

**PLANNING
FOR OUR FUTURE**



**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**HORSHAM DISTRICT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
TO 2018**

**NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF THE
Sustainability Appraisal and
Strategic Environmental
Assessment**

of the

**Site Specific Allocations of Land
Development Plan Document**

November 2007

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

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Horsham District Council is working towards producing a Local Development Framework. (LDF) This framework will contain a range of Documents which will set out the policies for land-use planning in the District. One of these documents is the 'Site Specific Allocations of Land', which sets out detailed development proposals for new homes, employment land, community facilities and other uses within the District.
- 1.2 A key aim of the Local Development Framework is to ensure that it contributes to sustainable development. This means balancing social, environmental and economic needs both now and in the future. To help ensure that the Site Specific Allocation of Land Document is sustainable a process called Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken and has incorporated the legal requirements of the "Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004". This non technical summary sets out a summary of the findings of the assessment process.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1 To undertake the sustainability appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations of Land document, the Council first collected 'baseline' data about the District as it is today on social, environmental and economic issues. This information was used to identify the sustainability issues affecting the District. These were then used to develop sustainability objectives and indicators. The objectives were used to judge how successful the Site Specific Allocations of Land document is in achieving sustainable development. These objectives and indicators were developed in consultation with internal and external organisations.
- 2.2 The Sustainability Objectives were used to assess the sustainability of the different Site Specific Allocations options. The results of this assessment helped to inform which options were incorporated into the document. The effects of the Site Specific Allocations of Land policies were then assessed to identify the positive and negative effects of the different options and policies. Where negative impacts were identified, mitigation measures to prevent or lessen the impact of the policy were suggested, in order to reduce any adverse effects arising from the proposals.

3.0 BASELINE DATA

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

Economic

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

Social

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

Environmental

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

4.0 SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN HORSHAM DISTRICT

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

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

5.0 THE SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK

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

Table One: Sustainability Objectives and Indicators

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR
Social Progress which meets the needs of everyone	
1. To ensure that everyone has access to good quality affordable homes that meets their needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of affordable homes built each year• Proportion of affordable housing / commuted payment on qualifying residential schemes• % of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom homes built as a proportion of the total• The number / percentage of people in housing need

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR
2. To ensure that everyone has access to the health, education, leisure and recreation facilities they require	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of applications with S106 agreements for infrastructure and community improvements completed • Number of applications resulting in the extension, improvement or loss of facilities
3. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of developments where advice from the Police is sought and followed.
Effective Protection of the Environment	
4. To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The condition of landscape areas • Type and percentage of planning permissions granted for new development in the Strategic Gaps
5. To conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of SSSIs. • Percentage of applications with S106 agreements for enhancements to biodiversity • Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance including • change in priority habitats and species (by type) • change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value
6. To conserve and enhance the historical and cultural environment of the District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of listed buildings lost as a result of development • Number of archaeological sites and historical parks and gardens lost or damaged as a result of development • Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award system
7. To maintain a high quality environment in terms of air, soil and water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of redevelopment proposals which result in the clean-up of contaminated sites • Number of Air Quality Management Zones • Number of rivers in Horsham District meeting river quality targets
8. To reduce car journeys and promote alternative methods of transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications with S106 agreements for public transport improvements • Parking Provision in residential developments •
9. To reduce the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of development proposals which incorporate sustainable urban drainage schemes • Numbers of planning permissions granted / refused on grounds of flood risk
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prudent Use of Natural Resources 	
10 To make the most efficient use of land by prioritising brownfield land for development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of homes built on previously developed land in towns and villages • Percentage of new dwellings completed at • less than 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) • between 30-50 dph • above 50 dph
11 To reduce the amount of waste produced and maximise the re-use and recycling of other materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard • Number of developments using reclaimed materials in construction
12 To ensure that rates of energy and water consumption are as efficient as possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard • Number of developments incorporating water and energy efficiency measures

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	INDICATOR
13 To seek to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, in particular by encouraging the provision and use of renewable energy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of developments incorporating energy efficiency measures • Number of developments built to BREEAM / Ecohome standard • Number of homes / developments linked to a combined heat and power system
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of High and Stable Levels of Economic Growth and Employment 	
14 To maintain the high and stable economy of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vacancy rates on employment sites • Amount of employment land lost to residential development
15 To seek to enhance areas where there are inequalities in the economy, particularly the rural economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of rural diversification schemes permitted • Amount of employment floorspace permitted
16 To maintain and enhance the vitality of Horsham town and village centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of new retail floorspace created • Number of retail units converted to other uses

6.0 COMPATIBILITY OF OBJECTIVES

6.1 The sustainability objectives were compared with each other and the LDF objectives to determine whether there are any areas where the objectives conflict. Identification of these conflicts meant that when assessing the Site Specific Allocations of Land policies, possible ways forward to prevent or reduce the conflicts could be found.

