

Regulation 14 Draft Petworth Neighbourhood Plan

Draft Sustainability Appraisal:

Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment

on behalf of Petworth Town Council

March 2017

Draft Sustainability Appraisal
Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment

Regulation 14 Draft
Petworth Neighbourhood Plan

March 2017

London

Riverside House
Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA

t: +44 (0)20 7261 4240
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Manchester

Eastgate
2 Castle Street, Castlefield
Manchester M3 4LZ

t: +44 (0)161 819 6570
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Weybridge

Suite A, 3 Weybridge
Business Park, Addlestone Road,
Weybridge, Surrey KT15 2BW

t: +44 (0)1932 837 850
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Nexus
Planning

Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.0 | Introduction..... | 4 |
| 2.0 | The Sustainability Framework..... | 6 |
| 3.0 | Methodology..... | 7 |
| 4.0 | The Sustainability Framework and The Neighbourhood Plan Objectives | 10 |
| 5.0 | Site Alternatives | 12 |
| 6.0 | The Sustainability Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Policies | 13 |
| 7.0 | Assessment Conclusion..... | 36 |
| 8.0 | Mitigating Adverse Effects..... | 37 |
| 9.0 | Monitoring the Environmental Effects of the Plan | 38 |

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This is a Draft Sustainability Appraisal (“SA”) of the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft version (April 2017) of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan. The Petworth Neighbourhood Plan will set out a vision for the future of the area to 2032, providing a strategy to manage improvements and a land use framework for development. If supported at referendum, the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan will gain statutory status and form part of the Development Plan, against which development proposals will be considered.
- 1.2 A Neighbourhood Plan must meet a number of basic conditions, as set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 and applied to Neighbourhood Plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These basic conditions include the requirement that the making of the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations. Where a Neighbourhood Plan could have significant environmental effects, it may fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment Regulations 2004 (which seeks to implement European Union Directive 2001/42/EC) and therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (“SEA”).
- 1.3 An Appropriate Assessment considering the potential impacts of the level of development at Petworth over the period up to 2032 has been undertaken by the South Downs National Park Authority. The emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan requires the delivery of 150 additional new homes and 0.5 hectares of new employment land at Petworth. For the purpose of the Appropriate Assessment, the only sites considered relevant are Special Areas of Conservation (“SACs”). The Appropriate Assessment concludes that there would be no adverse impacts on sites of European habitats or species as defined under the European Union’s Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC as a result of the level of development proposed at Petworth over the period up to 2032.
- 1.4 A SA extends the concept of SEA as a process through which to assess the environmental as well as social and economic impacts of a policy, plan or programme and its likely contribution to the delivery of sustainable development overall. The SA fully incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive.
- 1.5 Consultation on the SA Scoping Report was undertaken between January and May 2016, parallel to consultation on the options stage of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan. The SA Scoping Report set out the intended scope of, and methodology for, appraising the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan. The Petworth Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Objectives set out in the Scoping Report were informed by a review of other plans and policies, notably the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan’s own Sustainability Objectives, and an

appraisal of the key characteristics specific to Petworth as identified in the Baseline Report. Following consultation the Baseline Report has been subsequently updated. Both the Scoping Report (February 2016) and updated Baseline Report are available online at <http://www.petworth-tc.org.uk>.

- 1.6 Following consultation, it was not considered that the Sustainability Objectives required amending further. These Sustainability Objectives therefore now provide the framework SA for this appraisal of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan objectives and policies.

Structure of the Report

- 1.7 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** sets out the Sustainability Objectives which form the framework for appraising the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan;
- **Section 3** describes the methodological approach taken to this SA;
- **Section 4** provides an appraisal of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan objectives;
- **Section 5** provides a background on the Site Alternatives;
- **Section 6** provides an appraisal of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan policies;
- **Section 7** provides conclusions on the overall assessment;
- **Section 8** outlines the mitigation required to address possible identified adverse effects; and
- **Section 9** identifies means through which to monitor the environmental effects of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan.

- 1.8 Any comments on this draft SA report should be addressed to:

Petworth Neighbourhood plan
Petworth Town Council
Golden Squire
The Old Bakery
Petworth
West Sussex, GU28 0AP

- 1.9 The closing date for receipt of comments is **15th May 2017**.

