

CHICHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL

Chichester Local Plan

Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocation: Development Plan Document

January 2018

Chichester Local Plan

Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocation Development Plan Document

January 2018

1. INTRODUCTION.

The Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029 document has now been adopted by the Council. This was subject to a sustainability appraisal throughout its development. The second Local Plan document, the Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) has been submitted and subject to examination. Following the examination Proposed Modifications have been made to the DPD and this is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) accompanying the consultation on those Proposed Modifications. This SA is a development of the previous SA of the Site Allocation Preferred Approach DPD that was issued for consultation in 2015, and the SA that accompanied the submission of the DPD in March 2017. The Key Policies 2014-2029 document sets out the housing numbers and amount of employment floorspace to be achieved in the Plan and the Site Allocation DPD looks at the locational options for delivering these.

The main purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal is to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects for the site allocation options in the Local Plan so that decisions that have been made are in accordance to the objectives of sustainable development. The site options may not fully achieve all the sustainability objectives but the aim of the process is to ensure that they contribute towards all of the objectives as far as possible.

2. NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

What is a Sustainability Appraisal?

A Sustainability Appraisal is a process whereby a range of option for a plan's content is developed and then assessed to see what the major environmental, social and economic impacts are likely to be (both positive and negative effects).

What does it contain?

The full contents of an SA report are prescribed by the SEA Directive and UK guidance. This can make the reports lengthy. The key pieces of information for decision makers are the assessment matrices and their summary diagrams. These give the overall profile of pros and cons for the potential policy options

What is its purpose?

The purpose of an SA is not to make decisions, or to determine which option is 'the correct one'. No real world policy can address all aspects of sustainability completely. The SA is there to help inform decisions by assessing the likely positive and negative impacts of options across a wide range of topics.

Why is it important?

The SA is important to the soundness of the Local Plan. It demonstrates that decisions were made with full awareness of the positive and negative impacts of allocation decisions. The SA is the UK planning process that meets the requirements of the EU's SEA Directive. The Plan Inspector will use the completion of a comprehensive SA as a test of soundness.

How were options assessed?

A range of potential options were developed through discussions with the Local Plan team. A range of questions were developed through the SA 'scoping' process. These questions or assessment criteria were asked of all the potential options through the use of matrices. This process met EU and UK government requirements but led to a large amount of data. The summary diagrams provided, draw out the profile of positive and negative impacts into a more digestible form.

2.1 Alternatives considered

Appendices 1 and 2 of the Site Allocations DPD set out the long list of sites from which the plan process started. The SHLAA id numbers used in these appendices have been used in the SA assessment tables for ease of cross-reference. From this long list a shorter list of deliverable and relevant sites was developed, guided by the requirements in the Key Policies document. These are:

- For Residential: sites excluding those parishes that are nearing the Pre-Submission of their neighbourhood plan or have a plan in a more advanced stage. Only sites with a minimum site size of 0.25 hectares or capable of accommodating at least 5 dwellings have been considered.
- The Site Allocation DPD for residential development addresses Chichester city and sites surrounding the Chichester city Settlement Boundary in neighbouring parishes (including sites separated from the Settlement Boundary by the A27) (in line with Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Policy 5 - Parish Housing Sites 2012-2029) and the parishes of Bosham Boxgrove; Lynchmere; Hunston; Plaistow and Ifold (in line with Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies Policy 2 – Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, Policy 5 - Parish Housing Sites 2012-2029 and Policy 7 - Neighbourhood Development Plans.
- For Employment: sites within or close to Chichester city as identified in the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies - Policy 3 the Economy and Employment Provision 1.11.

The Options that meet these criteria are assessed in full in the assessment matrices. The summary diagrams contained in this document a very brief summary of findings is included below, but these must be read in conjunction with the full assessments.

The alterations to Settlement Boundaries are not assessed in the SA as they are either altered to include the submitted site option (Hunston) or sites with existing permissions (North Mundham, West Wittering) and so do not have an impact above or beyond the impacts of developing the submitted sites that have already been assessed.

