



# **Development Management Plan (Regulation 18 Stage)**

## **Sustainability Appraisal Appendix E**

**June 2016**

## APPENDIX E: Potential Policy Options Sustainability Appraisal

### Policy Approach to: Employment Designations; Principal and Local Employment Areas

#### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Manage new development and the mix of uses in the borough's main industrial and smaller, more local employment areas to ensure an adequate supply of land for development, and enable businesses to grow and diversify.

#### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1 Retain existing Borough Local Plan 'one-size fits all' approach	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 2 Introduce two tier designation with a policy which focuses on industrial, R&D and warehouse uses on principal employment sites and allows a more flexible approach to mix of uses in local employment areas and non-designated sites	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 3 Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

#### SA Comments:

Option 2 provides greater flexibility to meet the changing needs of business than option 1, greater scope for a variety of jobs to be provided, and more flexibility (allowing for better use of PDL to be made). Measures will be needed in other policies to protect local amenity and manage issues such as air/noise/light pollution.

#### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred option. This recognises the differing roles that different employment areas across the borough plan. It provides greater flexibility to meet the local and changing needs of businesses (thus assisting in providing more variety of job options and making better use of PDL in the borough) than Option 1. It provides more local specificity than Option 3, proposing a policy approach that reflects the specific characteristics of employment provision in Reigate & Banstead and the development pressures that exist here.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it is too restrictive on development in employment areas and could constrain the ability of existing businesses to grow or diversify and remain viable. Option 3 is rejected as it is considered important to have a policy that recognises specific local circumstances, including the need for employment-supporting development in employment areas.

### Policy Approach to: Employment Development Outside of Employment Areas

#### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

To support entrepreneurship, the policy seeks to provide opportunities for appropriate business uses, including home based businesses, to be introduced outside of designated Employment areas provided they would not have adverse impacts on their locality.

#### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1 Retain existing Borough Local Plan 'one-size fits all' approach	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 2 Have a specific policy which enables employment uses outside of designated Employment Areas and Town Centres (excluding Class A uses other than A2) provided there is no adverse impact on the locality	0	0	0	++	++	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0
Option 3 Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

#### SA Comments:

Option 2 provides greater flexibility than the other options in providing for the needs of many small businesses, which operate outside of town centres and employment areas, and will support entrepreneurship by facilitating the provision of affordable new start-up enterprises. Option 2 will also reduce the need for travel by helping to enable home based businesses to operate, and seeks to prevent adverse impacts on the locality by any proposals for new businesses.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred option with the highest score. It provides greater flexibility to meet the local changing needs of many businesses which operate outside of employment areas and town centres, due to cost savings and with improvements to broadband, and would strongly support economic growth and changing work patterns. Thus it would assist in providing more variety of job options, by supporting more affordable start up businesses, and making better use of PDL in the borough than Option 1. It provides more local specificity than Option 3, proposing a policy approach that reflects the specific characteristics of employment/business provision in Reigate & Banstead and the development/financial pressures that exist here. Option 2 also has a more positive effect than the other options on reducing the need for travel, due to enabling home based businesses, and consequently reducing pollution from traffic, and improving air quality.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it seeks to resist new employment uses outside of employment areas, and would constrain the ability of existing businesses to grow or diversify and remain viable, as well as new businesses to be able to start up. Option 3 is rejected as it is considered important to have a policy that recognises specific local circumstances, including the need for flexibility for new business enterprises and home based businesses, as well as the protection of the locality from any adverse impacts from new business proposals.

## Policy Approach to: Safeguarding Employment Land

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Safeguard employment land and premises to ensure an adequate supply of land for employment uses. Prevent unacceptable or unnecessary losses of employment land.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Retain existing Borough Local Plan Policy and resist loss of employment land	-	0	0	0	-	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Protect employment land unless it can be demonstrated that use is unviable for employment or employment generating uses and that alternative uses would not prevent adjoining businesses from operating effectively	0	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 3: Accept losses of employment land	++	0	0	-	+	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
Option 4: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	0	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Without policy to safeguard employment uses, there is a higher chance that employment uses will be lost to housing. This in turn could increase the need for people to travel to access employment opportunities.

The Borough Local Plan approach to protecting employment land (Option 1) provides a greater degree of protection for employment land but may be more inflexible in relation to other employment generating uses, and encouraging diversity of employment provision.

In terms of land contamination and other forms of pollution, commercial uses may be more polluting than housing. However appropriate policies can be used to manage and mitigate any risk of pollution. In addition, change of use from employment to housing provision may allow for the remediation of contaminated land.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 2 is the preferred option despite having the same scoring profile as option 4, as option 2 provides an additional layer of local specificity and detail, which will be beneficial in informing decision making on planning applications in particular recognising the need to protect local amenity and the ability of existing businesses to function (important to ensure surrounding/ adjoining business remain viable).

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected as it is more inflexible towards other employment generating uses and diversifying employment provision to other uses. As such it may result in the protection of employment land when there is no prospect of use for this purpose and where the land could be put to better use. This option conflicts with national policy and the Core Strategy. Option 3 was rejected as it would be likely to lead to the loss of employment land to more financially attractive developments such as residential. This could have a detrimental impact on the overall supply of employment land in the borough, putting local businesses at risk and meaning longer commuting distances for residents. Option 4 was rejected as it is considered beneficial to have a detailed, locally specific policy to inform the determination of development proposals in the borough.

## Policy Approach to: Local Skills and Training Opportunities

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Secure skills development, apprenticeships and training opportunities from new developments to benefit local people.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1 Do not have a specific policy on this issue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2 Encourage new developments over a certain size to make provision for/or support construction apprenticeships and/or other local training opportunities	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

This policy has the potential to provide employment opportunities for local residents currently out of work, and help to build a skilled workforce. It is not considered that Option 2 would have a significant detrimental impact on development viability.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it encourages the establishment of potential employment opportunities for local residents, maximising the benefits of new development in the borough.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it represents a missed opportunity for a positive policy to secure benefits for the local population in terms of the provision of work and training opportunities, with the associated benefits that these bring to individual residents, local communities, and the borough's economy.