2.0 The Sustainability Framework

2.1 The Petworth Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Objectives that form the SA framework against which the Neighbourhood Plan Key Principles and policies are assessed are set out within Table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

| Sustainability Objectives | |
|---------------------------|--|
| 1. | To conserve and enhance landscape character. |
| 2. | To ensure the Petworth community is prepared for the impacts of climate change. |
| 3. | To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases. |
| 4. | To conserve and enhance the biodiversity within Petworth. |
| 5. | Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. |
| 6. | To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health and well-being. |
| 7. | To improve accessibility to all health, educational, leisure and community services. |
| 8. | To improve the efficiency and safety of transport networks by enhancing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and by promoting policies which reduce the need to travel and increase pedestrian safety on the roads. |
| 9. | To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a good quality, affordable home, suitable to their need and which optimises the scope for environmental sustainability. |
| 10. | Enable viability of the local economy with improved diversity of employment opportunities and provision of space for required employment growth. |
| 11. | To reduce levels of deprivation within Petworth. |
| 12. | Minimise flood risk for new and existing development. |
| 13. | To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector. |

3.0 Methodology

3.1 This methodology follows the broad stages set out in the guidance document 'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive' (September 2005) and the Planning Practice Guidance. This SA Report reflects Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects; Stage C: Preparing the SA report; and Stage D: Consulting on the draft Plan and SA report.

B1: Testing the Neighbourhood Plan objectives against the Sustainability Objectives of this framework

3.2 The draft Petworth Neighbourhood Plan objectives are assessed against the Sustainability Objectives of the framework and classified in terms of compatibility, as set out in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1: Compatibility rating

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| ✓ | Positively compatible |
| 0 | Neutral / no effect |
| X | Negatively compatible |

B2: Developing and refining options including reasonable alternatives

- 3.3 The policies of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan must be in line with existing higher-tier policies and guidance contained in the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan 1999; the emerging policies of the South Downs National Park Local Plan; the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
- 3.4 The emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan Policy SD23 requires the delivery of 150 new homes at Petworth over the period up to 2032. Should the Neighbourhood Plan not seek to allocate land to deliver these new homes then the South Downs National Park Authority would be obliged to do so.
- 3.5 The preparation of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan has been an iterative process, led by a clear vision for the future of Petworth. A key part of the SA is evaluating any reasonable alternative policy options.
- 3.6 With regard to housing allocation options, 32 sites were initially identified for potential housing development including those promoted by the South Downs National Park Authority. Through the site assessment process undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Groups, 11 of these sites were assessed to be suitable for housing development. The remaining sites were

not considered suitable for housing. Using the 11 sites assessed as being potentially suitable for housing, the Neighbourhood Plan Working Groups developed three housing sites option packages that would deliver the required 150 new homes. The three options comprised:

Option 1: Allocation of two sites near to the centre of the town and a further area of housing to the south of Petworth, creating a new southern access to the school;

Option 2: Allocates the majority of development to the west of the town, with smaller sites around Rothermead, Rotherbridge Lane and an extension of Sheepdown Close;

Option 3: Allocates the development to the north of the town around Hampers Green. The option includes a large site opposite Hampers Green and smaller sites accessed from Northend Close.

- 3.7 In some instances, a 'No Policy' option to 'do nothing' has been considered against the proposed Neighbourhood Plan policy. This option broadly relies upon existing local and national policy guidance including the Saved policies of the Chichester Local Plan 1999; the emerging policies of the South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Stage B3 & B4: Predicting and evaluating the effects of the plan

- 3.8 Where the implementation of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan objectives or policies is likely to change the existing *situation*, the effects are assessed in terms of the nature of the effect (positive, negative, neutral, or uncertain) and where possible and appropriate its magnitude and duration over time. Table 3.2 sets out the terminology used within the appraisal matrices within Section 6 of the Report.

Table 3.2: Key for assessment of effects

| Positive | | Uncertain | Neutral | Negative | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ++ | + | ? | 0 | - | -- |
| Significant positive effect on the objective | Positive effect on the objective | Uncertain effect on the objective | No effect on the objective | Negative effect on the objective | Significant effect on the objective |

3.9 Predictions are supported by evidence, such as references to research, baseline information, discussions or consultation, which helped those carrying out the SA to reach their conclusions. The key evidence base sources available on line at: <http://www.petworth-tc.org.uk>.