The submission version of the DPD further narrowed the options to the site or sites proposed for inclusion in the DPD. However this SA report still contains the full range of options considered so that they can be compared and their merits and de-merits relative to the submitted option(s) can be seen.

The Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies states in paragraph 16.19 that local centres for East Wittering and Selsey will be defined either in a Neighbourhood Plan or in the Site Allocation DPD. Selsey Town Council have indicated that they are including local centres in their neighbourhood plan. This document therefore has not assessed these. However, East Wittering and Bracklesham Parish Council is not proposing to define a local centre in their Neighbourhood Plan, so one is identified in the Site Allocation DPD. The only reasonable alternative to defining the local centre is not to do so, but this would not be a deliverable option as it would not conform to the NPPF or the Local Plan: Key Policies document. Options for minor variances to the Local Centre boundary are possible but not likely to have an effect on the sustainability assessment objectives and so the proposal is not considered further in this SA.

2.2 Summaries of Findings for Residential Sites

2.2.1 Bosham

Option 1 (Highgrove Farm) [submitted option]

This option is assessed as having positive impacts for most of the social objectives and for transport and drainage. The negative impacts are on landscape and urban forms and on biodiversity, although not of these are assessed as being severe. The site boundary was slightly extended prior to submission, but this does not alter the SA assessment.

Option 2 (the French Garden)

This site has good access to the railway station, but has negative impacts on landscape and urban form by extending the settlement to the north of railway line. Surface water drainage to the Bosham stream has a potentially negative impact on water quality.

Option 3 (Swan Field)

Option 3 would have negative impacts on biodiversity as it is supporting habitat for Brent Geese (a Special protection Area designated species) and so is likely to fall foul of the Habitat Regulations requirements. The site is also very visible from the roads and is in the AONB. On the positive side it is a large site capable of delivering housing close to transport links and existing facilities.

Option 4 (Bullock Barn)

This small site is adjacent to option 3 above but as previously developed land it has less impact on biodiversity. However it is too small to deliver the required level of housing.

Option 5 (former Cricket Ground) and Option 6 (land South of the Old Bridge)

These adjacent sites are close to the centre of Broadbridge and have good transport links but have a negative impact on the AONB, on ecology (water vole and barn owl habitat) and potentially on the aquatic environment of the Bosham stream, which flows between the two sites.

Option 7 (land south of the Railway Arch)

This site was assessed negatively for most of the environmental objectives, including habitats, landscapes and water and air pollution. Good transport links was the main positive assessment.

Option 8 (land east of Taylors Lane)

The adverse impacts on water vole habitat and on the landscape of the harbour AONB were major concerns with this site. The poorer transport links relative to the Broadbridge sites was also a negative. On the plus side the site is large enough to meet housing needs and make additional room for open space and SUDs and gave easy access to the facilities of central Bosham.

Option 9 (land at Crede Farm)

Compared to the other old Bosham options (8 and 10) this smaller site is more closely integrated with the village form, but the site is still within the AONB. Good access to facilities in the village, but remote from the rail and bus links.

Option 10 (land West of Delling Lane)

Major negatives for this site were the proximity to the harbour and the impacts on landscape and ecology of the harbour. The impacts on the stream were also a concern. Not all of the site area would be needed for the number of homes required so there were opportunities to mitigate some of the negative impacts. Good access to facilities in the village, but remote from the rail and bus links.

2.2.2 Boxgrove

Option 1 (Land East of the Street)

This site is adjacent to the A27 with negative impacts on air pollution and noise for residents. Sites in Boxgrove generally do not have good transport links to Chichester other than by car and so poor assessments on these indicators are common to all the options assessed.

Option 2 (Land West of Priors Acre) and

Option 5 (Land west of the Street) [Submitted option]

These adjacent sites have near identical profiles of impacts - positive and negative. The positive impacts are predicted to be for housing and economic indicators. The negatives are on biodiversity and need to travel.

