Strategy. Staff were asked which plans and policies they had referred to at international, national, regional, county, district and a more local level when undertaking research on the different policy areas. Key documents for the General Development Control Policies were identified by reviewing the documents identified in the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy, and in consultation with other organisations. The information collected was set out in a table which identified the level and name of the document, its main aims, and the specific requirements in relation to the General Development Control Policies.

Baseline Data

2.10   Baseline data for the District was collected as part of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land documents. This information was collected for environmental, social and economic issues through a process of literature review, collection of information on web sites and through consultation with other organisations. The baseline data was collected on a district wide basis, and is therefore also relevant to the General Development Control Policies, which applies to the District as a whole. The key facts and trends about the District previously identified were therefore reviewed, updated where necessary, and summarised in this Report.

Sustainability Issues and Framework

2.11   As part of the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy, different sustainability issues affecting the District were identified by examining the requirements of the plans and policies and the findings of the baseline data. Taking into account the sustainability issues, a range of sustainability objectives were developed along with indicators to measure how the policies contribute to sustainable development. Given the district wide nature of the General Development Control Policies, it was considered that the same sustainability issues and indicators should be used to assess the General Development Control Policies document. These sustainability issues, objectives and indicators are therefore summarised in this report. Further information can be viewed in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Core Strategy, 2007.

Identification and Assessment of Local Development Framework Options and Policies

2.12   There are several alternative ways that the Council have approached the preparation of the General Development Control Policies document. This led to the development of a range of options. The options developed were based on how achievable they were in planning terms, and the requirements of higher level plans and strategies. The options developed were also formed taking into account the professional judgement of staff, who have a good understanding of the issues and what may or may not be possible in planning terms. The options were also refined following consultation on the Scoping Report and the Preferred Options documentation. These options were subject to an appraisal, from which it was then possible to appraise the effect of the policy on each sustainability objective. This was initially carried out by the staff writing the policy before being checked by the Senior Environmental Officer in the Strategic and Community Planning Department. To assess the effect of the policies on the sustainability objectives the matrix and scoring system set out overleaf was used.

Sustainability Objective	Option	Likely effects on the District	Assessment of Effects			Further comments/ mitigation
			Short term	Medium Term	Long Term	
1 -16	a					
	b					

Key

Strong positive effect	☺☺
Positive effect	☺
No effect / not applicable	😐
Negative effect	☹
Strong negative effect	☹☹
Effect not known / uncertain	?

2.13   Possible effects were considered in the short, medium and long term and consideration was given as to how this would affect each sustainability objective. The assessment also included consideration of the cumulative and synergistic impacts (effects which would result from a combination of the different policies acting together), as well as consideration of the significance of the impacts. This was carried out using further matrices and professional judgement.

3.0 THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DOCUMENT

THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DOCUMENT

3.1 The General Development Control Policies document will form one part of the Local Development Framework for Horsham District. It will add more detail to the long term vision and overarching policies for the District which are set out in the Core Strategy.

3.2 The objectives for the Local Development Framework are set out in the Core Strategy (2007), and also in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Assessment of The Core Strategy (2007). As the General Development Control Policies Document provides more detail and guidance to the Core Strategy it shares these objectives, and aims to meet them by setting out specific criteria against which planning applications submitted in the District will be considered. The policies will seek to provide local detail, certainty and guidance for communities, stakeholders, developers and landowners.

OTHER PLANS AND POLICIES

3.3 The General Development Control Policies document has been influenced by a wide range of other plans and strategies. These have already been identified as part of the SA/SEA on The Core Strategy and the *full list can be viewed by referring to the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Assessment of the Core Strategy (2007)*. Some of the key documents are however summarised below:

International

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
EC Directive 2001/42/EC – SEA Directive	Requires that environmental effects of certain plans and programmes are assessed, documented and mitigated against where necessary	A SA/SEA must be carried out for the development control policies

National

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks'	Sets out guidance on how to undertake a SA/SEA of an LDF document incorporating the requirements or the SEA directive	The SA must be undertaken from the start of plan preparation and improvements made to the plan must be documented
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	Requires local authorities to prepare LDFs with a view to achieving sustainable development	Section 39 places a duty on Local Authorities to prepare LDFs with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development
Various Planning Policy Statements and Guidance	Sets out the Government's vision for planning and the key policies and principles which should underpin the planning system	Development should be proactively managed through positive planning and achieve sustainable development.

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
UK Sustainable Development Strategy "Securing the Future"	Sets out updated guiding principles of sustainable development	Four identified priorities of sustainable consumption and production, climate change, resource protection and sustainable communities need to be addressed in the document
Planning Response to Climate Change – Advice on Better Practice – ODPM 2004.	Provides information on how planning can address the issue of climate change	Suggests measures to mitigate and adapt to climate change

Regional

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
A Clear Vision for the South East" The South \East Plan Core Document, March 2006 and The South East Plan Examination in Public: Report of the Panel, Volume 1: Report	Sets out the vision for the south-east until 2026 – EIP Report sets out recommended changes to the government.	Sets out potential growth areas and total housing numbers for south east, as well policies on a wide range of issues
SEERA (2004) Integrated Regional Framework	Identifies a vision and objectives in order to achieve economic development that benefits people and protects and improves the environment.	Sets out range of objectives and indicators which provide regional data on sustainability

County

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
The Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016	Sets out the vision for West Sussex to 2016 in terms of land-use policy	Contains a range of policies which are a strong material consideration when preparing local policies
Time for Action: A strategy for sustainable West Sussex.	Sets out a range of aims to help achieve sustainable development in the county	Need to consider aims in development of policies

District

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
Horsham District Council Community Strategy	Sets out the shared vision for the future of the District	Visions need to be incorporated into all LDF documents
The Core Strategy (2007) Horsham District Council	Sets out the spatial vision for the District with particular reference to land-use planning	Provides a broad framework of policies to be built upon as part of the DC policy document

Local

Name of Policy / Programme	Broad Aims of Policy /Programme	Requirements in relation to the DC Document
Parish Plans and Village Design Statements	Sets vision for parishes in District and detailed design statements	Requirements need consideration when developing policies

4.0 BASELINE DATA, SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES AND FRAMEWORK

BASELINE DATA

4.1   Before any appraisal of how the development control policies contribute to sustainable development could be undertaken, it was important to have an understanding of the District as it is today together with how this may change in the future without the Local Development Framework. This information or 'baseline data' provided a basis for identifying the sustainability issues affecting the District, and also predicting and monitoring the effects of the General Development Control Policies document.

4.2   Baseline data for the District was identified as part of the SA/SEA of The Core Strategy. It is considered that this information is also relevant to the General Development Control Policies, as this document contains policies which apply across the whole District. Full details of the baseline data can be found in Appendix 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Assessment of The Core Strategy (2007), but the key data is summarised in Table 2 overleaf.

4.3   Table 2 summarises the available baseline information under a range of topics which have been grouped under the main headings of social, economic and environmental data. The topics included in the table cover those listed in the SEA legislation. The table includes a description of the current situation, summarising any available data. The table also gives an indication of any trends, and where known, how the situation may change without the LDF.

SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES AND FRAMEWORK

<u>Sustainability Issues Facing the District</u>

4.4   The Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Assessment of the Core Strategy identified a range of sustainability issues affecting the District. The issues identified were derived from discussions with key organisations such as Natural England, The Environment Agency and West Sussex County Council as well as from wider consultation. The key sustainability issues which have already been identified are also relevant to the General Development Control Policies document, as the majority of the policies it contains, are applicable across the District as a whole. The key issues affecting the District are summarised on page 14.

