**NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**PARISH OF HELLINGLY**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

**REPORT OF THE PROJECT TEAM**

**MARCH 2019**

**CONTENTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Page |
| Sustainability Appraisal – Introduction | 1 |
| Hellingly Neighbourhood Plan – Screening for Strategic Environmental and Habitats Regulations Assessment | 1 |
| The Sustainability Appraisal Process | 2 |
| Scoping Report | 3 |
| Hellingly – Baseline Information, Context and Key Issues | 4 |
| Sustainability Framework and Objectives | 11 |
| Appraisal of the Policy Options and proposed Policies – Tables P1 – P20 | 18 |
| Policy Appraisal Summary | 39 |
| Appraisal of Recommendations – Tables R1 – R17 | 40 |
| Recommendations Appraisal Summary | 57 |
| Next Steps | 58 |

**APPENDICES**

Appendix 1– Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Screening Opinion Wealden District Council – October 2018 (separate attachment)

Appendix 2 – NDP Scoping Report – October 2018

Appendix 3 – Scoping Report Consultation Response

**Sustainability Appraisal – Introduction**

1. Sustainability Appraisal is a mechanism through which it is possible to assess the likely effectiveness of a Plan to help deliver sustainable development. This report forms the Sustainability Appraisal of the Hellingly NDP which is being developed in order to help guide development within the Parish of Hellingly in the period to 2028.
2. In particular the Plan is seeking to embody a number of key principles and objectives that will help in the delivery of sustainable development when assessed in respect of environmental economic and social objectives. The concept of sustainable development is key in all land use planning and is set down within and supported at Government level through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This concept is also relevant for the production of Neighbourhood Plans and has been carried forward in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.
3. Prior to carrying out a Sustainability Appraisal it is usual to request the Local Planning Authority, in this case Wealden District Council (WDC), to undertake a formal screening opinion of the draft NDP to identify whether a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is needed. Following a number of informal meetings with officers from Wealden on the emerging draft NDP a request for a formal screening was submitted.
4. This response (Appendix A – a separate attachment to this report) concluded that in the light of some of the policies proposed in the NDP that this may result in a likely significant environmental impact and that an SEA would be required. It was therefore recommended that such an SEA should be undertaken for the Hellingly NDP that incorporates a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). This should assess the Plan against agreed sustainability objectives including consideration of reasonable alternatives to the policies and recommendations proposed within the draft submission NDP.
5. Whilst not a legislative requirement, prior to preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal it was considered beneficial to firstly produce and consult upon an SA Scoping Report. A copy of the Scoping Report is attached as Appendix B.
6. These processes have helped to shape the final Sustainability Appraisal for the NDP. The SA provides a simple tool to help assess the likely effect overall, of the policies contained within the NDP, in seeking to help deliver sustainable development.

**Hellingly NDP – Strategic Environment Assessment and Habitat Regulations Screening**

1. Following advice received from officers of WDC and in close liaison with them the draft submission NDP was forwarded for a screening opinion in respect of any requirement to undertake Sustainability Appraisal and an Appropriate Assessment of the NDP.
2. In accordance with the Regulations the District Council has consulted with the Statutory Consultees – Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England – whose formal responses on the NDP are summarised within the formal screening opinion received in October 2018 and which is attached to this Environmental Report SA at Appendix A.
3. As a result of the screening assessment it was concluded that there is a possibility for significant environmental effects to arise as a result of the scope and nature of some of the policies within the draft NDP. The screening opinion concluded that it would be beneficial for Hellingly Parish Council to prepare a Sustainability Appraisal of its NDP in order to comply with its basic condition to demonstrate how the plan will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development within its area.[[1]](#footnote-1)
4. The conclusions of the screening opinion received from the District Council also confirmed that the Sustainability Appraisal should be light-touch and clearly proportionate to the matters and issues considered in the NDP.
5. As set out within the National Guidance, the Sustainability Appraisal approach is specifically framed to enable Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the plan to be incorporated within this process. As part of the SA for the Hellingly NDP reasonable alternatives to its proposed policies are detailed and appraised within the final environmental report (SA).
6. With regard to the screening of the NDP under Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Policy HNDPE of the draft NDP was provided for the purpose of avoiding or reducing any potential harmful effects of the Plan upon relevant European and international conservation sites at the screening stage. As however noted within the screening report[[2]](#footnote-2) in accordance with recent European Court Judgement it is not now possible to account for such embedded mitigation matters at the Screening Stage of a NDP. This means (as in Hellinglys case) that where a screening assessment has identified that a ‘likely significant effect’ on a European site may occur, a full Appropriate Assessment would be required to consider more fully these effects.
7. As the named competent authority under HRA legislation it will be the responsibility of WDC to carry out this assessment. It is at the appropriate assessment stage that any potential effects can be considered in adequate detail and mitigation and avoidance measures identified and considered in terms of their effectiveness.
8. The proposed submission NDP was submitted to Wealden District Council as the competent authority under the Habitat Regulations for the purpose of carrying out an Appropriate Assessment of the Plan.
9. This assessment (March 2019) concluded that certain of the policies contained within the NDP could have a likely significant effect upon designated European sites. The most appropriate way of avoiding or reducing any impacts was through provision of suitable policies. This Policy (HNDPE in the Plan) provides similar wording to that in the Wealden Submission Local Plan 2019. It is included in its own right to ensure that the NDP is compliant with the Habitats Regulations and the Appropriate Assessment forms part of the submission documents for the NDP.