## Policy approach to: Support access to electronic communication networks

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Ensure residents can benefit from the continued growth, enhancement and development of high speed broadband and mobile network coverage without the necessary apparatus undermining the character and appearance of surrounding areas and sensitive areas.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a policy; rely on national policy	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Option 2: Local policy in relation to improving broadband connectivity in new development	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Local policy in relation to design and siting of telecommunications apparatus	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++

### SA Comments:

Improving access to broadband can help overcome social exclusion and may help people access healthcare and other services remotely. In particular, access to high speed broadband can benefit local businesses, especially those in more rural areas. Access to services via the internet and more flexible business practices can help reduce the need to travel and therefore reduce emissions. Local policy in relation to siting of telecoms equipment can benefit by reflecting the specific sensitivities of the local area.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

A mixture of Option 2 and Option 3 is the Council's preferred approach. Both these options allow for the introduction of policy that reflects specific local circumstances and the characteristics and sensitivities of the borough. Option 2 takes account of the large number of small businesses and home workers in the borough to whom access to high speed broadband is vital. Option 3 allows for detailed criteria to be set out to assess applications for telecoms apparatus allowing for consideration of the localised impact of this form of development (particularly on the landscape and surrounding area) as well as the delivery of strategic objectives set out in national policy.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as national policy doesn't factor in local specificity in terms of the siting of communications equipment, including the sensitive areas which should be protected from this type of development. National policy does not provide enough detail guidance on telecommunications development and would not achieve the best result in terms of minimising impacts on sensitive landscapes and areas in the borough.

## Policy approach to: Ensuring a mix of uses within town centre frontages

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The policy seeks to provide flexibility over use classes within town centres whilst retaining core retail (A1) uses.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Carry forward BLP policy	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Refresh thresholds but allow for greater flexibility for changes of use where these enhance vitality and viability of an individual town centre.	0	0	+	++	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Options 1 and 3 both scored positively on a number of objectives around economic growth, sustainable employment growth and providing for the needs of businesses. A more flexible approach towards different types of uses in town centres can help to ensure a healthy balance of uses is retained both within primary and secondary frontages, including opportunities for community uses. By allowing for greater flexibility option 3 opens up opportunities for other potential uses to come forward further contributing to the vibrancy and vitality of the borough's town centres and is less restrictive than option 2. However it still allows for a degree of control over and above what option 1 would provide to safeguard the vitality of town centres and maintaining key services in town centres. Greater flexibility allows for best use to be made of PDL and heritage assets to be put into more viable uses.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach as it retains the principle of threshold but allows for local specificity to be introduced into the borough to ensure a healthy balance of uses is maintained across both primary and secondary frontages that reflect local circumstances of the town centre character and is not restrictive to certain uses

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 were both rejected as option 2 because it is more restrictive and does not allow for other uses in the borough's town centres which could add to the viability and value of the High Street frontages. Option 1 provides more general policy guidance and lacks local specificity.



## Policy approach to: Managing the development of town centre uses outside town and local centres

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The aim of such a policy would be to ensure the protection of the vitality and viability of town centres and local centres by carefully managing the development of potentially competing uses outside these centres.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy rely on national policy and the Council's adopted Core Strategy (primarily policy CS7) for sequential testing and impact assessment threshold.	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Set locally specific impact assessment threshold figures and a defined policy approach to retail warehousing uses.	0	0	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 2 is more locally specific. Both options will help promote the vitality of town centres but setting a local threshold will ensure that the policy protection included in the DMP is more reflective of and responsive to the character and sensitivities of the town centres in the borough. Option 2 will go a step further than Option 1 in encouraging expansion and location of retail uses within existing town and local centres, whilst acknowledging that in certain circumstances town centre uses outside town centres may be acceptable.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it protects the role and function of the borough's town centres by introducing locally specific retail impact assessment criteria, more suited to the characteristics of the borough than that in national policy, as well as specific recognition of local retail warehousing areas. This approach provides clearer policy criteria requiring impact assessment and consideration of existing shopping areas including town and local centres as part of new developments.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 recognizes the need and importance of protecting uses within town centre, however it does not provide locally specific threshold figures where impact assessments are required. The national threshold for impact assessment is higher than that which is suggested appropriate in R&B based on local evidence and its application could therefore have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of towns and local centres in the borough.

### Policy approach to: Ensuring continued viability and vitality of Local Centres

#### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Maintain and encourage the provision of core uses including A1, A3, D1, D2, etc. in Local Centres, providing important local services and facilities to communities across the borough.

#### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Introduce core use thresholds for local centres.	0	+	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Use policy criteria to manage uses within local centres.	0	+	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Don't have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy and NPPF.	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

#### SA Comments:

Option 1 and 2 both provide an opportunity for a policy approach that is specific to uses in local centres and can allow for recognition of the important role of community facilities in these areas as well as local retail facilities. In doing so, they can help promote healthier lifestyles (by reducing the need to travel by private car) and allow people to remain independent longer. Options 2 and 3 allow for a more flexible approach, which will be more beneficial in terms of making the best use of previously developed land: Option 1 (thresholds) may constrain this. All options score positively in relation to economic and employment growth.

#### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred policy approach as it allows for a flexible policy approach to uses in local shopping areas and smaller centres whilst recognising the important role that retail and other use (e.g. A3 and community uses) play in adding to the vitality and vibrancy of these centres, and providing accessible local services and facilities, and the need to protect these from pressure for alternative uses.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 3 were both rejected. Option 1 would be more restrictive on the types of uses allowed in local shopping areas and smaller centres across the borough and may result in increased levels of vacancies/ the best use of land not being made. Option 3 is a more general approach and does not allow for specific local circumstances (in terms of the need for and function of local centres) in the borough.

### Policy approach to: Development proposals in smaller centres and for isolated shops

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Seeks to protect isolated shops and smaller centres where these serve a useful role for local communities

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a policy; rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Have a local policy to protect isolated shops	-	0	0	++	-	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 2 would help protect shops/services which – whilst not being located in a town or local centre – provide a useful service for local people. This could help reduce the need for people to travel, and could help support local businesses and provide employment for local people. However without a degree of flexibility within such a policy (to allow for changes of use where the existing shop is no longer viable) the policy could prevent the best use of previously developed land being made and reduce opportunities (albeit limited opportunities) for additional residential provision.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it allows for local specificity with opportunity for clear policy criteria recognizing the importance and need to protect smaller centres and isolated shops for local communities. However it will be important that the policy is sufficiently flexible to allow for changes of use away from such uses where they are demonstrated to be no longer viable.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it provides less policy support in protecting stand-alone, but important, local shops and services.

## Policy approach to: Managing development within identified retail frontages

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Ensure vibrant, healthy and active frontages within identified retail areas minimizing the impact on other surrounding uses and retail users within retail areas.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy - rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Have a specific policy managing development in retail frontages	0	+	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Make specific policy reference to optimise use of upper floors	+	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

All options scored positively in relation to ensuring good local service provision (reducing the need to travel and encouraging/supporting healthy lifestyles, making best use of PDL and supporting economic growth and providing employment opportunities.