Option 3 (Land north of the Primary School)

This site shares the common impacts of Boxgrove as a location (See option 1 above), but has additional negative impacts on landscape and urban forms as it is adjacent to the National Park and also as a large site it would be difficult to define a new clear edge to the settlement.

Option 4 (Land South of Crouch Cross Lane)

This site is closer in to the centre of the settlement than some others mitigating landscape impacts, but shares the common drawbacks of all the Boxgrove options.

Option 6 (land North of Boxgrove Priory) and Option 7 (land east of the Priory)

These large sites share additional negative impacts on the historic environment and urban forms due to their proximity to the Priory and its open setting.

2.2.3 Chichester Housing Options

Due to the large number of sites these have been split into inner and outer sites, the latter are in other parishes including Lavant, Donnington and Oving, but the sites would be to meet Chichester city housing need rather than a Parish one.

Inner Chichester

Option 1 (land at Tesco) [submitted option]

This site is generally well located for access to facilities and for walking and cycling. The main drawback is the proximity to the noise of the railway.

Option2 (land at Frederick Road)

This site is further from facilities than option 1 scoring less well on need to travel, but otherwise has a similar impact profile to option 1.

Option 3 (Bartholomew's, Bognor Road) [submitted option]

This site has positive impacts for meeting housing needs and for access by cycling and walking. The main negative is the potential for adding to congestion and hence air pollution.

Option 4 (Hammonds, University of Chichester)

This site has a similar profile of impacts to the other Chichester sites, but has additional negative biodiversity impacts.

Option 5 (117 the Hornet) [submitted option]

This site has the lowest number of negative impacts on the inner Chichester options – it is also the closest into the shops and facilities of central Chichester. A brownfield location reduces impacts of landscape from use of greenfield sites out beyond the A27.

Wider Chichester options

These sites are generally greenfield sites on the edge of the current city boundaries. Therefore negative impacts on biodiversity and landscape are a common theme, especially compared to the inner Chichester (brownfield) sites.

Option 1 (land north of Summersdale Court), Option 3(Maddox Wood) and Option 4 (land north of Maddox Wood)

These Lavant parish sites would extend the City northwards into the gap between Chichester and Lavant. The Lavant road offers reasonable access into the city, supplemented by the cycling link of the Centurion way. The main negative impacts are on loss of trees and hedges and landscape impacts of these greenfield sites.

Option 2 (land north of Marchwood)

This option is more prominent in the landscape than the option above and there is good evidence of a range of protected species using the site, so the biodiversity impact is more severe. Access to facilities is also less good than options 1, 3 and 4. Overall the negatives outweigh the positives.

Option 5 (Shopwyke Lakes) [submitted option]

Unusually for the Chichester options this is a site already with planning permission and also a brownfield site. This option is effectively a small extension of an existing permission. The main drawback is the separation from the rest of Chichester due to the A27, but this is mitigated by the access improvements generated by the larger strategic location on the site. Provided that the potential contamination of the brownfield site can be dealt with then there are few negative impacts.

Option 6 (Land north of Stockbridge)

This large open site is separated from the City by the A27, which makes walking and cycling links difficult despite the proximity. The major negative impacts are on the protected wildlife of the Harbour and the landscape impacts on the Harbour AONB. Overall this site has the most negative impacts and the fewest positive of all the Chichester options.

2.2.4 Hunston Housing Options

There are multiple options at Hunston – for a relatively small amount of housing to meet a local housing need. Several of the sites are directly adjacent or are close enough to form a recognisable group with similar impacts due to their location relative to the village.

Options 1 (Land south of Meadow Close) and 8 (Land at corner of Church Lane)

Generally these options have few significant impacts. They are positive for housing and economy. Option 8 being close to the main road is the better location and is more self-contained.

Options 2 (Land south of Carmelite Convent) and 10 (land at Chrislee)

These two options are clearly separated from the existing village with negative impact on urban forms and landscape as a result. They are also further in terms of walking into the facilities of the village.