**Hellingly NDP – Preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal**

1. The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal is to assess the effectiveness and ability of the NDP to deliver and support sustainable development. The appraisal should look at reasonable alternatives to those policies and choices put forward in the Plan in order to also judge their effectiveness. It is an opportunity to consider ways in which the Plan can contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions within the Parish as well as a means of identifying and helping mitigate any potential adverse impacts of the Plan.
2. Sustainable development is a key concept in land use planning as set down within and supported through the NPPF.
3. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. In this regard the planning system has 3 overarching objectives which the NPPF confirms are interdependent and need to be prepared in mutually supportive ways: an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective.
5. The NPPF sets out in some greater detail the intentions of these 3 broad objectives and the requirement of the planning system to perform a number of roles.
6. ECONOMIC ROLE – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land and the right type is available in the right places and the right time to support growth and innovation, and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure.
7. SOCIAL ROLE – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of the present and future generations, and by creating a high-quality environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural wellbeing.
8. ENVIRONMENTAL ROLE – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution and mitigate and adapt to climate change including to low carbon economy.[[4]](#footnote-4)
9. The final Sustainability Appraisal report is a key document in supporting the NDP and will be submitted alongside the NDP for examination. An important part of the process of sustainability appraisal is consultation with statutory environmental bodies alongside other consultees.

**Hellingly Neighbourhood Plan Sustainability Appraisal – preparation of the Scoping Report**

1. The development of the Appraisal itself has evolved in accordance with guidance produced by the former Department of Communities and Local Government[[5]](#footnote-5). Initial stages relate to the preparation of and consultation upon an SA Scoping Report. This document sets out the context and key background evidence to the NDP and identifies a number of sustainability objectives for the Hellingly NDP.
2. Within this Sustainability Framework are set out a number of proposed indicators by which it is possible to measure the success of any particular objective in seeking to encourage and help deliver sustainable development.
3. The preparation of the scoping report enables statutory and other relevant consultees to comment and advise upon the nature and content of the final sustainability appraisal report.
4. The scoping report sets out the context for Hellingly Parish with regards those key other relevant plans, including core planning principles and objectives set down therein. Also, of especial relevance has been the evidence base and iterations of the emerging Wealden Local Plan.
5. Within the SA Scoping Report which is attached as Appendix B reference is made to a large number of Topic Papers and Support Papers which have helped to provide and shape a local context and evidence base for the NDP. This collection of baseline information and the identification of key issues and challenges for Hellingly has been further supported and informed through widespread consultation with residents and local discussion groups.

**Hellingly – Baseline Information, Context and Key Issues**

1. Through a wide range of consultation and engagement the NDP process has endeavoured (including the sending of a comprehensive questionnaire to all those in the Parish who are on the electoral role) to identify those key sustainability issues and objectives that face Hellingly. These have been augmented through a number of themed focus groups covering matters such as local businesses, farmers and environment as well as ones for each of the 4 principal settlements within the Parish.
2. Additionally, the evolution of policies and objectives has had to take into account and be informed by an appraisal of existing (adopted) Development Plan documents – in particular Wealden’s adopted Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal 2013.
3. The emerging Wealden Local Plan and its SA report both for the published Issues and Options document (2015) and the recently approved Submission Plan (August 2018) are also key to setting the scope and context for sustainability appraisal of the Hellingly NDP.
4. In addition to legislation requiring any NDP to not be in strategic conflict with the Development Plan, the Hellingly NDP also has to have regard to background studies and new evidence as work on Wealden’s emerging Local Plan progresses.
5. In seeking to ensure a local focus upon those sustainability issues facing the Parish a number of topic papers and support papers have been produced. These include matters relating to the demographic ‘parish profile’, agriculture, flooding, landscape, green and blue infrastructure, heritage and village character assessments.
6. All of this baseline information has helped to identify key issues and objectives relating to Hellingly Parish.