6.2 The results from this assessment indicated that most of the objectives were compatible with each other, or had a neutral effect. The main areas where objectives are not compatible are those which result in the need for development (e.g. provision of housing) against objectives which need to limit development in some way (e.g. protection of landscape character).

7.0 IDENTIFICATION AND INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

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

Table Two: Summary of Assessment of the Site Specific Allocations of Land Option

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected for Site Specific Allocations	Further information / Comments
<p>Built-up Area boundaries a) Use existing boundaries of built-up areas b) Amend built-up areas to include minor extensions suitable for development</p>	b	b	<p>It was considered that amending built-up area boundaries (option b) was more positive than letting them remain (option a) as this would allow some scope for development and change whilst protecting the majority of the countryside of the District.</p>
<p>Location of small scale sites a) Locate small scale developments on sites adjoining settlements which are close to facilities, are of low ecological value and are not damaging to the landscape, have reasonable employment networks close by, and where local need has been identified. b) Locate small scale developments which are close to facilities, are of low ecological value and are not damaging to the landscape, and have reasonable employment networks close by c) Locate small sites randomly around the District. d) Do not have any small scale sites</p>	a	a	<p>a) is the most sustainable as this option meets local housing and other needs, as well as trying to balance out the environmental effects. The other options do not take into consideration housing needs, and if housing were placed randomly across the District (option c) nearly all the SA/SEA objectives were found to be negatively affected.</p>
<p>1) Hornbrook/Hilliers a) Develop all of site comprehensively for a range of uses b) Develop some of site c) Do not develop any part of the site</p>	c	c	<p>Not allocating the site (option c) would not provide housing or facilities but would not harm the environment. Any development in this location would therefore need careful mitigation against environmental effects. Following responses at the Preferred Options stage, and further sustainability assessment work option c (no development) was selected.</p>
<p>2) Windacres Farm Option a) Develop all of the site comprehensively for a range of uses (housing and employment) Option b) Develop site for housing only Option c) Develop site for employment only Option d) Do not develop any part of the site</p>	a	a	<p>The results of this assessment showed that any development of this site would be damaging environmentally, option a) would be beneficial in economic and social terms by providing employment and affordable housing. Option a) was selected for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations of Land document, with mitigation needed to minimise negative environmental effects.</p>

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected for Site Specific Allocations	Further information / Comments
<p>3) Home Farns Green a) Keep school sites as they are and don't allocate Home Farm site b) Keep school sites as they are and allocate Home Farm site c) Merge schools on land at Home Farm and redevelop infants d) Merge schools with no additional development</p>	a	a	<p>Housing development (options b & c) was found to be damaging due to the harm to the environment and would also lead to increased journeys to work, services and facilities as there are limited employment services and facilities in the village. On balance keeping things as they (option a) was felt to be the most sustainable.</p>
<p>1) Shoreham Cement Works a) Develop a policy to bring about restoration of the site b) Do not have a policy and leave site a it is</p>	a	a	<p>On balance, it is considered that option a) is more sustainable and is included in the Site Specific Allocations of Land, as it provides landscape restoration, and assists the economy of the area. Mitigation of transport and biodiversity impacts will be necessary.</p>
<p>2) Warnham Brick Works a) Have a policy to help control future of site b) Do not have a policy</p>	a	a	<p>It is considered that having a policy would have more positive benefits than not, for example by enabling the provision of new waste facilities and assisting the economy, This option (a) was selected for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations of Land document.</p>
<p>3) Secondary Schools a) Safeguard land for a future secondary school in Southwater b) Do not safeguard land for a future secondary school</p>	a	a	<p>On balance, it is considered that safeguarding the land is the most sustainable option. This Council is involved in ongoing discussions with the West Sussex County Council Education Department to help clarify the need for any secondary school.</p>
<p>4) Brinsbury a) Have a policy to enable expansion of this site as a centre for rural excellence b) No policy</p>	b	a	<p>Option b (no development) is the more sustainable option, but option a) has been selected for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations of Land document as it will assist the rural economy and Brinsbury college. Care is needed to ensure that the development results in the minimum impacts on the landscape, environment and traffic.</p>