Table 2: Summary of the baseline information for Horsham District

Topic	Current Status	Trends	Likely change without LDF
		Social	
Population	Population of District was 122,087 in 2001 census	Increasing, with predicted population of 134,900 by 2016	Predicted increase takes into account anticipated levels of development; population increase likely to be less without LDF.
Housing	50,037 households in 2001 census of which 79% are owner occupied. House prices are high and 937 affordable homes are needed each year to 2011	Need for affordable homes likely to increase if house prices stay high and as population ages	Without LDF number in housing need likely to rise as less housing could be provided without the LDF.
Social Inclusiveness and deprivation	Out of 354 local authorities nationwide, only 14 are less deprived. Pockets of inequality do exist; for example some households experience fuel poverty and those in rural areas without a car cannot easily access the services and facilities they need.	Overall trend is relatively stable	Access to services and facilities unlikely to be improved without an LDF. Difficult to predict effect on LDF on overall indices of multiple deprivation
Community Safety	4.47 incidents of crime per 1000 residents April – June 2005. Fear of crime is high	Crime levels appear to be relatively stable	Effects of LDF / no LDF on crime are difficult to ascertain.
Human Health	Life expectancy is 78.9 for men 82.0 for women. Overall most people describe their health as generally good, but some problems with access to local health care, and no main hospital in the District.	Life expectancy has been rising. Work is ongoing to improve doctor's surgeries.	LDF has limited control on provision of health care, and effects on health without an LDF difficult to predict, although quality of life could decline with knock-on impacts of health.
Education	Overall levels of education are good – 75% school leavers enter further education. However ~18% of the adult population have poor literacy and numeracy skills	Concern over lack of nursery provision and pre and post school care	Provision of housing may ensure that schools in more rural areas remain open.
Leisure and Recreation	PPG 17 assessment revealed overall quality of provision of leisure and recreation facilities is good. Lack of hotel in Horsham has been identified as a potential problem for tourism	Not known	Without LDF increasing or improving leisure provision is likely to be more difficult.
Transport	87.5% of households have a car. Most people travel to work by car, though rates are lower in Horsham town	Trend for car ownership and travel (car trips) is increasing	Without LDF contributions to improved public transport are likely to be minimal, and reliance on the car likely to remain static or increase.

Topic	Current Status	Trends	Likely change without LDF
		Economic	
Material Assets	Unemployment is ~1%. Average income is £591 per week, but hides a discrepancy between high and low paid workers. Rural economy (particularly in south of District) is suffering from agricultural change and low rates of pay. Retail in the District has been assessed as being good.	Low unemployment and high income levels has been consistent in recent years	The LDF will assist provision of rural diversification schemes – without LDF, the rural economy is less likely to be improved / enhanced.
		Environment	
Cultural Heritage	19 Scheduled Monuments, over 1700 listed buildings, 37 conservation areas. Other studies have revealed historical importance and sensitivity of many settlements in the District.	Appraisals reveal that cultural heritage is threatened by development, increased traffic levels etc.	Without LDF protection of cultural heritage likely to be reduced, and lead to greater losses of cultural heritage.
Biodiversity Flora and Fauna	1 SPA, 23 SSSIs, 74 SNCIs in the District. Outside designated sites there are a range of important habitats (including ancient woodland) & species, some of which are legally protection.	Habitats and species are in overall decline as a result of development pressure and changing agricultural practices.	Without LDF protection of wildlife and biodiversity likely to be reduced, and lead to greater losses of natural heritage.
Landscape	2 AONBs. 32 landscape character areas of 21 were identified as being highly sensitive to change.	15 landscape character areas in good condition, 17 character areas in declining condition	Less development without an LDF could protect landscape character, but there will be no planning gain resulting in landscape enhancements
Soil (including waste)	82% homes built on previously developed land between 1.3.03 and 30.6.04. Limited information currently available as the extent of contaminated land in the District. Most household waste currently landfilled with a few sites in the District.	Target is for 60% homes to be built on brownfield land. Limited data on contaminated land. Recycling rates are rising in the domestic sector	Development of brownfield land would not be managed without an LDF. LDF has limited influence on overall rates of recycling.
Water	River and water quality generally good. 2750 homes in Sussex at risk from flooding. Rates of water consumption are at 160 litres a day.	Rates of water consumption are rising. Water quality is threatened by increased development.	Without an LDF development may be at a lower rate placing less pressure on water resources and quality. The LDF may however include measures to enhance water quality and protect supplies.
Air	No air quality management zones	Development could lead to these zones being declared.	Development without an LDF would be less controlled and measures to prevent air pollution are likely to be more limited.
Climatic Factors	Greenhouse gas emissions declined in the south-east between 1990 and 2002, but the amount from transport increased significantly. Average temperatures in SE are rising	No data available at a very local level but indications are that the local pattern is similar to regional changes	An LDF can help ensure that renewable energy and carbon neutral energy schemes are used, and that development incorporates measures to reduce the impact of climate change.

SUMMARY OF KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES FACING THE DISTRICT

- 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
- Fear of crime
- Development pressure is threatening the character, biodiversity and historical features of 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 resources including fuel and water supplies
- The need to continue to recycle and the problem of fewer waste disposal options
- The need to maintain the overall high and stable economy
- The need to enhance the rural economy in rural areas
- The need to maintain and enhance town and village centres.

The Sustainability Framework

4.5   In order to assess the contribution that the development control policies make in achieving sustainable development it is necessary to compare them against a range of sustainability objectives and indicators. A range of sustainability objectives and indicators have already been developed, and it is proposed to continue to use these as their district wide nature is applicable to the Development Control Policies. The objectives and indicators have been developed in consultation with stakeholders and are summarised below.

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES

1. To ensure that everyone has access to a good quality affordable home that meets their needs
2. To ensure that everyone has access to the health education leisure and recreation facilities they require
3. To reduce crime and the fear of crime
4. To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of the District
5. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the District
6. To conserve and enhance the historical and cultural environment of the District
7. To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality
8. To reduce car journeys and promote alternative methods of transport
9. To reduce the risk of flooding
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 provision and use of renewable energy
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

4.6   As part of the SA/SEA of The Core Strategy the different objectives were compared with each other and the LDF objectives to assess their compatibility. The findings of this comparison reveal that objectives which aim to protect the environment clash with economic and housing objectives as both of these two issues are likely to result in development with a subsequent loss of habitat. This situation remains for the General Development Control Policies document, and in order to achieve sustainable development it has been necessary to integrate these objectives and mitigate against any problems which arise.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF PLAN OPTIONS AND POLICIES

5.1   In order to carry out the Sustainability Appraisal of the General Development Control Policies it was necessary to examine the sustainability of different options which could be included in the document. The development of the different plan options drew on a range of factors which are summarised below:

- **Achievability:** With the exception of the 'do-nothing' option, the options selected are all capable of being incorporated into the planning system. Although planning influences a wide range of issues it is not completely comprehensive, and options such as changing land management practices to enhance biodiversity, or altering industrial processes to reduce pollution, have not been considered as they are not easily achieved through the planning system.

- **Higher level plans and strategies:** Some options have been precluded from consideration as a result of higher level plans and strategies. This is particularly important in the case of the General Development Control Policies document, as many of the options have been predetermined by the approach taken in the Council's Core Strategy, which has itself been subject to a SA/SEA. For example it would not be possible to include a policy setting out the number of houses to be accommodated in the District, as this has already been covered in the Core Strategy. However, it is realistic to consider whether the Development Control policies should be written to provide more information and detail to enhance the Core Strategy policies, for example perhaps providing a policy setting out planning issues for protected landscapes such as AONBs.

  It should be noted that the Core Strategy has now been found sound at an Examination by independent inspectors and was subsequently adopted in February 2007.

- **Consultation with Planning Policy Officers:** Officers have a good technical understanding of the different issues facing specific policy areas, as well as what is and is not likely to be achievable in planning terms.

- **Responses to the Scoping Report and Development Control Policies Issues and Options Consultation:** Responses to the Issues and Options consultation were generally supportive of the principal of the different policy areas, but some suggestions were made as to how policies could be improved and where new policies could be added. These changes have been considered as part of development and assessment of the plan options.

- **Responses to the Preferred Options consultation on the General Development Control Policy document:** Although few comments were received on the interim SA/SEA report for the General Development Control Policy document, a number of comments were received on the policies themselves. This resulted in a review of the different policy options and these were amended where necessary. For example, following comments on the policy document it was considered whether it would be appropriate to have a new policy on providing some retail facilities in rural areas.

ASSESSMENT OF PLAN OPTIONS

5.2   Most of the policy options that were considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process are relatively similar in their focus. Options considered were generally whether or not the General Development Control Policy document should have a policy on a specific subject or not, and in some instances whether there is an alternative method of addressing a specific issue. The main reason that options are relatively limited is because more strategic options were determined when writing the Core Strategy which already has been subject to its own Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment. Other options were also rejected as they would be a repetition of existing government guidance which is contrary to recommended practice.

5.3   One of the options that was considered was the do-nothing option. The results of this assessment have generally assumed that there would be no detailed policy coverage in addition to the Core Strategy policies which provide a broad framework for the District.

5.4   The results of the assessment of options are set out in table 3 overleaf. The results set out the different policy options which were considered, a brief summary of the assessment findings, together with the option selected. The results of this assessment work, is in appendix A which can be viewed on the Council's website www.horsham.gov.uk/strategic_planning or by contacting the Strategic and Community planning department.