B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects

3.10 Throughout the assessment process, where impacts have been identified appropriate mitigation and/ or avoidance measures have been identified where possible. Further consideration of mitigating adverse effects is provided within Section 6.

B6: Proposing measures to monitor the environmental effects of the plan

3.11 The significant adverse environmental effects of the implementation of plans must be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse effects and to enable appropriate remedial action to be taken.

4.0 The Sustainability Framework and The Neighbourhood Plan Objectives

- 4.1 This section appraises the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan theme objectives and predicts the significance of the impact upon the Sustainability Objectives of the SA framework. Table 4.1 demonstrates the key for the comparison between the Neighbourhood Plan theme objectives and the SA Objectives.

Table 4.1: Comparison Key

| |
|--------------------------|
| ✓ Positive compatibility |
| 0 Neutral/ No Effect |
| X Negative compatibility |

Compatibility of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan Objectives and the SA framework Sustainability Objectives

- 4.2 It is important that the SA objectives of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan (Table 2.1) are in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan theme objectives. As set out within Table 4.2, the majority of the theme objectives of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan are positively compatible with, or have a neutral effect on the SA framework where there is no association between the objectives / principles.

Table 4.2 Neighbourhood Plan Theme Objectives compatibility with Sustainability Appraisal Framework Objectives

| | | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Table 2.1) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Neighborhood Plan Theme Objectives | HO1 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | HO2 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 |
| | HO3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| | HO4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| | HO5 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | HO6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | HO7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO1 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO2 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO3 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO4 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO6 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | ESDO7 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | WS1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | WS2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | WS3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | WS4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | WS5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | WS6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| | GO1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GO2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GO3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GO4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | GO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | LWO1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | LWO2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | LWO3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LWO4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

5.0 Site Alternatives

5.1 As previously referred within Section 4, as part of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan process a number of sites have been promoted by landowners as having the potential to accommodate new development. The following section summarises the 11 housing sites that have been promoted for development and considered appropriate through the site assessment process and feedback from public consultation:

Residential Development

5.2 The following 11 sites have been promoted and considered potentially suitable for residential development through the site assessment process:

- Site PW01
- Site PW03
- Site PW05
- Site PW18
- Site PW19
- Site PW21
- Site PW23
- Site PW24
- Site PW25
- Site PW26
- Site PW31

5.3 To ensure delivery of 150 new homes, three packages of housing sites were developed with the Neighbourhood Plan Working Groups, each option comprising sufficient land to deliver 150 new homes. The housing sites included within each option comprise:

Option 1: Sites PW23, PW24, PW25 and PW31;

Option 2: Sites PW18, PW19, PW21 and PW26; and

Option 3: Sites PW01, PW03 and PW05.

Employment Development

5.4 Only one site has been promoted for and considered potentially suitable for employment use:

- Land east of Hampers Common Industrial Estate.

6.0 The Sustainability Framework and the Neighbourhood Plan Policies

6.1 This section appraises the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan policies and predicts the significance of the impact upon the Sustainability Objectives of the SA framework (Table 2.1). The significance assessment applies the 'significant positive' to significant negative' impact range methodology set out within Table 3.2. The results of this appraisal help to identify and describe the likely sustainability impacts of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy PP1: Settlement Boundary

Summary of the Options:

6.2 To include a policy that redefines the existing settlement boundary to include sites allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan and sets out that development outside the redefined settlement boundary will be resisted. Alternatively, reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework, and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Settlement boundary | + | 0 | 0 | -/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | - | 0 | 0 | -/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

6.3 To include a policy that redefines the settlement boundary and resists development outside the redefined settlement boundary.

Assessment Comment:

6.4 The settlement boundary scored more positively against the objectives, particularly against the landscape objective.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.5 The 'No policy' options was rejected as it provides less policy protection against inappropriate development outside the settlement boundary.

Policy PP2: Core Planning Principles

Summary of the Options:

- 6.6 To include a policy that sets out the overarching core planning principles for future development at Petworth. Alternatively, reliance on the Neighbourhood Plan vision, supporting key principles and objectives.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Core planning principles | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | ? | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.7 The preferred option is to include a core planning principles policy.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.8 The preferred option performed more effectively against the objectives as it provides greater certainty that development proposals will take account of cumulative impact of development within Petworth as well as the overarching policy objective of ensuring all development has appropriate regard to the town's historic character and National Park setting.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.9 The 'No Policy' option was also rejected as provided less positive and certain outcomes.