Option 2 scores more strongly than Option 1 in terms of supporting economic growth as it introduces local specificity which will help promote the vitality of retail frontages taking into account their local characteristics. Option 3 scores positively in relation to objective 1 as it can allow for housing provision in town centres. It also scores strongly in making best use of previously developed land and supporting economic growth through promoting town centre vitality.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

The preferred approach is a combination of options 2 and 3 as this supports a mixture of uses in its unique town centre setting and encourages the provision of active frontages in support of a vibrant town centre. It also recognizes the importance of upper floor usage and its contribution and also impact on the vitality and vibrancy of town centres to ensure that new development continues to make a positive contribution without, impacting on other users and existing businesses in the surrounding area.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 does not reflect local specificity in terms of availability and the physical restraints on town centre boundary expansion to accommodate additional retail floorspace and for this reason this option was rejected.

**Policy approach to: Temporary uses in vacant units**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Improve vacancy rates across town and local centres by allowing vacant units to be occupied for short and temporary periods.

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Don't have a policy- rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Include a specific policy with criteria to guide the introduction of temporary uses to reduce vacancies in town and local centres	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Option 1 doesn't make any specific reference to vacant units, however in general terms promotes the vitality and viability of town and local centres. Option 2 seeks to address vacancies in the borough by introducing policy criteria that encourage the better use of vacant buildings and therefore offers an improved opportunity to support economic growth and local employment needs as well as helping maintain the vitality of town and local centres.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it is more locally specific in providing policy support for a mechanism that can help to reduce the number of vacant units within the borough's town and local centres, with associated benefits for the local economy.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected as it does not make specific reference to vacant units in the borough's identified town and local centres.

## Policy approach to: Gatwick Airport Car Parking

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Seeks to protect surrounding area from further or additional airport parking proposals including short and long term parking.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy – rely on Core Strategy and NPPF.	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Have specific policy that seeks to resist airport car parking provision in the borough	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 1 scores negatively in relation to objective 4 as the option does not provide a clear policy basis on which to resist airport parking development. Continued provision of airport car parking outside the boundaries of the airport will lead to an increased number of vehicle trips. Option 2 encourages on-airport car parking, which will reduce the need for additional trips and therefore help contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gases. Option 2, in discouraging of airport car parking, will help make best use of previously developed land, ensuring that PDL in the borough that would otherwise be used for airport car parking can be brought into other uses. Both options score neutral in relation to supporting economic growth and providing employment for local people: airport car parking is not a labour intensive use, and it is not considered that Option 2 (which represents a continuation of existing policy) would have a significant detrimental impact for current operators of airport car parking.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred option as it allows for greater control over airport car parking in locations that are removed from the airport itself. This option will help direct additional airport parking to locations in closer proximity to airport terminals.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected because it does not allow for local specificity to control and prevent future airport car parking development from encroaching outside the airport boundary into the borough.

## Policy approach to: Design of Development

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Conserve and enhance local character and distinctiveness and local residential amenity through high quality design

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy only rely on the NPPF	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Include a more generic design policy which is applicable to all types of developments. (Good design is common in all types of development including residential, community facilities and commercial developments).	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+
Option 3: Include more detailed area based design policy reflecting local character, distinctiveness, historical and environmental interest features.	-	+	++	0	-	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+

### SA Comments:

The more detailed policy approach proposed under Option 3 allows for more local specificity however could impose additional design requirements which could increase the cost of development and therefore impact upon viability. Option 2 has potential to provide more flexibility and may allow for the more efficient use of PDL, but still is locally specific and ensures local character would be protected.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it allows for a locally specific policy on design, reflecting (and protecting and enhancing) the particular characteristics of the borough, to guide decision making on planning applications.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 3 allows for area specific design requirements, however this could run the risk of imposing additional design requirements which could impact on the viability of development, and thus work contrary to the need to make best use of previously developed land. It is considered that area specific design requirements would be better provided as guidance through supplementary planning documents. Option 1 requires reliance on national design policy, which is by nature very general and therefore will not work to the benefit of sustainable development in the borough to the same extent that a locally specific policy will.

### Policy approach to: Access, Parking & Servicing

#### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Provide safe, well designed access and parking for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians in line with parking standards influenced by geography, location, accessibility etc.

#### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a specific policy on access, parking and servicing, rely on the Core Strategy and NPPF.	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 2: Include a separate, detailed local policy on access, parking and servicing.	0	++	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 3: Don't have any local parking standard guidance	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 4: Have parking standards for the borough – use SCC guidance with local implementation detail	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 5: Have locally set parking standards for the borough	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0



**SA Comments:**

Option 1 scores positively in relation to objective 2 (promoting healthy lifestyles), option 4 (encouraging sustainable transport), and options 8 and 14 (reducing the use of private vehicles, and associated air pollution) as national policy and the core strategy encourage, in general terms, sustainable transport options. However Option 2 scores more highly in relation to objective 2 and 4 as it allows for more detailed policy criteria to deliver on this broad objective, to ensure that specific safety measures, and opportunities for sustainable transport options, are incorporated within new development.

Options 4 and 5 score the same, as both options allow for a locally specific approach to parking provision. Providing an appropriate level of parking is important to enable the less mobile to access services, but parking standards also allow for reductions in parking provision in the most sustainable locations, thus encouraging use of sustainable transport options as an alternative to the private car (securing benefits in relation to air pollution). Option 3 has been given a negative score under objective 4 as it does not allow for a reduced level of car parking in the most accessible locations.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

The preferred approach is to have combination of option 2 and option 4 or 5.

Option 2 allows for the introduction of detailed criteria to ensure specific measures are designed into new development to ensure safety and to improve the attractiveness of sustainable transport options. Options 4 or 5 allow for parking provision to be varied across the borough to reflect the relative accessibility areas, and to be varied across types of uses to reflect the specific needs of users and /or residents.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected as it does not provide detailed criteria to ensure specific measures are designed in to new development to improve safety and sustainable transport choices. Option 3 does not allow for detailed guidance on parking standard requirements across the borough and across different types of development and would not secure the positive sustainability benefits associated with such an approach.

**Policy approach to: Safeguarding against the effects of noise, air and light pollution, and remediating contaminated land****Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Seeks to ensure that development is designed appropriately to minimise the impact of noise, air and light pollution as well as contamination.

Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy - rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
Option 2: Have separate noise, air and light/ pollution policy	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	++	0	0

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 3: Don't have a policy on noise for development around Gatwick Airport	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
Option 4: Apply the 57bDLeq as the significantly adverse effect, thereby requiring impact assessments and mitigation measures.	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++	+	0

**SA Comments:**

All options scored positively around reducing land contamination and air quality reducing air, noise and light pollution through appropriate mitigation and remediation on new developments. Option 2 sets out one clear policy criteria for minimising noise, air and light pollution in development. Option 2 allows for the remediation of land to enable development on PDL. Option 2 addresses the design of development to minimise the impact of noise, air and light pollution as well as locating noise producing uses away from sensitive locations.

