

Appendix E – Table of spatial location of development alternatives and reasons for accepting/ rejecting

Alternatives	Reasons for selection / rejection
Issues and Options 2005	
<p>Option1 Build housing in a similar way to much of our existing urban areas, i.e. mainly detached and semi-detached housing, using pockets of underdeveloped land, previously developed non-residential land, and small pockets of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Building in Green belt not supported by consultation at this stage. The SA commented that building in the Green Belt may increase car use. Option rejected.</p>
<p>Option 2 Use a mix of mainly higher density housing (terraces, townhouses and flats) using pockets of underdeveloped land, previously developed non-residential land, but not the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Carried forward in combination with other options. This option could be enhanced by ensuring that development is allied to public transport provision and at a density sufficiently high (40+ dph) to create potential viability for combined heat and power. Option selected.</p>
<p>Option 3 Allow very high-density housing (flats) in areas of high public transport accessibility, i.e. in town centres and along the A23 Transport Corridor, reducing the amount of development in other urban areas and not using the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Carried forward in combination with other options. This option could be enhanced by ensuring that development is allied to public transport provision and at a density sufficiently high (40+ dph) to create potential viability for combined heat and power. Option selected.</p>
<p>Option 4 Combine Options 2 and 3 Allowing very high-density housing in town centres and along the A23 Transport Corridor, a mix of mainly higher density housing in other urban areas and safeguarding the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Carried forward in combination with other options, This option could be enhanced by ensuring that development is allied to public transport provision and at a density sufficiently high (40+ dph) to create potential viability for combined heat and power. Option selected.</p>
Preferred Options 2006	
<p>H1. Direct higher density residential development to Redhill and along the A23 Corridor, formulating appropriate housing density ranges for these areas and the rest of the Borough, after taking into account a range of factors (the character of areas, public transport, public services, resource efficiency and environmental impacts).</p>	<p>The air quality risk of placing homes very close to busy roads needs to be further assessed and appropriate measures taken. Neither the issues of noise or light appear to be addressed elsewhere in the preferred options. There are no measures advocated to reduce the risk of pollution into the Borough's rivers/watercourses. Opportunities to further reduce the ecofootprint of regenerated urban areas should be sought. Option selected.</p>
<p>E2. Include policies that reinforce the multi-purpose role of town centres and local shopping areas by retaining and increasing provision of retail, social, community and</p>	<p>This policy was included at PO stage to reflect national guidance. There was no alternative at previous stages. Conflicts may occur with SA objective to decrease</p>

leisure uses.	congestion. Option selected.
Preferred Options 2008	
<p>Sustainable levels, locations and forms of development will be sought in accordance with the Borough stated objectives of this strategy and the objectives and policies of the South East Plan and agreed NGP growth. Therefore strategic development in the borough will be directed to the following hierarchy of areas in the Borough:</p> <p>Redhill - as the Primary Regional Centre and a Regional Transport Hub, Reigate; Horley; and Banstead Village - as a focus for Town Centres</p> <p>Regeneration in the areas of Redhill Town centre, Horley Town Centre, Preston and Merstham.</p> <p>Two new neighbourhoods in Horley</p> <p>Other sustainable locations in the existing urban area</p>	<p>The Preferred Option is the spatial strategy required by the South East Plan and includes the New Growth Point status. Appraisal has found that the Preferred Option has strong sustainability attributes, in particular the delivery of affordable housing in locations with good accessibility, the opportunity to enhance cultural assets, heritage and a sense of place in urban areas. A degree of uncertainty exists, however, with respect to finding the right balance between use of land for employment and housing, addressing climate change, and the more minor issue of noise and light nuisance. The importance of the Employment Land Review is recognised in that it will inform the quantity of employment land required and, ultimately, which sites should be retained.</p> <p>Option selected.</p>
<p>Preferred Policy Approach 9 Regional, Town and Local Centres</p>	<p>SA commented that this policy could have a significantly beneficial effect on improving accessibility to all services and facilities, as well as facilitating the improving health and wellbeing of the whole population and reducing poverty and social exclusion. Concern was raised about congestion, and it was suggested that policy options should be directed at reducing private car use.</p> <p>Option selected.</p>
Submission 2009	
<p>Policy CS5</p>	
<p>The Council will allocate land for development in the sequence set out below and as indicated in Figure 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i . Redhill Town Centre; ii. Built-up areas of Redhill, Reigate, Horley and Banstead; a. Town Centres; b. Edge of centre locations within walking distance to town centres; c. Regeneration Areas: Preston and Merstham; d. Other sustainable locations in the existing 	<p>This was changed during the Core Strategy Examination, reflecting conversations with the Inspector concerning the clarification of the Council's desire to promote regeneration areas, and that therefore the policy should state 'all of equal priority'. Also during the Examination the decision was made by the Council that the reference to Sustainable Urban Extensions should be removed (e) as the latest SHLAA evidence showed that, due to the changes in housing figures in the South East plan, sufficient housing land</p>