Policy H1: Allocate land for 150 net additional new homes

Summary of the Options:

- 6.10 A key requirement of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan is to be in general conformity with the policies contained within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review and the emerging policies of the South Downs National Park Local Plan. Therefore, in accordance with Policy SD23 of the emerging Local Plan allocates land for 150 new homes within the Petworth.
- 6.11 Informed by the individual site assessment process, to ensure delivery of 150 new dwellings three alternative collective sites options were developed. These options being:

Option 1: Sites PW23, PW24, PW25 and PW31;

Option 2: Sites PW18, PW19, PW21 and PW26

Option 3: Sites PW01, PW03 and PW05.

- 6.12 To provide a comprehensive understanding, in addition to assessing the options, the individual sites that were identified as potentially deliverable and developable for the allocation options have also been individually assessed.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Option 1 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Option 2 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Option 3 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |

| Individual Sites | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Site PW01 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW03 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW05 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW19 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW21 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW23 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW24 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW25 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW26 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0/- | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| Site PW31 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | + | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.13 The preferred option is Option 3, which comprises Sites PW23, PW24, PW25 and PW31.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.14 All three-policy options performed relatively positively with no significant negatives identified. However, the preferred option score slightly more positively, particularly against accessibility to health, educational and other community facilities and services and improving local transport network safety.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.15 Whilst all three options achieve positive outcomes, Option 2 and 3 were rejected as the benefits associated within the new school access and parking / drop off area that could be delivered through Option 1 was considered a significant benefit over the benefits associated with Option 2 and 3. Option 1 was also supported by community feedback in 2016.

Policy H2: Integrated windfall sites

Summary of the Options:

- 6.16 To include a policy that encourages and supports windfall developments within the defined settlement boundary. Alternatively, reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework; and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Infill Policy | + | 0 | 0 | + | ? | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | + | 0 | 0 | + | ? | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.17 The preferred option is to include a windfall policy.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.18 Both options achieve the same outcomes. However, including a policy is considered a more positive and proactive approach, particularly as it helps support the Neighbourhood Plan aspiration development policies.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.19 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is considered to be a more positive and proactive approach.

Policy H3: Housing Type and Mix

Summary of the Options:

- 6.20 To include a housing type and mix policy to ensure that development proposals provide the right type and mix of housing to meet local need. Alternatively, reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Housing type mix policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? |

Preferred Option:

6.21 The preferred option is to include a Petworth housing type and mix policy.

Assessment Comment:

6.22 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option performed slightly more effectively against the objectives as it ensures that the housing type and mix needs of Petworth residents now and in the future are met through future developments. Both options may have a positive outcome toward reducing deprivation by ensuring that the appropriate size and type of accommodation is available to meet local needs.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.23 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it was considered to provide less certainty for the community over the type and mix of housing that would be supported by the Town Council and local community.

Policy H4: Affordable Housing Provision

Summary of the Options:

6.24 To provide a policy setting out affordable housing provision requirements from new residential development; or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review and the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Affordable housing policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Preferred Option:

6.25 The preferred option is to include an affordable housing policy.

Assessment Comment:

6.26 Both options scored equally as the policy requirements between the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan broadly align.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.27 Not having a policy was rejected as it was considered more preferable to have an affordable housing policy to provide the local community with certainty that developments coming

forward would be required to deliver affordable housing. Having a policy also provides developers and landowners with certainty over what the Town Council and local community expect by way of affordable housing provision.

Policy H5: Rotherlea

Summary of the Options:

- 6.28 The Policy H5 option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1, but defines the extent of the developable area, and sets out site-specific design criteria. The alternative 'No Policy' option does not define the extent of the developable area or important design criteria.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Rotherlea site policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.29 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and defined the extent of the developable area and site-specific design criteria.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.30 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that site-specific design criteria will help to ensure that development impact on character are mitigated, avoided or reduced. Clearly defining the extent of the site will assist in providing the community with certainty of the developable area.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.31 The 'No Policy' option was rejected, as the preferred option will ensure site-specific design measures are achieved.