Option 4 provides a trigger alerting planning officers of the potential impact on residents and will therefore require appropriate assessments and mitigation measures to make the proposal acceptable. In comparison option 3 relies on the judgement of planning officers in determining whether noise from the airport will have significant adverse impact. Option 4 takes a more proactive approach to ensure mitigation measures are provided.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

A combination of options 2 and 4 are the preferred policy approach and allow for local specificity in the mitigation of air, noise and light pollution. With specific noise contour guidance stipulating a 57dBLeq distance required for development to not result in unacceptable noise levels to residents based on the most up to date evidence. This approach also seeks to provide more opportunity for development through mitigation and attenuation measures including remediation of contaminated land to minimize negative impacts. Option 3 allows for more flexibility but could provide opportunities for development proposals to be built out with little or no mitigation measures in place. A balanced approach is required to ensure noise impact is reduced to an acceptable level.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected as it only provides generic guidance that doesn't reflect local circumstances in the borough for example it doesn't stipulate a threshold noise contour requirement for developments to be acceptable. It does provide any detailed guidance to assess each proposal against.

## Policy approach to: Back Garden Land Development

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

To ensure new development on back garden land is of a high quality design and layout which is appropriate to the context of the area and which has an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a separate policy, rely on Core Strategy and national policy	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Option 2: Reliance on general design policies within the DMP.	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Option 3: Do not allow any additional housing development on back gardens.	--	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+
Option 4: Have a separate DM policy to enable appropriate back garden development recognising the particular sensitivities of this source of land supply	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

**SA Comments:**

Options 1, 2 and 4 would all allow for some back land development therefore boosting housing supply. Option 3 would mean that this source of land supply – which makes a contribution to delivering the borough’s housing target – would be removed.

Options 1, 2 and 4 are likely to enable housing in more accessible urban locations reducing the need for travel and ensuring that these developments are well located in relation to urban services and facilities.

Whilst back garden development is classed as greenfield land, existing lower density residential developments can – through redevelopment - provide the opportunity to make best use of land, reflecting the decision aiding questions within this objective. Not allowing any additional housing development on back garden land (recognising the design and environmental considerations required) would limit the opportunities to make best use of land through residential intensification. Conversely options 1, 2, and 4 would all allow for sensitively designed residential intensification in these areas.

Options 1, 2 and 4 will enable the best use of urban land therefore helping to reduce the pressure on to develop on countryside locations and – in particular – the urban fringe. Option 3 would help to retain urban biodiversity by preventing fragmentation of green corridors; Option 4 (a specific local policy on back garden development) can provide the mechanism to ensure that green corridors are protected and enhanced as part of new development.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 4 is the preferred approach as it allows for a locally specific policy with criteria to ensure that back garden development is sensitively designed, not only with reference to residential amenity, but also the specific visual, access and biodiversity considerations that come with back garden land in the borough.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 2 was rejected as it is inconsistent with national policy, and fails to recognise that – if appropriately designed – back garden development and residential intensification provide an important source of housing land supply to meet local demand and the borough’s housing target. Indirectly, pursuing this option could increase the pressure to release land outside the urban area for development.

Options 1 and 3 were rejected as they promote a more general approach towards design criteria for back land garden development in the borough. Back garden development proposals have the potential to affect a significant number of existing householders, and come with a specific set of design challenges for which a more general policy, and/or strategic policies alone, are considered insufficient.

## Policy approach to: Housing Mix

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Ensure the mix of new housing delivered in the borough is consistent with the needs of existing and new households, including the needs of specific groups such as the elderly or young families.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Require housing mix to have regard to the Council's evidence of need and local character	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Set specific requirements for housing developments to incorporate a proportion of small units and larger units	++	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

All options allow for a mix of housing to be delivered, however option 2 allows for specific requirements (a proportion of smaller units and larger units on larger developments) to be secured through new development, providing a more affordable type of supply and the opportunity for downsizing, freeing up larger units, as well as meeting the needs of families and ensuring that mixed communities are achieved on larger developments.

The delivery of smaller units under option 2, particularly if these are for older people, will help the elderly remain independent for longer.

Option 1 allows for local character considerations to be taken into account when considering the mix of housing, which will ensure that new development protects and where possible enhances local townscape character.

All options will help promote best use of previously developed land.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

A combination of options 1 and 2 is the preferred approach: this will help ensure that – generally - the mix of housing provided reflects local needs (whilst safeguarding local character); and also introduces a mechanism to secure the delivery of smaller, relatively more affordable, units, as well as larger units to meet the needs of families on larger development sites and ensures that mixed communities are achieved in larger schemes.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 3 does not allow for a policy approach that reflects locally specific needs/requirements, and does not incorporate a requirement for sites to provide smaller and affordable units at a local level, or larger units on larger schemes. The nature of the housing market in Reigate & Banstead makes these things particularly important.

**Policy approach to: Delivering high quality homes**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Ensure new housing is built to a high standard, provides an adequate level of amenity for future occupants and delivers a proportion of housing suited to disabled residents or those who are less mobile

Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Set local qualitative criteria to ensure housing provides a good living environment for future occupants	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Require new homes to meet the national internal space standards	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Require housing developments to design a proportion of units which are accessible/adaptable for those with lower mobility	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 4: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

All options score positively in relation to the supply of housing land. Option 3 scores particularly positively in relation to Objective 2 as it requires provision specifically of accessible and adaptable units, a source of housing which will help people to remain independent.

Option 2 requires minimum space standards, which may mean units are slightly larger and that less units can be accommodated on a site than would otherwise be the case, therefore slightly negatively affecting the ability to use PDL efficiently.

Option 1 could enable the introduction of higher water efficiency standards (reflecting the fact that the borough is in an area of water stress) therefore making a positive contribution to the objective to maintain an adequate water supply (through reducing the demand for water).

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

A combination of options 1, 2 and 3 is preferred. This would allow for the introduction of local design standards to reflect specific local circumstances (such as water availability) (option 1); the provision of homes that are of a size suitable to meet people's needs and allow for healthy living environments (option 2), and specifically secure the delivery of adaptable housing units to provide for those who are older or less mobile, as well as wheelchair users (option 3). Whilst option 2 may mean that developments need to be of a marginally lower density, the benefits of providing homes of a suitable size are considered to outweigh this.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 4 was rejected as it represents a missed opportunity to take into account local needs and introduce national standards that can benefit the local population and wider environmental quality.

**Policy approach to: Construction Management****Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Promote and ensure good standards of construction management and ensure developments are carried out in a safe and considerate manner.