ASSESSMENT OF PLAN POLICIES

5.5   Following the assessment of the initial plan options, a more detailed appraisal of the policy wording was carried out, and the findings of this work added to the relevant option set out in Appendix A (see para 5.4 for more details on viewing this document). The assessment work was initially undertaken by members of the Strategic and Community Planning team involved in policy formulation, but was then given further consideration of the Council's Senior Environmental Officer based in the same team, and who has co-ordinated this study. The results were independently scrutinised by the Environmental Co-ordinator who has not been involved with the process of policy formulation.

5.6   The assessment of the Development Control policies was undertaken in two stages. The initial assessment was undertaken as part of the assessment of the Preferred Options policies. Following redrafting of the policies taking into account the comments made at the Preferred Options stage, further assessment was carried out. The results of this assessment work are set out in Table 4. The table also includes a list of the main changes made to the policies in light of consultation responses and the Inspector's report on the General Development control policies. The document, also sets out the mitigation measures that have been incorporated into the policy to ensure that it is as sustainable as possible.

Table 3: Results of option assessment, options selected and mitigation measures

Subject	Options	Summary of results
Landscape and Townscape Character	**General countryside protection** Option a: Have a policy which seeks to protect the countryside of the District Option b: Do not have any policy	Having a policy ensures protection of landscape character and biodiversity, but could have more negative effects on the rural economy by restricting development in these areas. **Option a was therefore selected** but mitigation of negative effects was identified as being required.
	Landscape character Option a: Have policy which protects landscape and townscape character Option b: Do not have any policy	Having a policy ensures protection of landscape character, but could have more negative effects on the local economy by restricting development in these areas. **Option a was therefore selected** but mitigation of negative effects was identified as being required.
	Settlement coalescence Option a: Have policy which protects settlement form within the District including designation of Strategic gaps Option b: Have policy which protects settlement form within the District including designation of Strategic and Local Gaps Option c: Do not have any policy	Options a and b will both help maintain landscape character by retaining existing settlement form. Having Local Gaps would provide an additional layer of protection, but government advice indicates that more local designations should be replaced by criteria based policies. A Strategic Gaps policy is however included in the West Sussex Structure Plan and South East Plan, and as a result of this **Option a has been selected**. Mitigation will be necessary to help protect settlements from coalescence elsewhere as well as any negative effects on the rural economy.
	Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty Option a: Have a policy which provides additional protection to AONBs Option b: Do not have any policy	This option was considered following comments at the Preferred Options stage that the policy covering AONBs had insufficient clarity and detail. It was found that Option a helps protect landscapes and would also have some positive economic effects by ensuring the District remains a pleasant place to live and work and so attract business to the area. **Option a was therefore selected**
	Biodiversity and Geology Option a: Have a policy which helps protect designated sites, species and wider biodiversity Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a helps protect designated and non designated areas of the District. Such a policy would also have some positive economic effects by ensuring the District remains a pleasant place to live and work and so attract business to the area. **Option a was therefore selected** as option b would result in degradation of the appearance and natural environmental diversity of the District.

Subject	Options	Summary of results
Landscape and Townscape Character (continued)	**Woodland and Trees** Option a: Have a policy which protects woodlands and trees Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a will help protect landscape and biodiversity in the District. Such a policy would also have some positive economic effects by ensuring the District remains a pleasant place to live and work and so attract business to the area **Option a was therefore selected** as option b would result in degradation of the appearance of the District.
	Pollution Option a: Have policy on all aspects pollution Option b: Have policy on some elements of pollution Option c: Have no policy on pollution	A policy which covers all aspects of pollution will help ensure that the whole environment is protected. Not doing so will mean certain parts of the environment could be degraded. **Option a** was therefore selected for inclusion at the submission stage, but **Option c was selected** by the inspector, given national legislation and the Core Strategy policies. Mitigation is required to ensure that signposting to this higher level information is provided.
Environmental Quality	**Flooding** Option a: Have a policy which prevents development in floodplains in accordance with the governments sequential test. Option b: Have a policy which prevents development in floodplains and also requires other measures to reduce risk of flooding Option c: no policy	The policy options were revised following comments on this policy in the Preferred Options documentation to refer to the sequential test. Both options were found to have positive effects on the objectives by preventing environmental, social and economic damage as a result of flooding. Option a reflects government policy and option b requires mitigation to reduce wider risks of flooding and as a result **a mixture of options a and b were selected.**
	Water Quality and Resources Option a: Protect water quality and resources Option b: Do not protect water quality and resources	A policy which protects water quality and resources will ensure that good quality water is available for day to day needs and protects the wider environment. Not having a policy could contribute to water shortages which would have an adverse effect on society and the economy. **Option a** was therefore selected for inclusion at the submission stage, but **Option b was selected** by the inspector, given national legislation and the Core Strategy policies. Mitigation is required to ensure that signposting to this higher level information is provided.

Subject	Options	Summary of results
Environmental Quality (continued)	**Renewable Energy and Climate Change** Option a: Include a policy that encourages the inclusion of renewable energy into developments. Option b: Include a policy that requires a certain proportion of a development's energy to be from a renewable source. Option c: No policy	These options were refined following comments on the preferred options that the renewable energy policy could be made stronger. Both options will be positive in helping address climate change, but option a is weaker as it would not set specific targets. Option b does set targets so is stronger but could be difficult to set for a smaller development to achieve in terms of costs. **A mixture of options a and b were selected**. Mitigation of negative landscape impacts of renewable schemes will be required.
	Design Option a: Have a policy on design Option b: Do not have any policy	A policy on design will have many positive impacts, such as protecting townscape character, and will help mitigate the adverse impacts of other policies. For example, it can ensure crime is designed out, ensure homes and jobs are close together and provide nature conservation benefits. **Option a was therefore selected.**
	Archaeological Sites and ancient monuments Option a: Have a policy that protects archaeological sites and monuments. Option b: Do not have any policy	No policy will increase the pressure for development of sites and could lead to loss of archaeological sites and monuments. Many of these are important to the landscape which would also be harmed. The tourist economy could also be harmed by the loss of such sites. **Option a was therefore selected.**
Improving the Quality of New Development	**Historic Parks and Gardens** Option a: Have a policy which protects nationally designated historic parks and gardens Option b: Do not have any policy Option c: Have a policy which protects nationally and locally designated Historic Parks and Gardens	No policy will increase the pressure for development of sites and could lead to loss of Historic Parks and Gardens. Many of these are important to the landscape and these would then also be harmed. The tourism economy could also be harmed by the loss of such sites. Extension of the policy to include locally designated sites will give greater protection. If this option is not selected mitigation will be necessary. **Option c was therefore selected.**
	Conservation Areas Option a: Have a policy that helps protect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas Option b: Do not have any policy	No policy will increase the pressure for development which could harm the appearance of Conservation Areas. This would also harm townscape character. The economy could also be harmed by damage to these areas making them less attractive places to live and work. **Option a was therefore selected.**

Subject	Options	Summary of results
	Listed Buildings Option a: Have a policy which controls development of listed buildings. Option b: Do not have any policy	A policy which controls development of listed buildings will help prevent unnecessary loss or damage, and help protect townscape character. **Option a was therefore selected**, and although the policy could prevent some change which may be necessary. This will need to be mitigated to help prevent this.
	Enabling Development (Listed Buildings) Option a: Have a policy to enable development of listed buildings in exceptional circumstances Option b: Do not have any policy	This policy helps ensure that in exceptional circumstances redevelopment of listed buildings can take place. This will help retain some listed buildings that may otherwise be lost. **Option a)** was therefore selected for inclusion at the submission stage, but **Option b was selected** by the inspector, given national legislation and the Core Strategy policies.
Improving the Quality of New Development (continued)	**Shop Fronts** Option a: Have a policy to control the appearance of shop fronts Option b: Do not have any policy	Controlling the appearance of shop fronts helps maintain townscape character and is beneficial to the economy by helping retain an attractive and distinctive place to visit. Option b is likely to inhibit this. **Option a was therefore selected**
	Adverts Option a: Have a policy to control adverts Option b: Do not have any policy	Controlling adverts helps maintain townscape character and is beneficial to the economy by helping retain an attractive and distinctive place to visit. However this is covered by national guidance, and **Option b was therefore selected.**
	Temporary buildings / development Option a: Have a policy which enables temporary structures to be built Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a will help meet local needs which exist only for a short period and may assist with the economy in rural areas. Effects on landscape and biodiversity are likely to be temporary. No policy would mean that needs could not be met as easily, or removal of structures may not take place. **Option a)** was therefore selected for inclusion at the submission stage, but **Option b was selected** by the inspector, given national legislation and the Core Strategy policies.
	Heath Common and West Chiltington Character Areas Option a: Have policy to protect the unique characteristics of Heath Common and West Chiltington Common Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a helps to maintain the distinctive townscape character of these two settlements, although it may have some impact on how much previously developed land can be developed. **Option a) was selected**, but mitigation of the amount of brownfield land that is developable will need to be mitigated by other policies.