Policy H6: The Square Field

Summary of the Options:

- 6.32 The Policy H6 option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1, but defines the extent of the developable area, and sets out design and landscape protection

criteria. The alternative 'No Policy' option does not define the extent of the developable area or important design and landscape protection criteria.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| The Square Field site policy | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.33 The preferred option is to include a Policy allocating the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and defining the extent of the developable area and site-specific design and landscape protection criteria.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.34 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that site-specific design and landscape protection criteria will help to ensure that development impact on the town's character and surrounding National Park landscape are mitigated, avoided or reduced. Clearly defining the extent of the site will assist in providing the community with certainty of the extent of the development area.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.35 The 'No Policy' option was rejected, as the preferred option will help to ensure site-specific design and landscape measures are achieved.

Policy H7: Petworth South

Summary of the Options:

- 6.36 The Policy H7 option allocates the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1, but defines the extent of the developable area, and sets out design and landscape protection criteria. The alternative 'No Policy' option would not define the extent of the developable area site-specific design and landscape protection criteria.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Petworth south site policy | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.37 The preferred option is to include a Policy allocating the site for residential use in accordance with Policy H1 and define the extent of the developable area and site-specific design and landscape protection criteria.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.38 The appraisal of the preferred option indicates that site-specific design and landscape protection criteria will ensure that landscape impact is mitigated, avoided or reduced and any development on the site will deliver transport and community benefits, in the form of a new area for parking and drop off at Petworth Primary School. Clearly defining the extent of the site will also assist in providing the community with certainty of the extent of the development area.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.39 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option will ensure this site-specific design and landscape protection measure are achieved.

Policy ESD1: Character and Design

Summary of the Options:

- 6.40 To include a policy that sets out Petworth specific design guidance to inform development proposals; or reliance on the strategic design policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Character and design | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.41 The preferred option is to include a policy setting out specific design guidance to inform development proposals.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.42 Both options scored positively outcome. However, the Petworth specific design guidance policy will ensure development proposals better reflected local character, design and materials.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.43 The development management decision-making process at the National Park level may not fully ensure that development proposals have been influenced by local character, materials and design principles. The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it was considered to provide the community with less certainty.

Policy ESD2: Housing Density

Summary of the Options:

- 6.44 To include a policy that sets out Petworth specific residential density guidance to inform development proposals; or reliance on the strategic design policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|-----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Housing density | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.45 The preferred option is to include a policy setting out Petworth specific residential density thresholds.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.46 The Petworth specific density policy was considered to potentially achieve greater certainty that a policy outcome would be achieved.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.47 The development management decision-making process at the National Park level was not considered to provide the same level of certainty for developers and housebuilders over the density that would be supported by Petworth Town Council and the local community. The 'No Policy' option was therefore rejected.

Policy ESD3: Requirements for a Design and Access Statement

Summary of the Options:

- 6.48 To include a policy that enables the residents and businesses within the Neighbourhood Area to actively shape and influence development proposals coming forward through clearly setting out the aspects to be addressed within Design and Access Statements submitted as part of qualifying planning applications. An alternative option would be to rely on the existing development management decision-making process led by the South Downs National Park Authority.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Design and Access Statement detail | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.49 The preferred option is to include a policy setting out the key aspects to be addressed within Design and Access Statements within the Neighbourhood Area.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.50 Both options scored positive outcomes. However, the Design and Access Statement policy will help to ensure that the design aspects, which are considered locally important, are fully considered early in the design process.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.51 The development management decision-making process at the National Park level does not ensure that all neighbourhood level important design aspects will be fully addressed and considered. The 'No Policy' option was therefore rejected.

Policy ESD4: Preserving Local Green Space

Summary of the Options:

- 6.52 To designate Local Green Spaces which are demonstrably special to Petworth residents; rely on market and community actions and / or strategic National Park Authority policies and strategies to protect these locally important spaces.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Assets of community value | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.53 To include a policy and designation of Local Green Spaces.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.54 The preferred option achieves more positive outcomes against the objectives than the 'No Policy' alternative.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.55 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to provide greater certainty to the local community over the continued protection of locally special green spaces.