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Include a policy that sets out the Council's expectations that the construction process is managed in a considerate manner, and requires agreement of Construction Management Statements	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0	0

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 2: Do not have a specific policy on this issue – rely on other standards/regulatory regimes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Option 1 could reduce the stress caused by development process for some residents and therefore improve community well-being. More efficient and well managed construction could help reduce waste and pollution.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 1 is the preferred approach. It will ensure that local issues around construction can be better addressed and managed, recognising that other national regimes and legislation governs many of the concerns raised by residents in relation to development construction.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 2 was rejected as it does not represent a proactive approach to managing issues associated with development construction, and represents a missed opportunity for positive planning to help minimise local amenity, waste and pollution issues.

**Policy approach to: Residential Area of Special Character (RASC)**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Ensure special lower density/character areas are retained, protected from unsympathetic development proposals, and where possible enhanced, reflecting the contribution they make to the borough's townscape and local character.

Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Only rely on the NPPF and generic design policies in the Core Strategy	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+



East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 2: Include separate detailed policy setting criteria in relation to scale, height, massing and density for development within RASCs across the borough to retain their distinctiveness and local character (lower density) from inappropriate and over development.	-	0	++	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++

**SA Comments:**

Maintaining areas of lower density housing (Option 2) will reduce the ability of these areas to contribute to housing supply, and mean that land in these areas may not be used to its maximum development capacity in absolute terms.

Option 2 does however seek to recognise and protect the distinct character of RASCs and maintain the contribution that they make to local character, townscape and the heritage of the borough. The continued safeguarding and provision of verdant landscaping in RASCs will help prevent against green corridor loss and habitat fragmentation in urban areas, thus helping to conserve and enhance biodiversity.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 2 is the preferred approach. This option allows for a locally specific policy protecting those parts of the urban areas of the borough that have been identified as having a special and cohesive low density character. It is recognised that protecting a small number of lower density areas from intensive development limits the ability of these areas to contribute to housing land supply in the borough, but there are important advantages in protecting local character/heritage, and retaining wider GI/biodiversity benefits in these areas.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected because it does not allow for those parts of the borough which have been recognised as having a special cohesive and low density character worthy of protection to be safeguarded against inappropriate development pressures.

## Policy approach to: Advertisements & Shop Fronts

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

To ensure that advertisement proposals, and proposals for shop fronts, do not harm the character and appearance of an area, heritage assets, residential amenity, or impact harmfully on highway safety

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy rely on the Core Strategy and NPPF	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 2: Don't have a detailed DM adverts and shop fronts policy but use more general DM design/amenity policies	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Option 3: Include detailed policy on advertisements and shop fronts including criteria in relation to visual impact and safety	0	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	+	0

### SA Comments:

By introducing greater detail about advertisements, option 3 will have more positive outcomes in terms of protecting local character and heritage as well as minimising light pollution, loss of residential amenity and visual impact on the wider landscape.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach reflects local specificity and allows for greater control over advertisements at the local level by addressing some of the issues around light pollution, heritage assets and conservation.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 were rejected. Option 1 does not allow for any detailed policy on detailed design criteria to protect the specific important characteristics of Reigate & Banstead. Option 2 does allow for locally specific criteria, but a general design policy would not allow for specific considerations in relation to adverts and shop fronts to be included and would therefore not maximise the benefits that such a policy could have in relation to character, pollution, amenity and visual impact.

## Policy approach to: Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Show people

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Ensure adequate provision of pitches and plots to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people including a 5 year supply of these sites and growth areas between years 6 and 10 over the life of the plan.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not allocate new gypsy and traveller sites	--	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Option 2: Make provision for sites and pitches by authorising currently unauthorised sites.	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Make provision for new sites by extending existing sites in the borough	++	+	?	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	?	?
Option 4: Provide new standalone sites	++	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	?	?
Option 5: Provide new sites through urban extensions	++	+	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	?	?

**SA Comments:**

Option 1 would not provide traveller accommodation to meet the identified needs set out in the Core Strategy, where as other options would allow for provision to be made. Option 1 therefore scores negative in relation to objective 1, but also objective 2, as it would exacerbate overcrowding and associated deprivation. Option 1 has been scored negatively in relation to objective 15 as – whilst a do nothing scenario might be considered to mean the status quo in relation to landscape is protected - it could result in an increase in unauthorised encampments which could have a negative impact as the Council would not be in a position to proactively manage where these locate.

Option 2 receives a neutral score in relation to objective 1 and objective 2 as it would not result in new accommodation being provided or any change in relation to overcrowding/deprivation. Other options score positively in relation to these objectives as they would provide new accommodation opportunities, helping to reduce overcrowding.

Options 3, 4, and 5 have been scored '?' in relation to a number of objectives. This is because the score would depend on the exact location of any site proposed and the constraints present on that site – further evidence and information on this is therefore required. It will be important that the impact of proposed allocations on flood risk, heritage, land and soil, landscape character etc. is considered and mitigation/avoidance/remediation measures are proactively identified.

In relation to objective 4, option 3 has been scored neutral as the location of existing sites is already established. Option 5 scores positively in relation to this objective as urban extensions will be better and more closely related to existing urban areas, and the services that they provide, thus reducing the need to travel.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

The sustainability appraisal indicates that option 2, 3, 4, and 5 should all be explored further. In identifying potential sites, it will be important that the impact on those areas where the impact is currently flagged as being uncertain is given further consideration.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 is rejected as it will have a negative impact on the ability of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people to access accommodation, and would result in additional overcrowding and associated negative impacts on health and wellbeing. Option 2 should only be considered in conjunction with other options (3, 4, 5).

## Policy approach to: Urban Open Spaces

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Protect the most important open spaces within the urban area (recognising the multifunctional role these spaces can play), whilst balancing this with the need to make best use of urban land.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Retain existing blanket restriction on development on designated urban open space	--	++	+	++	-	0	--	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	++
Option 2: Continue to designate and protect areas of urban open space but set out clear, exceptional circumstances, when some development could be acceptable	-	++	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	++
Option 3: Do not have a specific policy - rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	-	++	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	++

### SA Comments:

All options will restrict development potential and therefore score negatively against objectives that relate to the supply of land for development. By imposing a blanket restriction, option 1 has more negative outcomes in this respect. Protecting open space is positive in terms of health and well-being, biodiversity and climate change. Options 1 and 2, being locally specific, better recognise the importance of open space to local townscape.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach. This options seeks to protect urban open land where it provides an important multifunctional role in urban areas, however recognises that in some exceptional cases an alternative use may outweigh these benefits. The provision of locally specific guidance as to these exceptional circumstances will be beneficial to inform decision making on planning applications.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 is resistant to any change or loss of urban open space to any other development, and does not include flexibility to recognise that in some exceptional circumstances the sustainability merits of developing urban open space may outweigh the disadvantages.