Subject	Options	Summary of results
	Park Homes / residential caravans Option a: Have policy which enables provision of park homes and residential caravans Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a may help to provide affordable housing, but their rural location is likely to be damaging in landscape and environmental terms, and lead to more car travel due to their distance from services and facilities. **Option a was selected**, but environmental problems will need to be mitigated
Housing Provision	**Redevelopment / Change of use of residential to non-residential** Option a: Have policy which enables some residential properties to convert to non residential uses. Option b: Have policy seeking no loss in residential properties, with no exceptions Option c: Do not have any policy	Option a will result in the loss of some homes, but will ensure that community facilities and services and local businesses are provided. The number of homes converted is likely to be relatively small. Not having a policy could mean that a larger number of homes is converted to other uses in areas which may not be suitable for that use and could result in longer car journeys. Option b will not help provide community facilities or smaller businesses to develop which would harm economic objectives **Option a) was therefore selected.**
	Smaller Homes / Housing Mix Option a: Have a policy which ensures the provision of a mix of smaller housing to meet needs. Option b: Do not have any policy	A policy which requires smaller houses on all developments will help provide lower cost homes which meet the needs of a wide section of society. No policy could lead to the construction of expensive larger homes. Smaller homes are also likely to help the economy by ensuring that people of all ages, employed in different fields, can afford to live in the District. **Option a) was therefore selected.**
Employment Provision	**Employment Site / Land Protection** Option a – Have a policy which protects employment sites in built-up areas from loss to other uses Option b - Do not have any policy Option c – Have a policy which protects all employment sites from loss to other uses.	Option a ensures employment is retained in village centres. This benefits the local economy by ensuring that the people can live close to areas of work, and benefits the environment by reducing car trips. It also prevents employment land being relocated to new greenfield sites. Option c would prevent loss to other uses in rural areas, but control for this is provided by other policies. **Option a was therefore selected**
	New Employment Development Option a: Have a policy that enables new employment sites to be provided Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a ensures employment is provided in the District. This benefits the local economy by ensuring that the people can live close to areas of work. and benefits the environment by reducing car trips **Option a was therefore selected**, but negative effects of greenfield development will need to be mitigated.

Subject	Options	Summary of results
Infrastructure Requirements	**Telecommunications** Option a: Have a policy which controls the provision and location of telecommunications Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a will be benefit environmental objectives by ensuring telecommunications are located as sensitively as possible, in the least environmentally damaging locations. No policy could lead to installations being placed in unsuitable locations and **Option a)** was therefore selected for inclusion at the submission stage, but **Option b was selected** by the inspector, given that this issue is covered by national legislation and the Core Strategy policies.
Community Facilities and Services	**Protection of Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities** Option a: Have policy which helps protect existing open space, sport and recreation facilities. Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a helps to protect existing community facilities and could result in their enhancement whereas no policy would prevent this from occurring. There may be some circumstances which could lead to some loss of open areas. **Option a was therefore selected** but negative effects will need to be mitigated.
	New Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Option a: Have policy which enables the provision of new open space, sports and recreational facilities. Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a helps meet local community needs. It may also be beneficial in economic terms by providing employment and in addition benefit the environment through the provision of greenspace in areas of new development. **Option a was therefore selected** as option b would lessen the likelihood of the provision of new facilities.
	Sustainable Farm Diversification Option a: Have policy that helps enable farm diversification schemes. Option b: Do not have any policy	Farm diversification schemes are likely to help the rural economy but may have adverse effects on the environment by increasing car journeys to rural areas and be damaging to the landscape. The lack of a policy would help protect the landscape but rural life could be adversely affected. **Option a was therefore selected**, but negative effects need to be mitigated in the policy wording.
Rural Strategy	**Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings for Industrial, Business or Residential uses** Option a: Have a policy enabling conversion of agricultural and rural buildings for industrial, business and residential uses. Option b: Do not have any policy Option c: Have a policy that restricts these buildings to most sustainable locations, i.e. adjacent to BUAB and public transport infrastructure.	Option a helps ensure that businesses can locate in rural areas, assisting the rural economy. This may however increase car journeys as people travel to these sites for work. Option c is less damaging in this regard. Option a and c may however assist the retention of historic buildings in the rural areas. A combination of **option a and c has been selected** enabling conversions in all areas but mitigating it by placing restrictions on the redevelopment.

Subject	Options	Summary of results
	Rural Commercial Development and the Expansion of Existing Rural Commercial Sites / Intensification of Uses Option a: Have a policy to enable existing rural employment uses to expand / intensify Option b: Do not have any policy	Expansion of existing facilities could have negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity and environmental quality. Development could result in more employees travelling to rural sites which is likely to lead to an increase in car journeys. The policy will be beneficial to the rural economy. **Option a was therefore selected** as negative impacts have been mitigated through policy wording.
	Replacement Buildings in the Countryside Option a: Have a policy to enable replacement buildings for business and employment purposes. Option b: Do not have any policy	Replacement buildings may have less impact on the environment if they are using the same footprint of a former building. New buildings are likely to suit the needs of the business more effectively and therefore benefit the rural economy. **Option a was therefore selected** as damaging effects can be mitigated through policy wording.
Rural Strategy (continued)	**Essential Rural Workers Dwellings** Option a: Have policy which enables new homes for rural workers to be provided in the countryside. Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a helps provide homes in rural areas, and would therefore assist the rural economy by helping provide places where rural workers live and work close together. **Option a was therefore selected.** Mitigation against negative effects such as landscape damage will be necessary.
	House Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and Ancillary Accommodation Option a: Have a policy to enable House Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and Ancillary Accommodation in rural areas. Option b: Do not have any policy Option c: To include within the policy a restriction on the size of dwellings allowed in the Countryside to retain stock of small homes.	Option a and c help provide homes that meet needs in rural areas, but option a could lead to a loss of smaller homes in rural areas which may be required by some sections of the population. Both options also have the potential to harm the character of the landscape and environment. **A mixture of (primarily) option a, and c was selected** (it should be noted that c would be covered by the policy on smaller homes) The policy needs to mitigate against the identified negative environmental effects.
	Equestrian Development Option a: Have a policy which controls the provision of equestrian related land uses. Option b: Do not have any policy	Equestrian development can be damaging to the appearance of rural areas through fencing / new buildings. The development may however assist the rural economy. **Option a was therefore selected** as there is potential for the negative environmental effects to be mitigated.

24

Subject	Options	Summary of results
	Exceptions Housing Schemes Option a: Have policy which enables exception housing schemes Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a will ensure that affordable homes are provided in rural areas where a need has been identified. In addition these sites may help to maintain local facilities which would otherwise be vulnerable. **Option a was therefore selected**, but as the environment and landscape could be affected this will need to be mitigated.
Inclusive Communities	**New / Extensions to Retirement Housing and Care Home Schemes** Option a: Have a policy enabling provision of retirement housing and care homes inside and exceptionally outside BUABs Option b: Have a more restrictive policy allowing such development solely within Built-up Area Boundaries Option c: Do not have any policy	A policy enabling housing and care homes will help ensure housing needs for a specific part of the community is met. Development outside BUABs could damage the landscape and environment. **Option a was selected** for inclusion in the submission draft with mitigation of potentially negative effects. **Option b was selected** by the inspector, as it was considered such sites could be allocated in other LDF documents.
	Gypsies and Travellers Option a: To have policy enabling provision of sites for gypsies and travellers. Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a provides sites helps provide housing which meets a specific needs. No policy would mean that unauthorised sites could occur which may affect other settled communities and potentially be in more environmentally sensitive areas. **Option a was therefore selected** although mitigation of landscape and biodiversity impacts is required.
	Travelling Show people Option a: To have policy enabling provision of sites for travelling show people. Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a provides sites helps provide housing which meets a specific needs. No policy would mean that unauthorised sites could occur which may affect other settled communities and potentially be in more environmentally sensitive areas. **Option a was therefore selected** although mitigation of landscape and biodiversity impacts is required.
Vitality and Viability of Existing Centres	**New Retail Development within the Defined Town and Village Centres** Option a: Have a policy enabling new retail development within the defined retail frontage Option b: Do not have any policy	Option a will have a positive effect on the economy by enabling new retail development in towns and villages. The development could harm townscape character, but could be mitigated by policy wording and other policies. **Option a was therefore selected**
	New Retail Development Outside the Defined Town and Village Centres Option a: Have policy that controls the provision of retail uses outside town and village centres. Option b: Do not have any policy	This policy will have a positive effect on the economic objectives by concentrating new retail development in towns and villages, but in a way which does not detract from the main shopping centres. **Option a was therefore selected** as the lack of a policy could result in uncontrolled development