Policy EDS5: Public Green Spaces

Summary of the Options:

- 6.56 To include a policy that requires improvements to green space provision within the Neighbourhood Area; or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Public green spaces | + | + | 0 | + | +/? | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | +/? | 0 | +/? | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.57 The preferred option is to include a policy requiring delivery of public open space on sites allocated for residential development within the Neighbourhood Plan.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.58 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option was considered to achieve more certain outcomes over the delivery of public green space.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.59 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to be a more positive, certain and proactive approach.

Policy EDS6: Landscape and Visual Impact

Summary of the Options:

- 6.60 To include a policy that requires landscape and visual impact investigations for all new development that may have an impact on the character of the South Downs National Park. Alternatively rely on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, National Planning Policy Framework, and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Landscape and visual impact | ++ | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.61 The preferred option is to include a policy requiring appropriate landscape and visual impact investigations for all new development on the edge of Petworth.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.62 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option was considered to achieve more certain outcomes over ensuring that development proposals have been informed by a design led approach to minimise visual impact on the countryside surrounding Petworth.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.63 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to provide greater certainty that landscape and visual impacts would be investigated and appropriately mitigated, reduced or avoided through a landscape led approach to development.

Policy ESD7: Biodiversity and Trees

Summary of the Options:

- 6.64 To include a policy that seeks to protect the natural environment and trees and promote the protection and enhancement of biodiversity corridors and networks. Alternatively, reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Biodiversity and trees | + | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | +/? | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.65 The preferred option is to include a biodiversity and trees policy.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.66 The inclusion of a biodiversity policy achieves a significant positive outcomes for supporting and protecting biodiversity and positive outcomes for helping to protect the town's urban and rural character. The No Option achieve less certain delivery outcomes.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.67 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to be a more positive, certain and proactive approach.

Policy ESD8: Sustainable Design

Summary of the Options:

- 6.68 To include a policy that encourages development proposals to incorporate low carbon construction and energy efficiency measures; or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs

National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Sustainable design | 0 | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.69 The preferred option is to support and encourage the construction of exemplar high quality sustainable development. The policy approach achieves a significant positive outcome against seeking to address the causes of climate change.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.70 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option achieved significant positive outcomes against proactively seeking to address the causes of climate change.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.71 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

Policy WS1: Petworth Town Centre

Summary of the Options:

- 6.72 To include a Petworth Town Centre specific policy or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|---|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Town centre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | ++ |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | +/? |

Preferred Option:

- 6.73 The Preferred Option is the inclusion of a Petworth Town Centre specific policy. This new policy will encourage new retail, leisure, hotel and office development, which should be

located within the defined town centre boundary, or follow a sequential approach under specific criteria.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.74 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option performed more effectively against the objectives as it provides a locally specific policy framework to support Petworth Town Centre’s vitality and viability.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.75 The ‘No Policy’ option was rejected as the preferred option was a more positive and proactive approach to Petworth Town Centre.

Policy WS2: Visitor Accommodation

Summary of the Options:

- 6.76 To include a visitor accommodation policy or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved polices of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|----|----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
| Visitor accommodation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ++ |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | 0 | 0 | +/? |

Preferred Option:

- 6.77 The preferred option is the inclusion of a visitor accommodation policy, which would support Petworth as a tourist destination.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.78 The preferred option achieves more positive outcomes against the objectives than the ‘No Policy’ alternative, particularly support for the tourism economy.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.79 The ‘No Policy’ option was rejected as the preferred option is a more positive and proactive approach.

Policy WS3: Hampers Common Industrial Estate

Summary of the Options:

- 6.80 To include a policy protecting Hampers Common Industrial Estate as an important local employment site; or reliance on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Hampers Common Industrial Estate site policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | +/? | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | ? | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.81 The preferred option is the inclusion of Hampers Common Industrial Estate protection policy.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.82 The preferred option achieves more positive and certain outcomes against the objectives than the 'No Policy' alternative, particularly support for the local Petworth economy.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.83 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to be a more positive and proactive approach.