Local Development Framework Option	Most sustainable option	Option selected for Site Specific Allocations	Further information / Comments
<p>5) Sandgate Park a) Have a policy to restore Sandgate park as a country park b) Do not have a policy</p>	a	a	<p>The assessment found that a policy to restore Sandgate park (option a) was the most sustainable option. This would help enhance the environment, reduce effects of global warming through increased planting and provide an amenity for residents of the Storrington and Sullington area. It is also considered that the overall enhancement to the landscape will add to the attractiveness of the area and may encourage businesses to remain in or locate to the area, and therefore help ensure the high and stable economy of the District is maintained. Option a has been selected for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations of Land document</p>
<p>Car Parking a) Include policies to protect car parking b) Do not have car parking policies</p>	b	a	<p>The provision of car parking would not help reduce journeys by car and will contribute to air pollution and emissions of carbon dioxide. Car parking can also detract from the character of villages and towns. Option a) has been selected for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations of Land, and mitigation will therefore be needed to ensure that car journeys are not increased.</p>

8.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS OF LAND DOCUMENTS

- 8.1 Following the assessment of the Site Specific Allocations of Land options, the options selected formed the basis from which the policies were developed. These policies were then appraised, examining how each of the policies would affect the various sustainability objectives. In addition, the effects of the different policies acting together were considered. This process was undertaken continuously throughout the process of policy preparation.
- 8.2 The assessment of the Site Specific Allocations of Land policies generally found there were positive effects on the social and economic sustainability objectives, but less positive environmental effects. From the findings of the assessment it was possible to suggest ways in which the sustainability of the document could be improved. This included clarification of wording, or the identified of issues which need consideration at a later stage, for example as part of a Supplementary Planning Document or Area Action Plan.
- 8.3 A summary of the results of the appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations of Land document together with the improvements made as a result of the assessment is set out in the table below. The table also sets out how the policies have been changed from the “Preferred Options” stage.

Consideration of Collective Impacts

- 8.4 Table 3 shows that each policy can on its own have an impact on the environment or the economy. In addition, the effects of several policies can combine to have a much larger positive or negative effect. These collective or ‘cumulative’ impacts have been considered and the main effects identified are as follows:
- Future increases in population due to the development allocated sites have the potential to increase traffic and reliance on the car. This will have effects on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, the environment, and accessibility to services and facilities.
 - The effects on landscape and townscape both from the development in and around settlements across the District. In addition there may be effects on the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
 - There may be adverse effects on waterways and rivers due to the increased amount of hard surfaces arising from development. This could increase flooding or change the natural water drainage system. Development could also harm the water quality.
 - Biodiversity and the historic environment could be harmed from both the direct effects from development and from indirect effects from impacts on water quality and air quality.

Table 3: Summary of findings from the Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations of Land policies

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL1 – Previously Developed Land	Policy wording amended, taking out some larger sites which may have a more significant impact and setting these out as separate policies	Policy is beneficial in provision of homes and the economy, but is harmful in terms of affecting townscape character and increasing pressure on resources.	Reference to protection of townscape character in policy wording has been enhanced. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2, and with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document.	Oddstones, Greenfields Depot and RMC removed from the policy text by the Inspectors, but this does not affect the overall findings of the sustainability appraisal
AL2 – Lifestyle Ford, Bishopric	A new policy, (building on AL1) setting out more detail on requirements for development of the site, as its large size means its development could have significant impacts	Policy is beneficial in provision of homes and the economy, but is harmful in terms of affecting townscape character and increasing pressure on resources.	Impact of design of development on the townscape character is mentioned in policy wording. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document.	
AL3 – Parsonage Farm, Parsonage Road, Horsham	A new policy, (building on AL1) setting out more detail on requirements for development of the site, as its large size means its development could have significant impacts	Policy is beneficial in provision of homes and the economy, but is harmful in terms of affecting townscape character and increasing pressure on resources.	Reference to protection of townscape character in policy wording has been enhanced. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document	