Baseline Information – Key Issues

1. Hellingly is an essentially rural parish located within the southern part of Wealden District. As a rural parish lying immediately to the north of the rapidly expanding town of Hailsham Hellingly faces particular and significant challenges in meeting the broad aims of the NDP whilst reasonably contributing to meeting wider housing needs in Wealden District.
2. The population of Hellingly ward (which includes part of north Hailsham and all Arlington Parish) in 2014 was 7,158 a significant percentage increase (20%) from its 2011 figure of 5,959. The recent development of Roebuck Park at some 450 residential units has contributed significantly to this population increase over the last 5 years. Current planning permissions now being built out and significant (c1,500 units) proposed allocations within Wealden’s proposed submission Local Plan (August 2018) further contribute to concerns surrounding the sustainability of such growth together with a fear of rurality being lost and of the parish becoming suburbanised.
3. Whilst it is recognised that there will be growth within Hellingly it is felt appropriate, in terms of helping deliver sustainable development, to guide development to the best and locally most sustainable locations. This has in significant part meant developing the NDP to identify where such development should be resisted – whether by reason of landscape quality, flooding, biodiversity, amenity or sustainability reasons.
4. Where development is supported in the adopted and emerging District Plans, the NDP seeks to improve the quality of that development in terms of local character, design and materials.
5. Population and Housing Composition

* Hellingly’s population in 2014 was 7,158 a 20% increase on the 2011 figure (5,959)
* Over 20% of the population (2014) are aged 65+
* 2,308 households (2011) with 43.8% owned outright and a further 42% through either a mortgage or a loan
* Household composition identifies a significant percentage (24%) occupied as one person households, 12.5% occupied by a person aged 65+
* Families with children represent highest sector in terms of household composition at 28.6%
* Compared with the rest of Wealden figures for the 16-29 age group are markedly higher for Hellingly (13.1% for Wealden, 17.8 % for Hellingly ward)

Landscape Character

1. The northern part of the parish is included in the East Sussex County Landscape Assessment for the south slopes of the High Weald as:

“an intricate and small scale landscape with a strong pattern of hedgerows” and “this landscape of gentle valleys and slopes afford good views of the downs”

1. This contrasts with the predominantly pastoral undulating southern slopes of the High Weald and the more open arable countryside to the south of the Parish.
2. The Parish of Hellingly falls into three separate National Character Areas (NCA’s) as defined by Natural England under their responsibilities as set out in the Natural Environment White Paper, Biodiversity 2020 and the European Landscape Convention.
3. The Parish is dominated by the High Weald NCA an area of ancient countryside ad one of the best surviving medieval landscapes in Europe. The Low Weald NCA which is a broad, low lying clay vale which wraps around the High Weald, is a landscape of predominantly pastoral agriculture. A small part of the south east corner of the parish lies within the Pevensey Levels NCA providing an important link to the Pevensey wetlands of international conservation importance.

Flooding

1. Flooding is a major issue for the Parish with many instances being recorded locally. Flooding and the issue of flooding is a particular and regular occurrence including especially surface water flooding which has historically not been covered in any comprehensive way by official records. Wealden’s Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides additional evidence regarding the vulnerability of much of the Parish to flooding issues.

Nature Conservation

1. Hellingly has no internationally or nationally recognised sites within its boundaries but hosts three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) Hellingly Cemetery, Cowden Wood Meadow and the Jarvis’s, Nobody’s Wood and Park Wood complex.
2. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) are designed to promote a targeted landscape scale approach to conserving biodiversity in Sussex and identify the greatest opportunities for habitat creation and restoration at a County level. Three BOAs intersect and cover significant areas of Hellingly – the Pevensey and Cuckmere Valley link, the River Cuckmere Habitat link and the Cuckoo Trail Habitat link.
3. Ancient woodlands are recognised nationally as being of nature conservation importance and the parish has a significant number of designated ancient woods, many incorporating ghyll woodlands so characteristic of this part of Sussex and its preserved medieval landscape features.
4. The Parish is considered to be likely to be under recorded in terms of its biodiversity interest and work has now been commissioned on a Phase I Habitat Survey to incorporate identification and recording of notable species, priority habitats and opportunities for connectivity/wildlife corridors. This work will assist greatly in the implementation of policies designed to help conserve and enhance biodiversity within the parish.