Option 3 approach is more general and lacks local specificity at borough level – a more locally specific policy will secure maximum benefits in terms of protecting and enhancing local character.

**Policy approach to: Outdoor Sport and Recreation**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Encourage proposals for new or enhanced facilities and sites which provide opportunities for sport and recreation, and make sure these are designed and located in a sensitive manner.

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Set criteria to inform and encourage appropriate proposals for new or enhanced outdoor sport and recreation facilities	0	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++
Option 2: Do not have a specific policy - rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

**SA Comments:**

Option 1 provides local specificity to guide appropriate sports facilities. This includes considerations around landscape and biodiversity and therefore scores more positively against these outcomes.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 1 is the preferred approach for delivering and making provision for local sports facilities in the borough. Whilst broadly consistent with national policy requirements, it provides the more detailed policy guidance necessary to ensure that such facilities are sited in a way that maximises their benefits to the local community, whilst minimising negative impacts such as noise and light pollution and visual impact

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 2 recognizes the need to protect and make provision for sport and recreation uses however, lacks local specificity set out in option 1, missing the opportunity to secure additional local benefits and ensure local amenity is safeguarded.

## Policy approach to: Open Space in new Developments

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Secure appropriate open space, sport and play facilities from new housing developments to meet needs of future residents

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Require new developments to make appropriate provision for open space and play facilities on-site based on national standards	-	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+
Option 2: Do not require open space to be provided as part of new developments	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Option 3: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy / NPPF	-	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

### SA Comments:

Option 1 – by requiring open space provision – will slightly restrict, in quantitative terms – the amount of land upon which houses can be constructed. However providing open spaces as part of new development will help to support healthy lifestyles, provide sustainable transport choices (attractive walking cycling routes) and provide a biodiversity resource. It can also play a multifunctional role by helping provide flood storage (where appropriate) and providing visual enhancement. Conversely, not providing open space in new developments would negatively affect residents health and wellbeing, the townscape character of those areas and opportunities to support urban biodiversity.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 1 is the preferred approach. Making provision for open spaces in new development bringing a number of benefits including improved biodiversity in urban areas, and enhanced resident health and well-being.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 2 would be contrary to the Core Strategy and national policy requirements, and would negatively impact on townscape character, biodiversity and resident's health and wellbeing. Option 3 recognizes the need to make provision for sport and recreation uses however, lacks local specificity set out in option 1, missing the opportunity to secure additional local benefits and ensure local amenity is safeguarded.

## Policy approach to: Flooding

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Sets out the requirements for developments in areas of flood risk ensuring that the sequential test is undertaken and the flood risk impact on nearby areas is considered.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Rely on national and CS policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	+
Option 2: Have a separate DM policy on flooding which requires a flood risk assessment in relation to the scale of the development proposal.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	+

### SA Comments:

Both options scored the same with positive outcomes for reducing flood risk, safeguarding water quality, protecting the community from any increase in flood risk associated with climate change, and also protecting biodiversity associated with rivers, waterbodies and flood plains.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred option as it allows for more detailed policy criteria to ensure that development is well designed in relation to managing flood risk on new and existing properties.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 provides some guidance on managing flood risk but does not allow for the local specificity or detail that option 2 provides.



## Policy approach to: Landscape

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

To protect and enhance designated and undesignated landscapes across the borough including Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) and Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV)

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Only rely on NPPF and Core Strategy	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
Option 2: Don't have a detailed DM landscape policy but make reference to landscape in other DM policies where applicable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
Option 3: Develop a detailed policy locally specific to the borough highlight valued landscapes where development should be avoided and preserved	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++	++

### SA Comments:

Option 3 allows for more local specificity rather than a generic approach as set out in options 1 and 2. Option 3 encourages rural businesses providing it does not conflict with the policies approach towards protecting and enhancing the landscape and natural environment.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach as it allows for local specificity to the borough's biodiversity and landscape features by setting out clear detailed policy criteria for protecting and enhancing valued and attractive landscapes.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 both scored positively in securing positive benefits in relation to a number of sustainability appraisal objectives however, they were both rejected because they are more generic and lack local specificity and detailed policy criteria provided for by option 3.

## Policy approach to: Protecting Trees and Woodland Areas

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Protect and retain trees, groups of trees and hedgerows which make a positive contribution to the landscape and visual amenity of the public.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Only rely on the NPPF and Core Strategy	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Option 2: Don't have a detailed DM tree policy but make reference to trees and hedgerows in other DM policies where applicable	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Option 3: Include more detailed policy for managing proposals which directly and indirectly affect tree and hedgerows.	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++

### SA Comments:

All options score similarly, recognising the positive impact that trees can have in relation to the general health and wellbeing of communities, the townscape character of an area, the wider landscape, and as a rich source of biodiversity. Option 3 scores more highly in relation to townscape, landscape and biodiversity contribution as it allows for the identification of specific resources across the borough, and the protection of trees and woodland not just for their own sake but for the wider role that they play in the borough, which is relatively heavily wooded/treed.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach. A detailed, locally specific policy allows for clarity in policy about the Council's expectations in relation to the protection of trees and woodland as part of new development, and in terms of the circumstances under which tree removal will be acceptable. Together these will ensure that the important multi-functional contribution that trees make in the borough is maximised throughout the plan period.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 were rejected - whilst they allow for more general policy principles about tree protection to be captured they do not allow for a level of detailed policy that is considered necessary in the face of considerable development pressures.

## Policy approach to: Biodiversity & Geological Conservation

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Protect and enhance international, national and local designated sites for biodiversity (flora and fauna) and examples of interesting geology.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Rely on the NPPF and Core Strategy	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+
Option 2: Detailed policy to protect and enhance valued/ important biodiversity and geological features to ensure they are sensitively managed and protected in the future.	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	++

### SA Comments:

Both options score positively in relation to a number of objectives. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity can have wider positive impacts by improving the ability of people to access nature, and by protecting existing open, green and undeveloped greenspaces – meaning other green infrastructure functions can be fulfilled by the spaces (for example, visual contribution to landscape character, flood storage, adaptation to climate change).

Option 2 scores more positively in relation to conserving and enhancing cultural assets as it allows for specific policy criteria in relation to the protection of important geological features in the borough, and more positively in relation to conserving and enhancing biodiversity as it allows for specific policy criteria to manage the impact of new development on designated assets and other biodiversity resources in the borough.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred option. This option would allow for detailed policy criteria to protect and enhance the specific biodiversity interest features of the borough, as well as important geological features. Taken alongside wider GI interventions, this will make a positive contribution not just to nature conservation but also the health and wellbeing of the local population.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 provides general advice on the protection of biodiversity, however these policies are higher level, less detailed and provide less detailed policy criteria in relation to specific biodiversity and geology resources. As such this option was rejected.