Subject	Options	Summary of results
	Change of use from retail within the defined town and village centres. Option a: Have a policy which controls the change of use of retail units within defined town and village centre boundaries Option b: Do not have any policy	Changes of use could be damaging to town and village centres by leading to a loss of key stores. However option a) would prevent this by providing control on the amount and type of change that is allowed to take place. **Option a was therefore selected**
Vitality and Viability of Existing Centres (continued)	**Village and Neighbourhood Shops** Option a: Have a policy which enables development of village and neighbourhood shops Option b: Do not have any policy	This policy will have a positive effect on the economic objectives by enabling appropriate new retail development in town and villages that meets a local need. This could reduce car journeys to shops which are further afield. **Option a was therefore selected** but mitigation will be needed to ensure the shops do not detract from main town / village centres
	New Retail Development in Rural Areas Option a: have a policy which enables appropriate retail development in the countryside Option b: Do not have a policy	Option a would enable certain rural businesses to open stores (such as farm shops) which would be beneficial to the rural economy. There is however the potential for shops to compete with town and village centres and damage rural character, although this would be worse without a policy. **Option a was therefore selected**, although mitigation of adverse effects will be necessary.
Tourism Development	**Tourism** Option a: Have a policy which enables mainly small scale tourism development in the District. Option b: Do not have any policy	Effects of this policy are difficult to ascertain as it depends on the nature of the tourist attraction built – any attraction is likely to have positive economic effects, but could damage or enhance the environment depending on its nature. A negative impact would be increased traffic as many attractions will be in a rural areas, but mitigation measures can avoid this. **Option a has been selected at this stage**
Managing Travel Demand	**Transport and Access** Option a: Have a policy that ensures all development considers transport and access issues including public transport and pedestrians Option b: Do not have any policy	This policy can help reduce car journeys by seeking funding for enhancements to public transport and promoting non car journeys such as walking and cycling. This will have positive environmental effects. **Option a was therefore selected** as no policy would not have these benefits.
	Protection of Land for Transport Infrastructure Option a: Have a policy that prevents development on land that is to be safeguarded for transport infrastructure or public transport improvements Option b: Do not have any policy	Safeguarding land for future transport could help the environment as enhanced public transport is likely to limit car journeys. Some positive effects to the environment may occur if canal links for example are protected and then upgraded... **Option a was therefore selected**

Subject	Options	Summary of results
Managing Travel Demand	**Service Stations / Roadside Facilities** Option a: Have a policy which enables roadside facilities to be provided at locations on the Strategic Road Network Option b: Have a policy which enable roadside facilities to be provided on any road. Option c: Do not have any policy	Roadside facilities provide some employment but may damage the landscape, particularly in the case of option b, although the financial viability of a rural site is questionable. No policy would be damaging by not enabling any development which would harm needs of road users as well as the economy. **Option a was therefore selected** for the submission stage although mitigation measures will be necessary. **Option C was selected by the Inspector,** as the policy had a lack of criteria to assess such facilities, which can be achieved on a case by case basis.
	Airport Related Parking Option a: Have a policy that aims to prevent airport related parking unless there is no other viable alternative Option b: Do not have any policy	Airport parking (more likely with option b) is likely to detract from encouraging air passengers to travel to Gatwick by public transport. In addition, hardstanding can increase flood risk and car parks also harm the landscape. **Option a was therefore selected.**

27

Table 4: Summary of Effects of the Development Control Policies on the Sustainability Objectives