<p>urban area according to the criteria for sustainability as set out in Policy CS9; e. Sustainable urban extensions as identified through subsequent Local Development Documents.</p>	<p>could be found within the existing urban area. Option partially rejected.</p>
<p>Schedule A & B changes</p>	
<p><u>New composite policy CS4/CS5</u></p> <p><u>The Council will allocate land and direct development into the locations in the sequence set out below and as indicated in Figure 6:</u></p> <p><u>1. Priority locations for growth and regeneration (all of equal priority):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Redhill Town Centre;</u> • <u>Horley Town Centre;</u> • <u>Horley North East and North West sectors;</u> • <u>Preston Regeneration Area;</u> • <u>Merstham Regeneration Area;</u> • <u>Other regeneration areas as identified by the Council and its partners;</u> <p><u>2. Built-up areas of Redhill, Reigate, Horley and Banstead:</u></p> <p><u>(i) Town Centres first; then</u></p> <p><u>(ii) Edge of centre locations within walking distance to town centres;</u></p> <p><u>3. Other sustainable sites in the existing urban area according to the criteria for sustainability.</u></p>	<p>The SA scored this policy positively in relation to removing the reference to Sustainable Urban Extension for protecting the natural environment and biodiversity. There were issues raised concerning increased urban density and the ability to adapt to the impacts of climate change. Positive scoring was also given in respect of the change to ‘all of equal priority’ against the SA objective for flood risk – this is because it was considered the policy provided more flexibility to meet the requirements of the sequential test. Option selected.</p>
<p>Outstanding Issues</p>	
<p>References to sustainable urban extensions (SUE) reinstated.</p>	<p>Due to SHLAA revisions it was necessary to include potential for urban extensions for future growth. SA gave recommendations regarding scale of development and need for sustainable locations to be sought. It was highlighted that SA will be carried out any potential SUEs.</p>
<p>Option 1.No new housing (beyond SHLAA figures)</p>	<p>This option, whilst scoring positively for many environmental objectives, scored negatively for a number of impacts. These impacts were specifically around social and economic sustainability objectives and from not taking action to address the housing need in the Borough. These impacts are on the affordability of housing and the associated social problems this causes (for</p>

	<p>example lack of access to services and facilities, temporary housing and people in lower paid professions unable to live in the area). Economically, housing is required to support economic growth and a shortage of supply hinders labour market flexibility.</p> <p>Option rejected.</p>
<p>Option 2. Development in residential areas</p>	<p>The benefits of this approach are in putting development into what is an existing residential area, with existing infrastructure and negate the need, in the short-medium term, to build in green field sites. The loss of open space and greening could be limited by restricting development to the original development footprint, but providing higher density development within that footprint, such as flats. The impact on those currently living in these areas can be alleviated somewhat by excellent design, including designing in better security, biodiversity and flood risk mitigation.</p> <p>Option rejected (as insufficient alternative to urban extension/s)</p>
<p>Option 3. Development on Urban Open Land and other green space</p>	<p>The most important impacts that would be felt by the residents of the Borough are in terms of climate change and social inequalities. There is also the potential of loss of sites of bio-diversity value and sites which are part of a multi-functional green network for both people and wildlife, providing a range of functions such as flood mitigation, access and sport. Building on UOL has the potential to disproportionately impact on the poorest in our Borough as they may have limited access to the countryside, and may not have large gardens to enjoy. With obesity becoming a problem in children and teenagers, the loss of recreation space and open space that can be used for football, dog walking etc. may also disproportionately impact on those less able to afford alternative exercise facilities. Some urban green space is inaccessible; development of a small part of one site can enable improvements in access to the rest of it, for use as recreation land. This will improve the amenity value of the land, but not the value for biodiversity, and should therefore be assessed on a site by site basis. In order to mitigate the impacts of climate</p>