## Policy approach to: Green Infrastructure

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Enhance Green Infrastructure assets and networks across the borough, and ensure that new development makes a positive rather than negative contribution to these to maximise the multifunctional role that can be played by green spaces across the borough.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate DM policy rely on NPPF, Core Strategy and Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	++	+
Option 2: Separate DM policy to ensure new development protects and enhances Green Infrastructure assets across the borough	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	++	++

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it provides the opportunity for clear policy criteria requiring consideration and incorporation of green infrastructure as part of new development.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as – whilst it would still secure positive benefits in relation to a number of sustainability appraisal objectives – it does not allow for detailed policy criteria to maximise delivery opportunities and protect existing GI resources.

### SA Comments:

Both options score positively in relation to facilitating health and wellbeing, contributing to visual character, providing sustainable transport choices, helping contribute to adaptability to climate change, reducing flood risk and impact of development on water quality, and protecting landscape and biodiversity. Option 3 would allow for health and wellbeing aspects and biodiversity of GI to be maximised by including a clear policy requirement for new development to incorporate green spaces and routes for both residents and biodiversity.

## Policy approach to: Development within the Green Belt

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Protect the Green Belt and manage any development proposals within it, particularly in relation to the extension, replacement or re-use of existing buildings.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Define criteria to determine how the Council will approach development proposals in the Green Belt (e.g. extensions, replacement buildings)	0	0	0	0	++	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Option 2: Do not have a specific policy - rely on Core Strategy/NPPF	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

The preferred policy approach is Option 1 as it provides for local specificity in terms of preserving local landscape character and openness of the countryside and supporting rural diversification. Option 1 will allow for clear policy criteria to guide the appropriate development within the Green Belt that should be considered and incorporated into any extensions, alterations and or any new development in the Green Belt.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 2 would still encourage positive benefits around protecting and enhancing landscape character and encourage the reuse of buildings however, this option was rejected as it does not allow for locally specific and detailed criteria to guide development proposals in the Green Belt.

### SA Comments:

Options 1 and 2 both have positive outcomes in relation to the same objectives. Both encourage making the best use of previously developed land in the green belt, enabling rural diversification and seek to protect the urban fringe and open countryside. However in each instance, Option 1 scores more positively as it includes specific policy criteria allowing for local circumstances to be reflected and for more detailed to be provided to assist in the determination of planning applications. Option 2 (relying on more strategic guidance) would limit the positive benefits that could be achieved.

## Policy approach to: Horse Keeping & Equestrian Development

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Protect and safeguard the intrinsic character of the countryside and openness of the Green Belt from demands of equestrian development which could otherwise harm the openness of the Green Belt and character of the landscape

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a separate policy - rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Option 2: Include separate policy on horse-keeping/ equestrian leisure development	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0

### SA Comments:

Both options can allow for equestrian leisure development as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and countryside. Similarly both options can encourage best use to made of previously developed / existing buildings within the Green Belt. Option 2 has scored more positively in relation to sustainability objectives in relation to landscape as it allows for the introduction of more detailed policy criteria that relate specifically to the impact that horse keeping activities can have on the landscape, whereas Option 1 relies on more general policies.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it allows for detailed policy criteria that specifically relate to the impact that horse keeping can have on the Green Belt, taking account of the local landscape character of the borough.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it does not provide specific guidance or local context in relation to horse keeping, which is acknowledged to have a potentially negative impact on the Green Belt within Reigate and Banstead given its landscape character.

## Policy approach to: Buildings of Special and Local Architectural or Historic Interest

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The preservation, protection, and conservation, of the appearance, character, and setting of listed and locally listed buildings.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy, rely on NPPF, Core Strategy policies (CS4) and legislation	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Rely on general design policies in the DMP to make reference to heritage	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Have a separate DM policy to preserve character and setting of local listed and listed buildings and support measures to secure their continued viable us.	0	0	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 3 allows for more detailed policy in relation to managing development proposals for listed buildings, and will allow for the ability of the Council to protect and enhance these assets through sensitive development activities to be maximised. Options 1 and 3 promote actions to secure viable futures for listed buildings, making best use of these built assets.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach. This will allow for detailed criteria to guide decision making, maximising the ability of the Council to protect and enhance these important heritage assets and make best use of them.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 have a more general focus and would mean a less detailed and specific policy approach which would limit the ability of the Council to safeguard and enhance listed and locally listed buildings. These options have therefore been rejected.

## Policy approach to: Conservation Areas

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The preservation and wherever possible enhancement of the character and/or appearance of conservation areas.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy, rely on NPPF, Core Strategy policies (CS4) and legislation	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Rely on general design policies in the DMP to make reference to heritage	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Have a separate DM policy for conservation areas with criteria in relation to design, development and demolition	-	0	++	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Negative scores in relation to housing supply and making best use of previously developed land have been recorded for all options as the heritage interest of conservation areas may limit the appropriateness of maximising the physical development capacity of these areas. Option 3 provides for a local approach to the management of development in conservation areas, as this approach will allow more detailed criteria to guide decision making on relevant applications and therefore maximise the Council's ability to protect and enhance its conservation areas.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach as it sets more detailed and locally specific criteria to guide decision making and will therefore provide a stronger basis on which to protect and enhance conservation areas.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 were both rejected because whilst they can or could provide more generic guidance around the protection and enhancement of conservation areas they allow for less detailed policy criteria to guide the determination of applications for extension, demolition and development in conservation areas.



## Policy approach to: Historic Parks and Gardens

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The preservation and where possible enhancement of historic parks and gardens.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Rely on general design policies in the DMP to make reference to heritage	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Option 2: Don't have a separate policy, rely on NPPF, Core Strategy policies (CS4) and legislation	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
Option 3: Have a separate DM policy on this issue including criteria about how HPGs should be protected and enhanced.	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	+

### SA Comments:

All options score similarly and can provide benefits in relation to health and wellbeing (access to greenspace), conserving heritage assets, and protecting and enhancing landscape character and biodiversity. However the option of a specific DMP policy on HPGs allows for more local specificity reflecting particular local circumstances, pressures and opportunities, and a clearer framework within which relevant applications will be considered.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach as it allows for a locally specific policy to protect the borough's historic parks and gardens, recognising their particular contribution to the borough's history and landscape and their sensitivity to development

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 can or could provide more generic guidance around the protection of historic parks and gardens but are not locally specific to the borough and as such they represent a missed opportunity to maximise the contribution of these areas and minimise the impact of new development on them.