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC1: Countryside Protection and Enhancement	Wording amended to be less restrictive, enabling some development (e.g. farm diversification) in rural areas	Policy generally limits development in rural areas which helps protect the character and biodiversity of the District. Some development may be possible as a result of the policy which would help the rural economy.	To prevent the risk of overdevelopment in rural areas, policy wording has been amended to ensure that proposals do not lead, individually or cumulatively to an increase in the level of development in the countryside.	Clarifications made following inspectors report, including clarification of criterion d) on sustainable development
DC2: Landscape Character	Some minor wording amendments made	This policy will ensure that the character of the District will be protected and enhanced. This will have positive effects on other environmental objectives such as biodiversity. The policy could limit rural development and harm the rural economy.	Rural strategy policies help mitigate potential damage to the rural economy. The need to prepare an SPD providing further detailed guidance on how to protect and enhance character has been incorporated into the supporting text of the policy.	Minor clarifications made to policy wording following Inspector's report.
DC3: Settlement Coalescence	Amended to draw greater distinction between section of policy covering the whole District and the second part which applies to areas designated as a Strategic Gap.	Protects the character of the landscape in the District and Strategic Gaps further protect the separation between larger settlements. It could make the provision of homes and facilities more difficult.	Provision of homes is covered by allocations in The Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land documents.	Reference to townscape character removed following inspector's report – covered by policy DC9 - Design
DC4: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs)	Policy originally part of larger policy covering biodiversity and geology. Policy split to provide greater clarity on development affecting AONBs	This policy was found to have a positive effect on the environmental objectives and will also likely to assist the economy by retaining a high quality environment providing a pleasant place to live and work. The policy could make it more difficult to provide affordable housing in these protected areas.	Paragraph added to policy and further explanation in supporting text that some local scale development may be appropriate, but that mitigation measures to counteract negative effects need to be provided.	Minor clarifications made to policy wording following Inspector's report.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC5: Biodiversity and Geology	Originally part of policy DC4. Policy split to provide greater detail on development and biodiversity	There are positive effects on the environmental objectives and the policy will assist the economy by retaining a high quality environment providing a pleasant place to live and work. The policy could make it more difficult to provide housing, services and facilities.	Other policies help provide for housing, services and facilities and it is considered important that development does not harm or enhances biodiversity; changes to the policy wording was not felt appropriate.	Final paragraph deleted, as covered in PPS9 and Core Strategy
DC6: Woodland and Trees	Originally policy DC5. Wording amended to correct factual error and increase clarity	This policy has positive effects on the environmental objectives and is also likely to assist the economy by retaining a high quality environment providing a pleasant place to live and work. The policy could make it more difficult to provide affordable housing, services and facilities.	Other policies help provide for housing, services and facilities and it is considered important that development does not harm or enhances biodiversity; changes to the policy wording was not felt appropriate.	Deletions made to some of policy to prevent repetition of national policy
Pollution	Originally policy DC6. Wording changed to be less restrictive to enable development that would not cause unacceptable risk.	This policy was found to have a positive effect on the environmental objectives and is also likely to assist the economy by retaining a high quality environment providing a pleasant place to live and work.	This policy, provides more detail on protection of environmental quality, thus helping to mitigate CP2.	Policy deleted following Inspector's report as not felt to add sufficient further local detail to CP2. Supporting text to remain which in itself mitigates CP2.
DC7: Flooding	Amended to refer to Government's sequential test on flood risk and require the use of mitigation measures to limit flood risk	This policy has significant positive benefits as it helps to reduce the risk of flooding which can harm the environment, people and the economy.	This policy is itself mitigation for Core Policy 2, providing more detail on minimising flooding	Was Policy DC8 at Submission. Further local detail added to policy, referring to Strategic Flood Risk Assessments.
Water Quality and Resources	Amended to require measures to be put in place to prevent a significant increase in water demand.	This policy has a positive effect on the environmental objectives and is also likely to assist the economy by retaining a high quality environment providing a pleasant place to live and work. It could arguably restrict the amount of housing that can take place, but development cannot take place without assurance from water companies that water supplies can be maintained.	This policy is itself mitigation for Core Policy 2, providing more detail on protection of water resources	Policy deleted following Inspector's report as not felt to add sufficient further local detail to CP2. Supporting text to remain which in itself mitigates CP2.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC8: Renewable Energy and Climate Change	Originally policy DC9. Wording amended requiring development to incorporate a certain level of renewable energy technologies.	This policy has mixed effects on the objectives, for example enhancing air quality, but potentially damaging the character of the District. However climate change would probably have a larger effect on the character of the District longer term.	This policy is itself mitigation for Core Policy 2, providing more detail on renewable energy provison. In addition, the policy has been worded to ensure that issues such as landscape character are addressed.	Was policy DC 10 at Submission. Minor clarifications made to policy wording following Inspector's report.
DC9: Development Principles	Originally policy DC10 -Design Policy divided to separate essential criteria from those more likely to be relevant in more unusual or larger applications.	This policy was found to have positive or neutral effects on all objectives, as good design will help mitigate a range of problems such as the risk of crime, pollution and enhance biodiversity.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP3 providing more detail on a range of design issues	Was policy DC 11 at Submission. Reference to townscape character added in order to compensate for deletion from policy DC3.
DC10: Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments	Originally policy DC11.Requirement for archaeological assessments to be submitted if necessary.	This policy will have a limited effect on many of the objectives but the policy will help retain the character and cultural heritage of the District.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP3 providing more detail on cultural heritage issues.	Was policy DC12 at Submission
DC11: Historic Parks and Gardens	Originally DC12. Requirement for historic landscape assessment added	This policy will have a limited effect on many of the objectives but the policy will help retain the landscape character and cultural heritage of the District.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP3 providing more detail on cultural heritage issues.	Was policy DC13 at Submission
DC12: Conservation Areas	Originally DC13. Some minor wording amendments made	This policy will benefit the character and historical environment of the District in particular. It could however make brownfield development in these areas more difficult.	Policy has been worded so that development in conservation areas is not ruled out – it has to fit in with the appearance of the area.	Was policy DC14 at Submission. Minor clarifications made to policy wording following Inspector's report.
DC13: Listed Buildings	Originally DC14. Requirement for archaeological or historical assessment added	This policy will benefit the character and historical environment of the District in particular. It could however make brownfield development in these areas more difficult.	Policy has been worded so that development affecting listed buildings is not ruled out – it has to fit in with the appearance of the area.	Was policy DC15 at Submission. Minor clarifications made to policy wording following Inspector's report.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
Enabling Development	Originally DC15. Wording changed to require benefit of change of use to outweigh impact of development	The aim of the policy is to help protect listed buildings which will benefit the character of the district together with its cultural heritage.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP3 providing more detail on cultural heritage issues	Policy DC16 at Submission. Policy deleted following Inspector's report as policy repeats national guidance, and does not provide local detail.
DC14: Shop Fronts and Advertisements	DC16 & 17 merged. Major reference to adverts removed as repetition of existing guidance.	This policy will help to benefit the character of towns and is also likely to assist the local economy.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP3 providing more detail on sense of place	Was policy DC17 at Submission
Temporary Buildings/ Development	No changes made	This policy will be positive in meeting needs such as services and facilities e.g. when permanent facilities are being re-built and improved. Other effects are less certain as it depends on the exact nature of the temporary use, but there is the potential for it to harm the environment if badly located.	Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC18 at Submission. Policy deleted following Inspector's report as policy repeats national guidance, and does not provide local detail
DC15: Heath Common and West Chiltington Character Areas	Originally DC19. Amended to refer to boundaries for the two areas on proposals map	This policy will benefit the character of the District. It could however make brownfield development in these areas more difficult.	It has been ensured that the policy has been worded so that development is not ruled out, but ensures that the characteristics of the area are retained.	Was policy DC19 at Submission. Minor wording changes made following the Inspector's report.
DC16: Park Homes/ Residential Caravans	Originally DC21.Policy wording amended to be more restrictive e.g. requiring marketing to District residents	This policy has the potential to damage the character and environment of the District due to the development of such sites. Such developments have the potential to be located in rural areas which would result in increased car journeys	Policy has been worded to ensure that such sites are only located adjacent to Built-up Area boundaries which would limit car journeys to services and facilities. Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood, this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC20 at Submission. Minor amendments made following the Inspector's report.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC17: Redevelopment / Change of use of Dwellings to Non-Residential Use	Originally DC22 Minor wording amendments made	This policy will have relatively limited impacts on the sustainability objectives as the number of conversions is likely to be low. The policy does however enable some needs to be met, e.g. provision of dentist surgeries in former homes.	No specific mitigation considered necessary.	Was policy DC21 at Submission
DC18: Smaller Homes / Housing Mix	Originally DC23 – More detailed policy wording developed.	This policy will help ensure the provision of smaller dwellings which meet residents' needs. An increased number of smaller dwellings has the potential to affect the character of settlements.	Policy has been worded to ensure that the development respects the local character of the area.	Was policy DC22 at Submission. Wording amended to take into account lack of current evidence base, following Inspector's report
DC19: Employment Site/ Land Protection	Originally DC24 - Minor wording amendments and addition of EPZ areas to Proposals Map	This policy has positive effects on the economic objectives by helping to maintain the economy of the District. The policy also maintains the status quo in terms of site availability so is unlikely to have any additional effect on the environmental objectives. The policy could make it more difficult for some housing development to come forward.	Housing provision in the District has already been set out in the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land document.	Was policy DC23 at Submission
DC20: New Employment Development	Originally DC25 Further detail added, e.g. extensions to existing units and requirement for Green Travel plan.	Provision of employment could result in less availability of land for other uses, but will assist the economy of the District. Development could also harm the character of the District and other environmental objectives.	Other uses are such as housing are set out in the Core Strategy and Site Specific Allocations of Land document. The policy has also been written to apply to sites in BUABs which will help minimise effects on the environmental objectives.	Was policy DC24 at Submission. Some deletions made to the policy, which repeat DC9, following the Inspector's report
Telecommunications	Originally DC26 Minor wording amendments and additional coverage of health in supporting text.	Although this policy will have wider benefits in ensuring business and social communication links across the country, the main problem is the potential for masts to harm the character of the District.	Policy has been written to ensure that the visual impact of masts are taken into account when considering applications.	Was policy DC25 at Submission Policy deleted following Inspector's report as policy repeats national guidance, and does not provide local detail

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC21: Protection of Existing Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities	Originally DC27 No change	This policy was assessed as having positive or neutral effects on the objectives, ensuring that existing facilities are maintained, which will also help the environment and economy.		Was policy DC26 at Submission
DC22: New open space, sports and recreation	Originally DC28 Reference to enhancement of existing facilities added.	Enabling the provision of new facilities will help ensure the provision of services and facilities, limit antisocial behaviour and the economy. New build does however have the potential of harming environmental objectives.	Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC27 at Submission
DC23: Sustainable Farm Diversification	Originally DC29 Further detail and clarification added to policy.	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	The policy has been worded to ensure that applications consider issues such as landscape and wildlife.	Was policy DC28 at Submission. Wording amended following Inspector's Report to better reflect national requirements
DC24: Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings for Industrial, Business or Residential Uses	Originally DC30 & DC34 Further detail and clarification added to policy	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC29 at Submission. Wording amended following Inspector's Report to better reflect national requirements
DC25: Rural Commercial Development and the Expansion of Existing Rural Commercial Sites / Intensification of Uses	Originally DC31 Policy worded to emphasise commercial development. Additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	Potential damage to the environmental objectives has been mitigated by making reference to other relevant policies such as that on landscape character.	Was policy DC30 at Submission. Wording amended following Inspector's Report to remove repetition of criteria covered by other policies, and clarification of policy wording to avoid risk of unnecessary development in the countryside

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC26: Replacement Buildings for Commercial Uses in the Countryside	Originally DC32 Policy worded to emphasise commercial development. Additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC31 at Submission. Wording amended following Inspector's Report to avoid risk of unnecessary development in the countryside
DC27: Essential Rural Workers Dwellings	Originally DC35 Policy worded to emphasise commercial development. Additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	Other policies cover issues such as biodiversity.	Was policy DC32 at Submission. Policy amended following the Inspector's report to remove criterion covered elsewhere in the policy
DC28: House Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and Ancillary Accommodation	Originally DC36 Minor wording changes made	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	The policy has been worded to ensure that applications consider issues such as landscape and wildlife.	Was policy DC33 at Submission. Wording changes made to add clarity following the Inspector's report.
DC29: Equestrian Development	Originally DC33 Reference to dwellings removed as covered by other policies in the document.	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	Other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. biodiversity), as no policy should be read in isolation. To ensure this is understood this has been clarified in the main text of the document.	Was policy DC34 at Submission
DC30: Exception Housing Schemes	Originally DC20 No changes made	A key positive effect of this policy is that it will help ensure that all residents who need it will have access to an affordable home. The policy is however likely to have some negative effects on the environmental objectives.	Policy has been worded to ensure such homes are relatively small in number, provided to those who need it and are not in private ownership. Policy also worded to make reference to consideration of character and design policies	Was policy DC35 at Submission