Options 3 (Land east of Foxbridge Drive) and 7 (Land east of Southover Way)

These adjacent sites to the east of the settlement are more sustainably located than Options 2 and 10 but have greater landscape and biodiversity impacts than either Options 1 and 8 or options 4 and 9.

Option 4 (Reedbridge Farm) and

Option 9 (land South of Reedbridge Farm) [submitted option]

These sites have an overall neutral impact profile. Option 4, being closer to the road, would be more prominent and visible than Option 9. The latter is assessed as having no negative impacts.

Option 5 (Hunston Dairy Farm)

This site is separated from the existing village by a field, although it is closer than Option 1 and 10. The site is also prominent and visible from the roundabout on the main road so is assessed as having negative impact on landscape and townscape.

Options 6 (Land at Bridge Farm), 11 (Land at Farmfield Nursery) and 12 (land north of 10 Oak View)

These sites to the West of the village have reasonable access but more landscape impacts than Options 1 and 8 and Option 4 and 9. Options 11 and 12 would also have greater visibility from the main road. Option 6 would also impact on the setting of the Canal if it was development on that side of the site.

2.2.5 Lynchmere Housing Options

In the submitted DPD none of the site options were finally included for submission. Those that were considered are listed below:

Option 1 (land at Sturt Avenue) and

Option 5 (land at Sturt Meadow Cottages)

These options would involve clearing woodland and also have a negative impact on the River Wey adjacent. The sites also have poor access, although they are close to the facilities of Camelsdale. The submitted policy contains some mitigation proposals for the biodiversity impacts, but some negative impacts remain.

Option 2 (Tennis courts at Blue Anchor House)

This option lies between the settlements of Camelsdale and Hammer but has good accessibility from Haslemere. However it is adjacent to the National Park.

Option 3 (Land west of the Mill tavern)

This option like Option 2 lies between the two settlement boundaries. It would be prominent on the main road and it would also lead to the loss of allotments for the community.

Option 4 (land north of Copse Road)

Although more clearly linked to the existing settlement boundary of Hammer, this site is both an SNCI and in part Ancient Woodland so development here would have severe negative impacts on biodiversity.

2.2.6 Plaistow and Ifold Housing Options

The options in Ifold are remote from facilities and the nature of the area is that opportunities to travel by means other than the car are very limited. The options at Plaistow (option 6) and Dunsfold Wood are even more remote and rural.

Options 1 and 2 (Land south of Foxbridge Cottage)

There is the potential to impact on the ancient woodland adjacent. The positive impacts are on meeting housing need and on the economic indicators. Overall the assessment is negative for these options.

Option 3 (Land south of Barnwood)

This site is on ancient woodland, so development here would not normally be acceptable at all in planning terms, especially as other options exist at Ifold.

Option 4 (land at Shortlands Copse)

As for Option 3, this site is on ancient woodland, so development here would not normally be acceptable at all in planning terms. In addition the site is remote from the existing settlement centres of Ifold and Plaistow, making it even less sustainable in travel terms.

Option 5 (Land north of Todhurst)

This option is in Plaistow rather than Ifold, giving access to the school and village hall. However there would be loss of woodland and impacts on the ancient woodland and pond adjacent.

Option 6 (land at Little Springfield Farm)

This site is separated from Ifold by fields, increasing its negative impact on landscape and urban forms. The site is also adjacent to ancient woodland.

Option 7 (land north of Little Springfield Farm) [submitted option]

This option is adjacent to the existing settlement boundary of Ifold (albeit on the other side of the road) and is the only site not on or adjacent to ancient woodland. In that sense it is the least worst option environmentally, with positive impacts for housing and employment.

2.3 Employment Site Options

2.3.1 Chichester Employment Sites

Option 1 (the Bus Garage)

The main positive impacts of the site would be on reducing the need to travel, increasing cycling and walking and providing good access to facilities and jobs. These are all related to the very central location.

The main negative impact is the demolition of a building of quality and interest. Additional traffic will add to air quality problems.