	<p>change UOL may be invaluable as an area to absorb surface water and to make the human environment a more acceptable one in relation to heat.</p> <p>Option rejected</p>
Option 4. Flats above shops	<p>This option is positive in terms of reducing pressure for development on green field land with no loss of green space. By their nature these dwellings will have good accessibility to services and facilities and will thus reduce congestion. This option will bring positive benefits to the area by improving surveillance. There will be a limited supply of this kind of development which will require further broad locations to complement it.</p> <p>Option rejected (as insufficient alternative to urban extension/s)</p>
Option 5. Development on the Rural Surrounds of Horley	<p>Flooding is the main sustainability concern with regards to the RSH, much of the RS are covered by a 1 in 100 year flood risk zone, and historical flood data shows the area has experienced significant flood events. In view of this, and taking into account the precautionary principle in light of climate change, it is supposed in this appraisal that building in much of the RSH would result in negative impacts in respect of flooding. Biodiversity will incur a negative impact, although due to the proximity of the Green Belt to this RSH this could be mitigated with habitat creation nearby and green corridors linking habitats identified through the GIS.</p> <p>Option selected. (as it is not in the Green Belt and should therefore be considered before MGB and the area could potentially sustain some small scale development, avoiding all areas of flood risk)</p>
Option 6. Sustainable Urban Extensions (likely to be Green Belt)	<p>This scenario has been appraised at a strategic level and not having reference to any particular part of the Borough. If a Green Belt release were to occur then thorough appraisal of a number of potential sites would need to be undertaken. Any policy would require the use of careful wording that would only trigger the release of MGB land once the supply of PDL has been developed, this is necessary to ensure that urban regeneration is the priority for development; all the while it is feasible. The</p>

	<p>most accessible locations are going to be sought, which would lead to minimal increases in car miles. A potential negative impact is the loss of soil quantity and quality, particularly if the development was on agricultural land, although care can be taken so as to not irreversibly affect the soil. This development scenario would gain greater sustainability credentials if the scale of the development allowed for supporting infrastructure that would reduce the need for travel such as shops, community and leisure facilities and schools. A large scale development would also increase the potential viability for a CHP scheme. The GI Strategy would need to be in place to inform design for biodiversity and habitat corridors that would need protecting or enhancing through design measures. Design measures are important in minimising the disturbance to the landscape. The development would need to take into account nearby watercourses that could be negatively impacted on by the development. This scenario scores positively in social terms from the benefits of providing sufficient housing, and also in terms of the support to the economy by way of consumers and a flexible labour market.</p> <p>Option selected</p>
Submission 2012	
No new alternatives considered	
Further Amendments 2012	
Further work was required by the Inspector to give more clarification on the scale, timing and broad area for the Sustainable Urban Extension.	
Option 1. One large extension (1500 - 2000 dwellings)	<p>The scoring for this appraisal showed a lot of uncertainty due to the location being unknown at this stage. Much of the scoring was dependent on location, and therefore the option could not be rejected at this stage.</p> <p>Option selected.</p>
Option 2. Two or three medium sized extensions (500-700 dwellings)	<p>The scoring for this appraisal showed a lot of uncertainty due to the location being unknown at this stage. Much of the scoring was dependent on location, and therefore the option could not be rejected at this stage.</p> <p>Option selected.</p>
Option 3. Several small extensions (100 to	The scoring for this appraisal showed a lot of

300 dwellings)	uncertainty due to the location being unknown at this stage. Much of the scoring was dependent on location, and therefore the option could not be rejected at this stage. Option selected.
Option 4. Stand alone settlement (2000 dwellings)	The scoring for this appraisal showed a lot of uncertainty due to the location being unknown at this stage – the results concluded that for a settlement this size the scoring would not be significantly different to an urban extension. The fit with the overall spatial strategy for the borough would be compromised if this option were selected. The need for the settlement to be near the road and rail network would limit the options to an extent that an urban extension would be a better fit with the overall aims of sustainability. Option rejected.
Option 5. Development on employment land	This option scores double-negative for two of the SA objectives, and indicates a restriction to economic development and growth should this option be taken forward. If there was an oversupply of employment land in the borough then some could be taken without too much detriment, however this is not the case as the land required for 1,600 homes would far exceed any negligible take of employment land. The only mitigation to these double-negative scores would be to designate other areas of employment land, which may then conflict with housing land supply in any case. The decision could be taken to designate employment areas in the Green Belt, however the employment areas in the Green Belt will not be accessible and may contribute to land contamination issues. There are positive impacts associated with this option; however the negative scoring for the economic pillar of sustainability makes this an unbalanced and unsustainable option, both in the short and long-term. Option rejected.
The next set of alternatives was the Broad Areas of search (BAS). Please see the results section of this report for more detailed reasons for selection or rejection.	See results section.