Policy WS4: Land east of Hampers Common Industrial Estate

Summary of the Options:

- 6.84 The Policy WS4 option allocates the site for B1, B2 and B8 business activities. Alternatively, the 'No Policy' option requires any proposals for the site to be assessed against the existing policies within the higher level Development Plan and the NPPF; or the site is allocated within the emerging Local Plan. The site currently lies outside the existing defined settlement boundary.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|----|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
| Land east of Hampers Common Industrial Estate | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | +/? | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

6.85 The preferred option is to include a policy allocating the site for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

Assessment Comment:

6.86 Both of the options scored well against the framework objectives. However, the inclusion of a policy support local employment opportunities. Given the site is located on the edge of the settlement there are potential landscape impact issues associated with development on the site. However, and landscape impacts could be mitigated or avoidance measures put in place as part of the design and development management process. Policy wording can be included to ensure appropriate consideration is given to landscape impact as part of the development management process. There is uncertain outcomes under the No Policy option on the basis that the South Downs National Park Authority may look to allocate employment land at Petworth as part of the Local Plan process in order to meet employment land needs across the National Park.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.87 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it was considered a less positive and uncertain option to helping to deliver future local employment land needs.

Policy GA1: Parking Requirements

Summary of the Options:

6.88 To include a policy setting out residential car parking space requirements and protection measures against the loss of existing residential car parking spaces below the Neighbourhood Plan standards; or rely on strategic South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council policy mechanisms.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | |
| Parking requirements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.89 The Preferred Option is to include a policy setting out residential car parking space requirements and car parking space loss protections.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.90 The preferred option scores positively against the objectives, particularly in relation to helping to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety on residential roads.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.91 The 'No Policy' option was rejected, as the preferred option was the more positive approach on highway safety.

Policy GA2: Pedestrian and Cycle Movement

Summary of the Options:

- 6.92 To include a policy encouraging good walking and cycling connections to the town centre from allocated sites; or rely on strategic South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council policy mechanisms.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Pedestrian and cycle movement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.93 The Preferred Option is to include a policy encouraging the creation of a safe walking and cycling connections.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.94 The preferred option scores positively against the objectives, particularly in relation to improving health and transport choices.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.95 The 'No Policy' option was rejected, as the preferred option was the more positive approach.

Policy GA3: Traffic Calming Measures

Summary of the Options:

6.96 To include a policy encouraging measures to reduce traffic speeds through the town centre and enforce against heavy good vehicles passing through the town. Alternatively, rely on strategic South Downs National Park Authority and West Sussex County Council policy mechanisms.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Traffic calming measures | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

6.97 The Preferred Option is to include a policy encouraging traffic calming measures within the town centre.

Assessment Comment:

6.98 The preferred option scores positively against the objectives, particularly in relation to conserving the historic environment, pedestrian and cyclist safety and health and well-being.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

6.99 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to provide more positive and certain outcomes.

Policy GA4: To protect and increase car-parking capacity at Pound Street Car Park

Summary of the Options:

6.100 To include a policy setting out support for measures to provide additional car parking capacity in Pound Street Car Park; or rely on strategic Chichester District Council policy / strategy mechanisms.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Pond street car park | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.101 The Preferred Option is to include a policy setting out support for measures to provide additional car parking capacity in Pound Street Car Park.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.102 The preferred option scores positively against the objectives, particularly in relation to improving the transport network and highway safety around the town; helping to increase accessibility to community facilities and services within the town centre, and helping support local business and tourism.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.103 The 'No Policy' option was rejected, as the preferred option was considered the more positive approach across a wide range of economic and social objectives.

Policy LW1: Community and Leisure Facilities

Summary of the Options:

- 6.104 To include a policy actively encouraging and supporting the renewal and enhancement of existing community facilities; or to rely on market and community actions.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Community and Leisure facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.105 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining that support will be given to proposals that support the renewal and enhancement of existing community facilities.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.106 The Preferred Option assessed outcomes were more positive than the No Policy option.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.107 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to achieve more positive outcomes against improving access to community facilities and services as well as helping to maintain and improve health, well-being and community cohesion and community groups.

Policy LW2: Playing fields and Sports Facilities

Summary of the Options:

- 6.108 To include a policy to retain and where possible enhance existing playing fields and sports facilities. Alternatively, rely on the strategic policies within the Saved policies of the Chichester District Local Plan First Review, the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework; guidance within the Planning Practice Guidance; and other plans, policies and strategies by other bodies such as Sport England.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Playing fields and sports facilities | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.109 To include a policy to retain and where possible enhance existing playing fields and sports facilities within Petworth.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.110 The Preferred Option assessed outcomes were more positive and is considered to provide greater certainty to the community over the continued ability to access playing fields and sports facilities for health and well-being.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.111 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option achieved a more certain positive outcome against improving access to community facilities and services as well as helping to maintain and improve health, well-being and community cohesion and community groups.