Option 2 (the Post Office Depot)

Similarly to Option 1 this central site has a positive impact on travel, accessibility and economic objectives. Re-development would have a positive impact on the townscape of the canal basin.

The main negative impact would be additional traffic adding to air quality issues.

Option 3 (the Bus Station)

This option would have to rely on a central location for the re-location of the existing facility in order to avoid a serious negative impact on bus usage within the City.

The main positive impact is predicted to be come from the very central location, similar to Option 1 and 2 above - access to jobs and facilities, reducing the need to travel and encouraging walking and cycling. However the site is surrounded by busy roads on three sides (and train tracks on the fourth), which reduces its accessibility slightly.

Option 4 (Chichester High School, Kingsham Road) [submitted option]

This is also a central location, but slightly further from the main shops than options 1-3. Access is reasonable. There are few negative impacts.

Option 5 (land West of Frederick Road)

This site is on the edge of the city with landscape impacts. Access by means other than car is difficult and even then the site access to the A27 is convoluted. There are few positive impacts other than some economic ones.

Option 6 (Plot 12 Terminus Road) [submitted option]

This site is within the existing industrial estate and has a limited impact on landscape of the historic environment. The connection to the A27 is good, but the site is remote from walking and cycling links and from the train station.

Option 7 (Mixed use plot at 41 Terminus Road)

The location next to the Chichester Gate development allows for a wider range of potential uses and this is also supported by the more central location with good access by a variety of means. Development here would put additional pressure on the Stockbridge roundabout with air pollution

impacts, but these will be limited by the small size of the site. This site was included in the preferred approach version of the DPD, but was removed before submission due to a restrictive covenant on residential development.

2.3.2 Wider Chichester Employment sites.

Option 1 (land at Clay Lane, Fishbourne)

A good location for jobs locally within Fishbourne, but less so for meeting Chichester's needs. The main negative impacts are on biodiversity and air pollution.

Option 2 (Land south of the A27)

Extending Chichester to the south of the A27 has negative impacts on landscape (getting closer to the Harbour AONB) and on biodiversity (closer to the Harbour SPA/SAC). The A27 also acts a barrier to pedestrian access but good road access make the site attractive from an economic standpoint.

Option 3 (land to the rear of 69 Fishbourne Road)

The direct proximity to the SNCI and possible knock on effects on the Harbour are the main issues with this site. Good local accessibility and provision for local jobs needs are the main positive impacts.

Option 4 (Site 3 Tangmere City Fields)

This option does not directly compare with the others in this section, due to the location and therefore potentially meeting different economic needs. However this site could meet some of Chichester's need for employment sites. The relative remoteness of the site and lack of cycling/walking/train links militate against this. As a local employment site it has few drawbacks. To meet district wide needs it is more questionable, good access to the A27 is its main positive in that regard.

2.3.3 North Mundham and Runcton Employment sites

Option 1 (land south of Bognor Road)

This large site can accommodate a range of uses, meeting wider than just parish needs. Closer to transport links than the other option. The site has the potential to affect biodiversity and water quality negatively, but delivers well on the economic objectives.

Option 2 (Walnut Tree Field)

The site is more remote and would be more attractive to horticultural uses than office development. Accessibility is not as good as option 1, but this could be mitigated through the type of employment use on the site. This option is less sensitive than Option 1 for wildlife and water quality.

2.3.4 Oving Employment sites

Option 1 (land west of Sherwood Nursery)

For this site, negative impacts outnumbered the positive ones, with biodiversity loss and poor access to facilities and transport links being the primary issues.

Option 2 (land north of Fuel Depot)

This site has similar drawbacks to Option 1, but with the addition of concerns over contaminated land. The main positive for options 1 and 2 is the large amount of space that they could provide for development.

Option 3 (land south of Shopwyke Road)

This site is broadly similar to options 1 and 2, but without the negative impacts on biodiversity and contaminated land. Remoteness from the city centre and transport links remains a concern but the site is more sustainable than its near neighbours in options 1 and 2.