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC31: New/Extensions to Retirement Housing and Care Home Schemes	Originally DC37 Amended to emphasise preference for development in BUABs and to include proposals that would bring about an environmental improvement and to cover new and extensions to existing site and clarify the meaning of certain aspects of the policy.	The policy has positive effects in providing homes to a specific element of the community, and could provide facilities that could be used by others. Development outside BUABs could damage the environmental objectives and increase car journeys both from residents and staff.	The policy has been written to refer to other relevant policies such as character, and the need for any development outside a BUAB to be exceptional and to provide environmental enhancements has also been included in the policy.	Was policy DC36 at Submission. Reference to development outside the BUAB deleted following Inspector's report, removing the potential for harm to the environmental objectives arising from the earlier policy wording.
DC32: Gypsies and Travellers	Originally DC38 Reference made to the fact that sites could be inside or outside a BUAB.	This policy has positive effects by providing living space for a specific section of the community and also sites are relatively sustainably located close to services and facilities. The policy does however have the potential to harm the environmental objectives resulting from development in rural areas.	The policy has been worded to ensure that applicants refer to policies on landscape and design.	Was policy DC37 at Submission. Minor amendments made to the policy wording following the Inspector's report.
DC33: Travelling Show-people	Originally DC39 Reference made to the fact that sites could be inside or outside a BUAB.	This policy has positive effects by providing living space for a specific section of the community and also that sites are relatively sustainably located close to services and facilities. The policy does however have the potential to harm the environmental objectives resulting from development in rural areas.	The policy has been worded to ensure that applicants refer to policies on landscape and design.	Was policy DC38 at Submission. Minor amendments made to the policy wording following the Inspector's report.
DC34: New Retail Development within the Defined Town and Village Centres	Originally DC40 Additional requirement for green travel plan added and links to proposals maps provided	This policy will have a particularly positive effect in enhancing town and village centres. However, new development has the potential to harm the character and historical form of these centres.	The policy limits the overall size of development that would be acceptable (other policies address larger stores) and in addition other policies in this document mitigate problems which may occur (e.g. design), as no policy should be read in isolation.	Was policy DC39 at Submission. Minor amendments made to the policy wording following the Inspector's report.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC35: New retail and Leisure Development Outside the Defined Town and Village Centres	Originally DC41 Additional details /criterion added to help guide such developments	Retail development outside town and village centres has the potential to harm the economy of town and village centres and also affect the character of the district. If located outside a town and village centre retail can also increase the level of car use.	Policy has been written to be restrictive about the nature of any such development, including coverage of transport and effects on town and village centres. Other policies in this document mitigate other problems which may occur (e.g. design)..	Was policy DC40 at Submission. Minor amendments made to the policy wording following the Inspector's report.
DC36: Change of Use within Defined Town and Village Centres.	Originally DC42 & DC43 Wording amended to give greater clarity to the numbers of units able to change use	This policy generally has neutral or positive effects on the objectives, helping retain the vitality and viability of town and village centres, and is also likely to protect the character and appearance of town and village centres.		Was policy DC41 at Submission
DC37: Neighbourhood and Village shops	Originally DC44 Additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	This policy has positive effects in helping retain access to local services, but new shops do have the potential to harm the character of the neighbourhoods. There is also the potential for these stores to conflict with larger shopping areas.	Policy has been worded to limit the size of new or extensions to facilities. Other policies in this document mitigate other problems which may occur (e.g. design), as no policy should be read in isolation.	Was policy DC42 at Submission
DC38: New Retail Development in rural areas	New Policy	The policy will help the rural economy in particular, but could damage environmental objectives such as landscape character.	The policy has been worded to ensure consideration of local character. Other policies in this document mitigate other problems which may occur, as no policy should be read in isolation.	Was policy DC43 at Submission. Reference to character deleted following Inspector's report as repeated elsewhere in the document, and these policies mitigate the potential harm to landscape character.

Policy	Changes made from the Preferred Options Stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
DC39: Tourism	Originally DC45 Some deletions to policy where covered elsewhere in the document. Other additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	This policy was found to have mixed effects on the sustainability objectives: it is likely to help the rural economy, but the development could protect or harm biodiversity and character. Development could also increase the amount of traffic in rural areas.	The policy has been worded so that proposals must not conflict with the objective of protecting the character of the District and requirements for a green travel plan. The policy also refers to the need to consider other policy objectives for the District.	Was policy DC44 at Submission. Various deletions made to the policy following the Inspector's report. These are all duplications of policies nationally or elsewhere in the document, and these policies help mitigate potential harm to the SA/SEA objectives.
DC40: Transport and Access	Originally DC46 Additional details /criterion to help guide such developments	This policy helps reduce the need to travel by car and as a result is likely to have a positive effect on some environmental objectives due to reductions in emissions. The policy may also help design out potential negative effects of development, e.g. the potential for increase in crime / fear of crime	This policy is itself mitigation for CP20 providing more detail on transport issues.	Was policy DC45 at Submission. Minor amendments made to the policy wording following Inspector's report.
DC41: Protection of Land for Car Parks	Originally DC47 Link to proposals map added to policy	This policy helps to ensure access to facilities. The policy is also likely to have longer term positive effects on the economy.	This policy is itself mitigation for CP20 providing more detail on transport issues.	Was policy DC46 at Submission. First section of policy deleted following Inspector's report as a repetition of CP19.
Service Stations / Roadside Facilities	Originally DC48 Further detail requiring justification for development added.	This policy is likely to assist the economy but could harm the character of the District if the locations of the facilities are not given careful consideration.	Policy has been worded to limit facilities to appropriate location on the road network and that its need can be justified.	Was policy DC47 at Submission. Policy deleted following Inspector's report, as policy not felt to be clear enough to assist in the dealing of such proposals.
DC42:Airport Related Parking	Originally DC49 No change	The policy could help protect the character of the landscape by controlling airport related parking – unauthorised activity is likely to be more damaging to the landscape.	Policy is worded to be restrictive and only enable such development if a need exists and no reasonable alternatives are available. Other policies seek to encourage public transport.	Was policy DC48 at Submission

CONSIDERATION OF COLLECTIVE IMPACTS

5.7   Whilst many policies may individually have a minor impact on the environment, they may collectively have a much larger effect. Additionally, the environmental 'response' to the collective impacts of these projects may be delayed until a certain threshold is crossed, or when the impact comes to light in sudden or dramatic form such as flooding.

5.8   There are two main kinds of collective impacts that may occur as a result of the core policies. These are cumulative and synergistic effects:

Cumulative impacts occur when for example, there are impacts from several developments in one vicinity. The combined effects of these developments can have a significant impact.

Synergistic effects are where there are the combined impacts from one development have a particular effect on a certain receptor.

5.9   In order to assess the cumulative and synergistic effects of the plan, the overall outcome of the assessment of each policy against the sustainability objectives was set out in a table. This enabled an assessment of where several positive effects of different policies would work together and where there were areas where there may be negative impacts that combine to have a greater impact than a single policy in isolation. The results of this assessment are set out in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Assessment of Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

DC Policy	1 - Affordable Homes	2 - Services and facilities	3 - Crime and fear of crime	4 - Landscape character	5 - Biodiversity	6 - Historical / cultural environment	7 - Environmental Quality	8 - Reduce car journeys	9 - Flooding	10 - Brownfield land	11 - Reduce waste	12 - Efficient us of energy & water	13 - Climate and renewable energy	14 - High and stable economy	15 - Rural economy	16 - Town / village centres
DC1: Countryside Protection and Enhancement	☹	☺	?	☺?	☺	☺	☺	☺	?	☹	?	?	☹	☺	☺	☺
DC2: Landscape Character	☹	☹	☺	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹	?
DC3: Settlement Coalescence	☹	☹	?	☺	☺	☺	☺?	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	?	☺
DC4: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	☹	☹	?	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹	?
DC5: Biodiversity and Geology	☹	☹	?	☺	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹	?
DC6: Woodland and Trees	☹	☹	?	☺	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹	?