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL4 – Roffey Social and Sports Club	A new policy, (building on AL1) setting out more detail on requirements for development of the site, as its large size means its development could have significant impacts	Policy is beneficial in providing enhanced leisure facilities but leads to some loss of open space which could harm biodiversity.	Reference to protection of townscape character in policy wording has been enhanced. Impact on biodiversity has been addressed in policy wording.	
AL5 – Riverside Concrete, Stane Street, Pulborough	A new policy, (building on AL1) setting out more detail on requirements for development of the site, as its large size means its development could have significant impacts	Policy is beneficial in provision of homes and the economy, but is harmful in terms of affecting townscape character and increasing pressure on resources.	Reference to protection of townscape character in policy wording has been enhanced. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document	
RMC Engineering Works	Was policy AL18 at the Preferred Options stage. Wording amended to include potential impact on the AONB for the submission document.	The policy was found to have a positive effect in helping to bring about country park, but the location of the site would have negative effects on the transport network.	The requirement for eco-homes was added in to the policy wording	AL6 in the submission documentation, the Inspectors removed this policy, due to their concerns about the isolated nature of the site and the impact on the transport network

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL6 – Land at Merios Farm, Ashington	Further assessment work was undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Site will result in loss of greenfield land, and impact on biodiversity. It is also likely to increase pressure on resources but is more positive in provision of homes.	Policy amended to increase reference to rural road character, and reference to affordable homes added. Requirement to protect and enhance trees and hedges in policy wording and reference to biodiversity added to supporting text. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document	Policy AL7 in the Submission Document
AL7 – Land at Hammonds, East Street Billingshurst	Was policy AL9 at the Preferred Options stage. Further assessment work was undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Site will result in loss of greenfield land and may have an adverse impact on the nearby conservation area, although the policy wording helps this. Policy has positive effects in the provision of homes.	Reference to woodland enhancement added to policy.	Policy AL8 in the Submission Document
AL8 – Land at the Plough, Lower Beeding	Was policy AL13 at the Preferred Options stage. Further assessment work undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Policy is positive in enabling the provision of affordable homes, and the local economy, but scale of development is high for size of village and could affect its setting and environment.	Policy wording amended to ensure setting of site and pub is not harmed and that pedestrian links are enhanced. Further reference to the scale of the development site could potentially be added to the supporting text.	Policy AL9 in the Submission Document
AL9 – Land at Windacres Farm, Rudgwick	Was policy AL14 at the Preferred Options stage. Further assessment work undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Site results in loss of greenfield land, and could have a negative effect on environmental and resources objectives. Policy is more positive in providing economic enhancements to the village.	Policy expanded to include reference to ensuring adequate infrastructure provision – e.g. sewerage, given existing supply problems in the . Pressure on resources is also covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document	Policy AL10 in the Submission Document

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL10 – St. Joseph’s Abbey, Storrington	Was policy AL15 at the Preferred Options stage. Further assessment work undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Site will result in loss of greenfield land and may have an adverse impact on the nearby conservation area, although the policy wording helps this. Policy has positive effects in the provision of homes.	Policy expanded to cover access issues and ensure protection of the conservation area / Moorish door.	Policy AL11 in the Submission Document
AL11 – RAFA Site Sullington	Was policy AL16 at the Preferred Options stage. Policy wording amended to state density of development and addition of boundary planting to ensure landscape of AONB is protected	Will result in loss of greenfield land and increase pressure on resources and the environment, but will ensure provision of specific housing need and could help local economy.	Land to south of site is a (geological) SSSI. Reference to this added to supporting text. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2 in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document	Policy AL12 in the Submission Document
AL12- Parsonage Farm, St Peters Meadow, Henfield	Was policy AL19 at the Preferred Options stage. Further assessment work undertaken in response to Preferred Options consultation	Site will result in loss of greenfield land, and impact on biodiversity. It is also likely to increase pressure on resources but is more positive in provision of homes.	Requirement for landscaping added to policy. Pressure on resources is covered to some extent by CP2, in the Core Strategy, with more detailed policies to be provided in the General Development Control Policy Document Policy has been amended to consider transport infrastructure, and to ensure that development provide landscape and biodiversity enhancements.	Policy AL13 in the Submission Document
AL13 Shoreham Cement Works, Upper Beeding	Was policy AL22 at the Preferred Options stage. Reference to landscape and biodiversity protection added to policy	Site will help restore scar in landscape but is likely to result in increased car journeys to the site. Development could also impact on biodiversity in the area.	Policy has been amended to consider transport infrastructure, and to ensure that development provide landscape and biodiversity enhancements. Impacts such as landscape, biodiversity and transport will be given further consideration as part of a future development brief for the site as well as part of an EIA which will be required with any planning application.	Policy AL15 in the Submission Document