## Policy approach to: Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Archaeology

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The preservation and where possible enhancement of scheduled ancient monuments, and sites of archaeological potential.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a separate policy, rely on NPPF, Core Strategy policies (CS4) and legislation	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Rely on general design policies in the DMP to make reference to heritage	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Separate DM policy with detailed criteria for the protection of SAMs and requirements for archaeological assessment required on sites in /adjacent to sensitive areas	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 3 would provide greater local specificity and detail, and thresholds for assessment, and thus have a more positive impact and ability to conserve archaeology and SAMs across the borough.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 3 is the preferred approach as it provides locally specific guidance on preserving SAMs and protecting/recording archaeology across the borough. This means that the particular local circumstances and sensitivities in relation to assets in Reigate & Banstead can better be protected as part of the decision making process.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Options 1 and 2 were rejected as – whilst they can or could provide more generic guidance - they represent a missed opportunity to put in place locally specific detailed policy to protect these heritage assets.

## Policy approach to: Airport Parking

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Aims to ensure that airport related developments are acceptable in environmental terms, thereby directing car parks within the boundary of the airport. It also seeks to avoid impact on the amenities of neighbouring areas.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Do not have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy/ NPPF	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Retain existing BLP policy which requires consistency with other policies	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 2 reflects current and future plans for Gatwick Airport and is in keeping with the Core Strategy objectives. The policy encourages the best use of land to support the function and convenience of Gatwick Airport.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Both options scored the same, however option 2 is the preferred approach as it is protecting the role of Gatwick Airport and supporting its function.

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected as it does not have local specificity around airport car parking in response to current and future plans of Gatwick Airport and the impact this could have on the borough.

## Policy approach to: Strategic Employment Site

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

Seeks to meet and deliver local employment needs and strategic development proposals, working with partners across the Gatwick Diamond to develop and grow the borough's economy.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Allocate a site for strategic employment provision	0	0	0	?	?	++	++	+	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?
Option 2: Don't allocate a site for strategic employment provision	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Option 1 would support economic growth and provide for local employment opportunities to meet the needs of the local economy, whereas option 2 would not encourage these aspects.

Option 1 has several question marks around objectives on flood risk, sustainable transport, PDL, water quality, land contamination air quality, pollution, landscaping and biodiversity due to the location of the site in the borough being unknown.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Further detail is needed in relation to the location of a potential site. **In identifying potential sites, it will be important that the impact on those objectives where the sustainability impact is currently flagged as being uncertain is given further consideration.**

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Not applicable

**Policy approach to: Cemetery or Crematorium provision**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

Ensure adequate burial facility provision in the borough to meet potential level of need

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Allocate a site for cemetery provision	-	0	?	+	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Allocate a site for crematorium provision	-	0	?	+	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 3: Do not allocate site for a new cemetery or crematorium	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Option 3 would potentially allow for alternative use of land for housing to boost the supply, depending on where the site is, whereas options 1 and 2 may prevent a suitable site within the borough from delivering and boosting the local housing supply.  
Options 1 and 2 by providing facilities within the borough would help reduce the need for residents to travel outside the borough to external facilities.  
Options 1 and 2 have question marks around conserving and enhancing historical and cultural assets and PDL since the location of a potential new site is not known at this stage.  
Most of the objectives for Option 3 are neutral as not allocating a site would have no impact on the SA objectives.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

The need to allocate sites will be dependent on assessment of burial needs and the sustainability of any proposals will depend on the location of the potential site..

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Not applicable.

## Policy approach to: Retail Warehousing

### Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)

The aim of such policy would ensure the protection of designated retail warehousing areas in the borough, whilst taking into account the impact of out of town retail developments on the viability, vitality and stability of the town and local centres.

### Scoring for each option

East Surrey SA objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1: Don't have a specific policy – rely on Core Strategy and NPPF.	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Have a separate policy on retail warehousing	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### SA Comments:

Both options scored positively in relation to economic growth and meeting the needs of the local economy in terms of providing for the needs of businesses and job creation. Option 2 would direct retail warehousing to sustainable locations in relative close proximity to town centres therefore ensuring sustainable travel. This approach also allows for local specificity around the requirements for development within designated retail warehousing areas in terms of scale and impact on traffic. It also ensures the viability and vitality of town and local centres by being specific about the uses appropriate in these designations, therefore leaving main town centre uses to be directed to town centres in the first instance.

### Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it provides greater definition of retail warehousing and allows for greater control over where retail warehousing proposals are permitted in the borough (within designated retail warehousing).

### Reason for rejecting alternatives

Option 1 was rejected because it does not allow for local specificity around restricting the location of retail warehousing within designated areas in the borough and protecting these designating sites to ensure they remain viable and active areas.

**Policy approach to: Netherne on the Hill**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

To ensure the most appropriate designation of land in the village of Netherne.

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Do not remove Netherne on the Hill from the Green Belt	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Remove Netherne on the Hill from the Green Belt	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Option 1 scores negatively for objective 1 relating to the provision of sufficient housing, and objective 5 for making the best use of previously developed land; this is due to the fact that if the village were to remain in the Green Belt, the principle of additional residential dwellings would be unacceptable in principle in accordance with national policy, and additions to existing dwellings/buildings would be significantly constrained. This would not make the best use of available land. However, option 2 would enable greater flexibility in terms of additional development within the village area.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Option 2 is the preferred approach as it would enable land that no longer reflects the open character of the Green Belt, due to its dense and built up character, to be removed from the Green Belt, and more suitably classified as built up/urban area. This would also enable more flexibility in terms of the additions to buildings/new buildings potentially achievable, and more efficient use of available land within the settlement area removed from the Green Belt.

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Option 1 was rejected as it does not recognise the built up character of Netherne on the Hill, which is not considered to reflect the open character of the surrounding Green Belt, and does not enable the most efficient use of land.

**Policy approach to: Babylon Lane / Lovelands Lane**

**Summary (What does the policy seek to achieve?)**

To ensure the most appropriate designation of land at Babylon Lane / Lovelands Lane.

Scoring for each option

<b>East Surrey SA objectives</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
Option 1: Do not include Babylon Lane / Lovelands Lane in the Green Belt	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Option 2: Include Babylon Lane / Lovelands Lane in the Green Belt	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**SA Comments:**

Both options score negatively for objective 1 relating to the provision of sufficient housing, and objective 5 for making the best use of previously developed land; this is due to the fact that the area is currently designated as 'Countryside beyond the Green Belt', and has been historically treated in terms of planning constraints to development, in a similar way to land designated as Green Belt. Therefore, both options would present a constraint to additional residential development and making the best use of available land.

**Preferred Option/ Policy Recommendations**

Not applicable – both options score the same

**Reason for rejecting alternatives**

Not applicable.