	SA/SEA Objective															
	1 - Affordable Homes	2- Services and facilities	3- Crime and fear of crime	4- Landscape character	5 - Biodiversity	6- Historical / cultural environment	7- Environmental Quality	8 - Reduce car journeys	9 - Flooding	10 - Brownfield land	11 - Reduce waste	12 - Efficient us of energy & water	13- Climate and renewable energy	14- High and stable economy	15 - Rural economy	16 - Town / village centres
DC7: Flooding	☺	☺	?	☺	☺	☺	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC8: Renewable Energy and Climate Change	☺	☺	?	☹?	☹?	☹?	☺	☹?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	?
DC9: Development Principles	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC10: Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺
DC11: Historic Parks and Gardens	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC12: Conservation Areas	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC13: Listed Buildings	☹	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC14: Shop Fronts and Adverts	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺?	☺	☺
DC15: Heath Common and West Chilt Character areas	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC16: Park Homes/ Residential Caravans	☺	?	☺	☹	☹	☹	☺	☹	?	☹	☹	☹	☹	☺	☺	☺
DC17: Redevelopment / Change of use of dwellings to non-residential use	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC18: Smaller Homes / Housing Mix	☺	☺	☺	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☹	☹	☹	☺	☺	☺
DC19: Employment Site/ Land Protection	☹	☹	?	☺	☹?	☺	☺?	☺	?	☹	?	?	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC20: New employment development	☺	☺	?	☹	☹?	☹	?	☺	☺	☺	?	?	☺	☺	☹	☺

	SA/SEA Objective															
	1 - Affordable Homes	2- Services and facilities	3- Crime and fear of crime	4 - Landscape character	5 - Biodiversity	6- Historical / cultural environment	7 - Environmental Quality	8 - Reduce car journeys	9 - Flooding	10 - Brownfield land	11 - Reduce waste	12 - Efficient us of energy & water	13- Climate and renewable energy	14- High and stable economy	15 - Rural economy	16 – Town / village centres
DC21: Protection of existing open space, sport and recreation facilities	?	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	?	☺	?	☺	😐	?	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC22: New open space, sports and recreation	😐	☺	☺	😐	😐	😐	😐	☺	?	☺	😐	?	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC23: Sustainable Farm diversification	😐	☺	?	☺	☺	☺	☹	☹	?	😐	😐	?	☺	☺	☺	☺
DC24: Conversion of Agricultural and rural buildings for industrial, business or residential uses	☺?	☹	?	☹	☹	😐	☹	☹	?	☺	?	?	😐	😐	☺	😐
DC25: Expansion of existing rural employment sites / intensification of uses	😐	😐	😐	☹	☹	☹	☹	☹	?	?	?	?	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC26: Replacement buildings in the countryside	😐	😐	?	☹	☹	☹	☹	😐	?	☺?	?	?	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC27: Essential Rural Workers Dwellings	☺	😐	?	☹?	☹?	☹?	☹?	😐	?	😐	?	?	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC28: House Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and ancillary accommodation	😐	😐	?	☹?	☹?	☹?	☹	☹	?	☺	?	?	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC29: Equestrian Development	☺	☺	?	☹	☹	☹	😐	☹	?	☹	?	?	😐	☺	☺	☹
DC30: Exception Housing Schemes	☺	😐	😐	😐	☹	☹	☹	😐	?	☹	☹	☹	☹	☺	☺	☺

	SA/SEA Objective															
	1 - Affordable Homes	2- Services and facilities	3- Crime and fear of crime	4- Landscape character	5 - Biodiversity	6- Historical / cultural environment	7 - Environmental Quality	8 - Reduce car journeys	9 - Flooding	10 - Brownfield land	11 - Reduce waste	12 - Efficient us of energy & water	13 - Climate and renewable energy	14- High and stable economy	15 - Rural economy	16 – Town / village centres
DC31: Retirement housing and care homes	☺	☺	😐	☹	☹	☹	☹	😐	😐	☺	😐	😐	😐	☺	😐	☺
DC32: Gypsies and Travellers	☺	☺	?	☹	☹	☹	?	😐	?	☹	☺	☺	😐	?	?	?
DC33: Travelling Showpeople	☺	☺	?	☹	☹	☹	?	😐	?	☹	☺	☺	😐	?	?	?
DC34: New retail development within the defined town and village centres	😐	😐	😐	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺	😐	☺	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	☺
DC35: New retail and leisure development outside the defined town and village centres	😐	☺?	?	☹	☹	☹	😐	😐	😐	☹	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC36: Change of use within defined town and village centre boundaries	☹	😐	?	☺	☺	☺	😐	☺	😐	☺?	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC37: Neighbourhood and Village shops	😐	😐	😐	☹	😐	☹	😐	☺	😐	☺	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC38: New Retail Development in rural areas	😐	😐	?	☹	😐	☹	?	☹	😐	☹	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC39: Tourism	☹	☺	?	☹	☺	☹	😐	☹	?	😐	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	☺?
DC40: Transport and Access	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	☺	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	☺?
DC41: protection of land for car parks	😐	☺	😐	☺	☺	☺	☺	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	😐	☺	☺	😐
DC42 Airport Related Parking	😐	😐								😐	?	?		☺	☺?	😐

5.10 The assessment of cumulative and synergistic effects identified a number of areas where policies combine to have a positive or negative effect on the sustainability objectives. The key cumulative effects identified were as follows:

- The policies protecting the environment and character of the District work together to help protect the wider environment, but they could also jointly combine to limit the overall land which is able to be developed. This is however the broad intention of many of these policies, as the control of development in the District will help to protect its overall character. Furthermore other policies are present, such as those in the Site Specific Allocations of Land which allocate land to help meet specific housing or employment needs.
- The landscape character and environmental protection policies whilst combining to provide a stronger level of protection to the wider environment of the District are in direct conflict with the rural strategy policies. These policies all have the potential to adversely affect the character and environment of rural areas, whilst combining to protect and enhance the rural economy.
- Most policies combine to have a positive effect on the economy of the District. This is achieved by direct measures such as protecting employment sites, but also by protecting the environment which ensures that the District remains a pleasant and attractive area, thereby encouraging people to live and work in the area.
- In some instances it was not possible to draw any conclusions about the likely positive or negative effects on some of the sustainability objectives. For example the effects of the policies on crime and fear of crime are particularly hard to predict, and the overall effect of the policies will therefore need to be closely monitored.

Significant Effects

5.11 Following the identification of the effects likely to arise from the General Development Control policies, both individually and cumulatively, the significance of the different impacts was determined. The significance of the effects was identified using the professional judgement of those undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal work, based on the outcomes of the assessment work.

5.12 The most significant effects of the General Development Control Policies that have been identified are set out below:

- The rural strategy policies have the potential to adversely affect the landscape character and environment through a combination of small scale developments and increased transport in these areas. Conversely however, the landscape character and environmental protection policies combine to help provide a strong level of protection to the wider environment of the District.

- The requirement for developments to meet some of their energy needs from renewable sources has the potential to reduce the impact on climate change.

- Ensuring that employment areas remain in villages and towns will help ensure that villages maintain their character and the balance of residential and employment areas.

Mitigation Measures

5.13   In order to prevent or minimise the negative effects of the policies that were identified in the assessment of the General Development Control Policies document a number of mitigation measures have been suggested and incorporated. It is also worth noting that many of the DC policies are themselves written to mitigate potential problems that were identified in the assessment of the Core Strategy, and to a lesser extent, the Site Specific Allocations of Land document. The Core Strategy polices are strategic in nature, and the DC policies help provide additional detail to these overall strategies, therefore preventing negative effects that may otherwise occur. Table 4 sets out the mitigation measures that have been incorporated, but these are broadly as follows:

- Amendment of the wording of policies or additions and clarifications of the supporting text of the General Development Control Policies.
- Other policies: Other policies in the General Development Control Policies document help to mitigate against the negative effects of others. For example policies on landscape and biodiversity help to protect the character of the District where rural development policies may otherwise harm it. Where appropriate, cross reference to other policies has been made in the document or a specific issue has been highlighted. The document also emphasises that the DC policies must be read as a whole, rather than viewing individual policies in isolation.
- Supplementary Planning Documents: many of the negative effects arising from the proposals will be given further consideration and mitigated against in other supplementary planning documents. For example it is anticipated that an SPD will be produced providing more information on landscape character.

6.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

6.1   This document sets out the results of the sustainability appraisal of the different options and policies in the General Development Control Policies document. The results of the appraisal were taken into account in the preparation of the Submission Document for the General Development Control Policies document and the SA/SEA has now been updated where appropriate taking into account the Inspector's report.

6.2   This document is published alongside the adopted General Development Control Policies document. The Sustainability Appraisal has played an important part in demonstrating that the document is sound by ensuring that it reflects sustainable development objectives.

6.5   It is a requirement that the effects of the General Development Control Policies document are monitored. This will be achieved by monitoring the indicators which are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Core Strategy (2007). 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. In accordance with the regulations regarding monitoring, the report will be prepared prior to the end of December each year. It should be noted that there may be some indicators which cannot be measured annually, depending on the type and nature of the indicator, and these will be monitored according to the timescales which are possible.   The findings of these indicators will help measure how well the plan contributes to sustainable development, and inform future reviews of the plans and policies.