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL14 - -- Warrnam and Wealden Brickworks, Horsham	Was policy AL23 at the Preferred Options stage. Policy wording amended to include reference to archaeology on and near the site.	Site will be beneficial in economic terms and also help management of resources though waste treatment facilities and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. A Storage and distribution facility may increase traffic. Direct social effects likely to be relatively limited due to nature of proposal.	Policy has been amended to consider transport infrastructure. Impacts such as archaeology will be given further consideration as part of a future development brief for the site as well as part of an EIA which will be required with any planning application.	Policy AL16 in the Submission Document
AL15- Centre of Rural Excellence, Brinsbury	Was policy AL21 at the Preferred Options stage. Requirement for flood risk assessment and archaeological assessment and sustainable transport added to policy	Site is likely to be beneficial in economic terms by helping Brinsbury college expand, but will be damaging to landscape and the environment.	Requirement for EIA suggested and added to policy. This should cover this issues of odour, landscape and biodiversity.	Policy AL14 in the Submission Document
AL16 – Car Parking, Billingshurst	Saved local plan policy which was subject to environmental appraisal which predated SEA legislation	This policy will be positive in social and economic terms but will be more harmful environmentally by encouraging journeys by car	Provision for pedestrian access added to policy wording in order to ensure link for people on foot as well as by car.	Policy AL17 in the Submission Document
AL17 - Southwater Fire Station	New Policy Based on continuation of saved local plan policy	Development will result in loss of greenfield land and is likely to harm the environment. It will be beneficial in social and economic terms helping to provide an essential service.	Land has already been allocated for business use as part of old local plan.	Policy AL18 in the Submission Document

Policy	Changes made from Preferred Options stage	Summary of Effects	Mitigation suggested and incorporated	Other Comments
AL18 – Meadowside	Saved local plan policy which was subject to environmental appraisal which predated SEA legislation	This policy will be positive in social and economic terms but will be more harmful environmentally by encouraging journeys by car.	Supporting text amended to ensure link for people on foot as well as by car.	Policy AL19 in the Submission Document
AL19 – Sandgate Park	Saved local plan policy which was subject to environmental appraisal which predated SEA legislation	This policy will have a range of positive effects, socially and economically but particularly in relation to the environment by enabling the landscape to be restored, and biodiversity to be enhanced.		Policy AL20 in the Submission Document

Significant Effects

- 8.5 Once the individual and joint impacts of the policies in the Site Specific Allocations of Land had been identified, it was possible to decide which impacts were most significant. It is considered that the most significant effects arising from the Site Specific Allocations of land are those which result from the development requirements placed upon the District.
- 8.6 Significant effects arising from development include potential harm to the landscape, and increased reliance on the car. More beneficial impacts include increased numbers of affordable homes, which will benefit a wide group of the population currently unable to access the type of housing they require.

Mitigation Measures

- 8.7 In identifying the possible effects of the Site Specific Allocations of land, mitigation measures to help combat the impacts arising from the documents have been put in place. The mitigation measures are set out in table 3 but can be summarised as follows:
- Amendment of the wording of policies
 - Other policies: Other policies in the documents help to prevent the negative effects of others.
 - Many of the effects arising from the proposals will be given further consideration and mitigated against in other documents, such as the General Development Control Policy document.
 - Suggestion of areas for further study. This has included identification of issues to be studied as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will be provided with a planning application for some proposals.

9.0 NEXT STEPS

- 9.1 This document is published alongside the adopted Site Specific Allocations of Land document. The Sustainability Appraisal has played an important part in showing that the document is sound by ensuring that it reflects the sustainable development objectives.
- 9.2 It is a requirement that the effects of the Site Specific Allocations of Land on sustainable development are monitored. The monitoring will be undertaken on an annual basis and will be incorporated into the wider annual monitoring which is required for the Local Development Framework. The findings of this monitoring will help measure how well the plan contributes to sustainable development, and inform future reviews of the plans and policies.