Option 4 (Chichester Garden Centre)

This site is still further from Chichester than the options above, but the location on a major dual carriageway may make it attractive to a wider range of employers than Options 5 and 6 below. The site is prominent and visible and re-development would involve the loss or re-location of the present use, which reduced the overall economic benefit.

Options 5 and 6 (Lansdowne Nursery and Sherwood Nursery)

These two adjacent sites have very similar profiles of impacts, both positive and negative. The re-use of the existing nursery development minimises the landscape impact, but the sites are more remote from the city than options 1-3, increasing the need to travel and reducing the opportunities to do so on foot or by bicycle. In addition they do not have good access to the A27 either.

Option 7 (Springfield Park, Merston) [submitted option]

This option is closer into the city than options 4-6, reducing the need to travel and as a site in existing use (as a lorry park) re-development would not have major new landscape impacts. The Bognor Road roundabout would offer reasonable access to the city and the A27, helping attract high quality businesses.

Option 8 (the Fuel Depot, Bognor Road) [submitted option]

This site fronts onto the A27 and the Bognor Roundabout, making it a slightly more sustainable location than option 7 above, otherwise its impact profile is quite similar to the adjacent Option 7. However its former use raises contaminated land and water pollution concerns that will need to be addressed and mitigated to allow for re-development. If that occurs the negative impacts predicted could be removed (due to the mitigation measures).

2.3.5 Hunston Employment sites

Option 1 (Land at Chislee)

This option has also been considered as a housing site. As an employment site its location, separated from the village of Hunston is less important than as a housing site, but it is still remote

from the facilities of either Chichester or Hunston for those working there. However on the positive side, access to the A27 is good.

Option 2 (Watery Lane Frontage)

This option fronts onto the A27 and in townscape terms it would extend Chichester on to the south side of this road. The location would attract certain types of employment use but is remote from the train stations, but is on a good bus route. The new pedestrian bridge does connect the site well to the Whyke estate, more so than the village of Hunston.

3. NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

The approach adopted is to use expert judgement to identify positive, neutral and negative effects through the assessment matrices. The main sustainability effects on a set of policy options are then summarised in a more visual form through the use of bar chart diagrams. These are the best place to start, but the full matrix should be referred to, especially to distinguish between neutral effect and no effect / no significant effect. The full assessment text is also where any uncertainties and any differences between short medium and long term effects are identified.

The SA was carried out by members the Environment Management team within the Environment Directorate of CDC. The team is responsible for the development and implementation of policy and projects that contribute to Sustainable Development within the Council and within the District as a whole. The Local Plan documents were prepared by the Planning Policy team within the Environment Communities Directorate of CDC. The two teams have worked closely together on the development of options and the presentation of findings, but the assessment itself has been independent from plan writing. The two teams have separate line management structure below Executive Director level.

Uncertainties always exist in any assessment, especially a qualitative assessment such as this. The cause and effect relationships, deductions and assumptions that underline the assessment matrices are not definitive and all predictions carry some uncertainty. In addition there is also a risk that other viable options have not been identified and assessed or may have been identified early on and not eliminated prematurely. We have attempted to minimise these latter risks through early discussion with policy planners and by keeping an audit record of these discussions and of early-stage options not taken further.

One of the main reasons for issuing the SA for public consultation is to solicit the views of organisations and individuals on the uncertainties and assumptions contained within the SA. The written comments within the matrices identify where specific uncertainties are considered to exist. The consultation comments were then taken into account, and assessment revised as appropriate before this SA report was prepared.

4.1 The SA Framework

The framework was established by the SA Scoping Report (which is also available on the District Council website). The working engine of the SA process is the assessment criteria. These questions

are asked of the policy options to assess how far the options impact positively or negatively on the achievement of the SA objective.