Employment and Economy

1. From the 2011 census some 64% of the parish population is shown as employed, part time or self employed with just 2.2% unemployed. This may suggest a reasonably high percentage of retired residents but also needs to account for those who may choose not to work for other reasons such as bringing up family.
2. There is little retail offer in the Parish which supports 1 petrol station (with small convenience offer), 1 garden centre, 2 public houses, 1 hotel, 1 motel and a limited number of other individual outlets. The local sub post office has now closed. Given the proximity of Hailsham this is not surprising. There are no professional offices and no healthcare (doctors or dentists) facilities although there is a veterinary practice at Lower Horsebridge.
3. Some employment opportunities exist through farm diversification, particularly at Broad Farm which hosts a number of successful rural workshops employing some 250 people.

Broadband

1. Only parts of the Parish receive mobile telephone coverage and the cover is patchy and reception intermittent. The existence of several providers means that quality of connection varies from one to another.
2. Equally fast fibre optic connection is not widely available. Although Government and BT boast of the service being available to 95% of the population the local experience is somewhat different. This is proving a positive disadvantage to businesses wishing to set themselves up other than in the centre of a town, as well as proving disadvantageous to residents who increasingly find other local infrastructure stretched or declining.


Infrastructure

1. There is no rail connection in either Hellingly or Hailsham the nearest station being Polegate. Some residents frequently choose to travel to Berwick or Etchingham to catch a train.
2. In addition to school services there are 4 regular bus services linking Hellingly to Eastbourne through Hailsham, through Uckfield and Heathfield to Tunbridge Wells and through Herstmonceux to Hastings.
3. The parish currently has a single form entry primary school catering for 240 children aged 4-11. Older children travel to secondary schools in Hailsham, Ringmer Heathfield and Willingdon. Work should begin soon upon delivering a 2-form entry primary school, an idea put forward some 10 years ago in respect of the then proposed development at Roebuck Park and elsewhere.
4. In respect of sports and recreation there is a recreation ground at Horsebridge, a cricket pitch at Hellingly Country Park, a golf course off the A267 and a specialist cycle speedway track at Lower Dicker. There are other open spaces with public access including a significant area of ancient woodland at Park Wood. The Hellingly Country Park at Roebuck Park and a number of smaller children’s play spaces. A number of these facilities are shared with clubs from Hailsham in terms of usage.
5. There is an acknowledged (by the District Council) shortage of outdoor playing space in the north of Hailsham and Hellingly area. Without planned provision with the extensive amount of new residential development proposed in the immediate vicinity, this situation will only worsen.

Heritage and the built environment of the settlements in Hellingly

1. There are 60 dwellings or structures within Hellingly parish that are statutorily listed for their architectural and historic importance (2 Grade I, 4 Grade II\* and 54 Grade II). The majority of these (21) are in Hellingly Village.
2. There is 1 Conservation Area – Hellingly Village which was first designated in 1972. The District Council has recently reviewed and significantly enlarged this Conservation Area.
3. Following evidence specifically commissioned as part of the NDP work upon Village Character Assessments for the 4 principal settlements of the parish has identified a number of buildings recommended for ‘local listing’ by Wealden as non-designated heritage assets.
4. From consultation upon the NDP, residents of the 4 principal settlements strongly support the retention of their separate character and identity. This has been supported by evidence from Village Character Assessments to help develop policies to support sympathetic and appropriate developments within these settlements.

**Map of Hellingly Parish – the area designated for preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan**



1. Following assessment of key baseline information and those issues identified from this process and from widespread consultation a Sustainability Framework was developed for the purposes of producing the Sustainability Appraisal. This framework is set down at Table 1 of the Scoping Report and identified some 15 Sustainability Objectives covering Environmental, Economic and Social issues. For each objective a number of indicators were put forward by which to help measure the success of each objective in helping to deliver sustainable development.
2. In accordance with the regulations the Scoping Report was published for consultation in November 2018. It was subject to a 5-week consultation period (16 November – 21 December) with statutory consultees: The Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England together with a number of other key partners including WDC and East Sussex County Council.
3. Comments received on the Scoping Report are attached which also incorporates in tabular form, the response of the Parish Council where appropriate in identifying changes to and incorporation of suggestions into the Sustainability Appraisal work. (Appendix C – SA Scoping Report revised version)
4. The Scoping Report identified 15 proposed Sustainability Objectives for the NDP. These were chosen as representing those key challenges facing the Parish of Hellingly over the period of the Plan. These related not only to existing challenges but also those that were anticipated in light of the significant amount of future growth likely to arise from the emerging Wealden Local Plan.
5. These objectives, and the sustainability framework proposed, were the subject of consultation at the scoping report stage. They are set out below at Table 1 together with proposed indicators of success and a colour representation of their principal sustainability role – i.e. environmental, economic or social. As identified within the scoping report some objectives are felt to have benefits across all 3 roles and these are identified accordingly. The final list of SA objectives and its Framework include those identified within the Scoping Report together with amendments that have been made in response to feedback from the consultation process.
6. In response to the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report it was recommended (Environment Agency) that a further sustainability objective be added, namely ‘to protect and enhance the environment’.
7. This additional objective has accordingly been incorporated in the final Sustainability Appraisal and within the Sustainability Framework (SA16) at Table 1. As with the other sustainability objectives each of the proposed policies within the NDP have been assessed against SA16 at Table 1. As with the other sustainability objectives each og the proposed policies within the NDP have been assessed against SA16 and the predicted impacts recorded in the appropriate tables P1 – P20.