Policy LW3: Assets of Community Value

Summary of the Options:

- 6.112 To designate assets of community value to ensure their protection over the period covered by the Neighbourhood Plan unless it is demonstrated that development or redevelopment is to the benefit of the local community. Alternatively, rely on market and community actions and / or strategic National Park Authority policies and strategies to protect locally important assets.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Assets of community value | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.113 To include a policy and designation of assets of community value.

Assessment Comment:

- 6.114 The preferred option achieves a more positive outcome against accessibility to local community facilities and services than the 'No Policy' alternative.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.115 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as the preferred option was considered to be a more positive and proactive approach.

Policy D1: Infrastructure Delivery

Summary of the Options:

- 6.116 To include a policy clearly setting out that new development should contribute to the provision of new social and community infrastructure; or to leave emphasis of the importance of providing new infrastructure to negotiations as part of the South Downs National Park Authority decision-making process.

| Policy Alternatives | Sustainability Appraisal Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Infrastructure delivery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 |
| No policy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/? | +/? | +/? | +/? | 0 | +/? | +/? | 0 |

Preferred Option:

- 6.117 The preferred option is to include a policy outlining the need for new development proposals to contribute to the provision of new social and community infrastructure

Assessment Comment:

- 6.118 Both options scored positively against the objectives. However, the preferred option was considered to perform slightly more effectively against the objectives as it ensures that essential local facilities and community services are provided as part of all new development proposals.

Why were the other Option(s) rejected?

- 6.119 The 'No Policy' option was rejected as it was considered essential that new development mitigates the impact of increasing demand on the full range of local facilities and community services, in Petworth.

7.0 Assessment Conclusion

- 7.1 The conclusion of the assessment of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan key principles and policies is that they will have no significant environmental effects and will promote sustainable development. In meeting the level growth prescribed by the emerging South Downs National Park Local Plan a number of site allocations were necessary on greenfield land outside the currently defined settlement boundary. The principle reason being, due to the limited availability of deliverable and developable previously developed land within the existing settlement boundary. The policies have been clearly selected and drafted to ensure that any potential for negative impacts is avoided through site selection and effective policy wording.
- 7.2 Preparing the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan has required the use of planning judgement to strike the right balance between the technical suitability and community acceptability of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 7.3 In some cases, this can lead to policies that may not be the most sustainable of all the potential choices made, but they are nonetheless sufficiently sustainable so that they will lead to no significant environmental effects. This is the most important test required by the EU Directive on SEA and the 2004 Regulations.
- 7.4 However, the conclusion remains that in a number of cases, the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan should deliver positive effects for local residents and businesses as Petworth meets its development needs in the period up to 2032. Reasonable alternative policy options have been assessed within this report to compare and contrast the options chosen, but in no case does the alternative perform better, and in most cases as well, against the chosen policy and there is therefore no case for policy changes as a result.

8.0 Mitigating Adverse Effects

- 8.1 SEA guidance requires measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing the plan. Where practical this report identifies the likely negative and positive impacts each policy has on achieving sustainability objectives based on the framework set out. It demonstrates that the policies of the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan will positively contribute towards delivering the social, economic and environmental objectives set out in the SA framework.
- 8.2 Where any potential significant negative and negative effects were identified, it was concluded that the policies in the Petworth Neighbourhood Plan, the Saved Policies of the Chichester Local Plan 1999; the emerging policies of the South Downs National Park Local Plan; or the National Planning Policy Framework adequately alleviated or mitigated the impacts, particularly over the medium to longer term.

9.0 Monitoring the Environmental Effects of the Plan

- 9.1 Petworth Town Council and the South Downs National Park Authority will jointly monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of the Neighbourhood Plan using available data. The annual South Downs National Park Authority Monitoring Report will provide some data at this level.
- 9.2 The purpose of monitoring is to provide information on the social, environmental and economic effects of planning policy documents help determine the extent to which objectives, targets and programmes are being met. Monitoring will also allow the Town Council to know if it is necessary to trigger contingency plans, should performance fall below expectations, or circumstances significantly change.