However, for the sake of brevity short names are used for the assessment criteria in the assessment matrices and the summary charts. These are:

| SA Objective | SA Assessment Criteria | Short Name |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| 1) Protect and enhance wildlife | Does the option prevent biodiversity loss and habitat fragmentation? | 1A. Biodiversity Loss |
| | Does the option allow for movement of habitats with climate change? | 1B. Habitat migration |
| | Does the option enhance biodiversity opportunities and create new habitat? | 1C. Habitat creation |
| 2) Maximise efficient use of natural resources | Does the option protect water resources? | 2A. Water resources |
| | Does the option maximise use of waste resources? | 2B. Waste resources |
| | Does the option make efficient use of energy, make consumption more sustainable and reduce food miles? | 2C. Sustainable consumption |
| 3) Reduce pollution | Does the option reduce air pollution from industrial processes and transport? | 3A. Air pollution |
| | Will the option assist the remediation of contaminated land? | 3B. Contaminated land |
| | Does the option reduce levels of water pollution? | 3C. Water pollution |
| 4) Achieve zero net increase in greenhouse gas emissions | Does the option maximise the use of renewable and low carbon energy sources | 4A. Low carbon energy |
| | Does the option reduce the need to travel? | 4B. Need to travel |
| | Does the option minimise the embodied carbon in goods and buildings? | 4C. Embodied carbon |
| 5) Minimise flood risk for new and existing development | Does the option reduce the risk of coastal, fluvial surface water and groundwater flooding? | 5A. Flood risk |
| | Does the option increase the use of SUDS and provide opportunities for restoring natural function to river and coastal systems? | 5B. Sustainable drainage |
| 6) Does the option ensure the district adapts to the effects of climate change | Does the option ensure the district adapts to the effects of climate change? | 6. Adapt to climate change |
| 7) Achieve a sustainable and integrated transport system | Does the option achieve modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport, integrating bus and train networks? | 7A. Modal shift |
| | Does the option create able networks for cyclists and pedestrians? | 7B. Cycling and walking |
| 8) Conserve and enhance landscape and built | Does the option encourage sustainable land management practices for landscape conservation? | 8A. Landscape conservation |

| SA Objective | SA Assessment Criteria | Short Name |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| heritage | Does the option ensure protection of traditional urban forms? | 8B. Traditional urban forms |
| | Does the option ensure protection of listed buildings, conservation areas and archaeological sites? | 8C. Historic environment |
| 9) Increase availability of affordable housing | Does the option meet local housing need? | 9A. Housing needs |
| | Does the option provide the right housing mix of size and tenure, allowing for the continuation of sustainable mix of people within communities? | 9B. Sustainable mix |
| 10) Provide access to services and facilities | Does the option improve access to services and facilities? | 10. Access to facilities |
| 11) Improve community safety | Does the option Improve community safety? | 11. Community Safety |
| 12) Promote economic development to maintain quality of life and competitiveness | Does the option deliver improved quality of life for all? | 12A. Quality of life |
| | Does the option ensure that economic opportunities area accessible to all? | 12B. Access to jobs |
| | Does the option ensure that value added is retained in the District? | 12C. Value added |
| 13) Develop a dynamic diverse and knowledge based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities | Does the option encourage innovation? | 13A. Encourage innovation |
| | Does the option develop knowledge based economy locally? | 13B. Knowledge based economy |
| 14) To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness | Does the option ensure skills are enhanced to increase access to works? | 14A. Enhanced skills |
| | Does the option ensure a skilled workforce is available locally to allow business developments? | 14B. Skilled workforce |
| 15) Enable viability of the rural economy with enhanced diversity of employment opportunities | Does the option promote a prosperous and diverse rural economy? | 15A. Rural economy |
| | Does the option promote sustainable tourism? | 15B. Sustainable Tourism |

4. CONSULTATION

This SA has been subject to consultation at each stage of the DPD preparation process. The final consultation closed in January 2017 and the SA was finalised ready for submission of the DPD in March 2017. Following Main Modifications made at Examination the SA has been reviewed but as the site options remain as submitted, even when changes have been made to the wording of policies, the SA findings remain unchanged from the Submission version.