**Table 1**

**Sustainability Framework and Objectives**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL** | |
| SA1 – Countryside Heritage  Protection of the rural character of the Parish. To identify and conserve the most sensitive and valued landscapes for their environmental and social benefit. | Indicators of Success  Designation as Area of Locally Valued Landscape in adopted NDP. Development of land in lower landscape sensitivity area only. |
| SA2 – Local Green Space  To identify and protect valued Local Green Space for social, recreational and biodiversity benefit. | Designation of Local Green Space in adopted NDP. Retention of all designated Local Green Spaces over the period of the NDP. |
| SA 3 – Flood Avoidance and Mitigation  To identify land at risk of flooding, including surface water flooding and to seek to guide development away from such areas. | Designation of Area at Risk of Flooding’ within adopted NDP. Development in this area resisted or strictly controlled. |
| SA4  To minimise the risk of flooding within Hellingly Parish and of climate change upon flooding incidence. | Monitoring of flood incidents recorded by LFA (ESCC). Enhanced flood mitigation measures in all developments within the Parish. |
| SA5 – Biodiversity  To identify, protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure assets within Hellingly Parish. | Designation of all green and blue infrastructure assets in adopted NDP. |
| SA6 - Biodiversity |  |
| To improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity gains including use of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas to seek such gains. | Improved design, mitigation and connectivity for biodiversity in all developments.  Widespread use of biodiversity opportunity areas and re-connection of wildlife corridors through developer contributions and use of Community Infrastructure Levies. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Indicators of Success |
| SA7 – Heritage and Protection of the Built Environment  To identify, conserve and enhance the historic and built environment. | Adoption of Policy on designated and non-designated (local list) heritage assets in NDP.  Acceptance and support by LPA/EH of recommendations for local listing. |
|  | Production of a Management Plan for the Hellingly Conservation Area. |
| SA8  To contribute to the reduction of air pollution and improve air quality within the area. | Incorporation of appropriate policy within the adopted NDP.  Inclusion within all major developments of electric vehicle charging points.  Monitoring of air quality by appropriate bodies to assess improvements to local air quality. |
| **ECONOMIC** | |
| SA9  To support diversification of agricultural and other land based rural business within the Parish. | Rural Economy Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of new or diversified rural businesses or expanded existing businesses. |
| SA10  To support new agricultural or other appropriate rural businesses where a new dwelling is considered necessary. | Isolated dwellings Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of new agricultural start-ups. |
| SA11  To support as appropriate truly innovative designs for new isolated dwellings. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Indicators of Success |
| **SOCIAL** | |
| SA12  To support residential developments that are in accordance with the Development Plan and where a high percentage of starter homes/homes for the elderly are incorporated. | Appropriate Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of such schemes approved by the Local Planning Authority. |
| SA13  To support developments in the most sustainable locations locally. | No. of developments outside of Flood Areas and Area of Locally Valued Landscapes or of Blue/Green Infrastructure. |
| **SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC** | |
| To retain the separate character of the 4 main settlements in the Parish (Hellingly Village, Lower Horsebridge, Lower Dicker and Roebuck Park) is one of the 2 high level objectives of the NDP. Policies consulted upon and being developed to deliver this aim are considered to be able to help deliver key sustainability objectives across all 3 criteria – namely social, economic and environmental. They are accordingly dealt with here in the scoping reports sustainability framework. Equally a general objective to protect and enhance the environment should show benefits across all 3 namely, social, environmental and economic criteria. | |
|  | Indicators of Success |
| SA14  To retain, conserve and enhance the separate character of the 4 main settlements in the Parish. | The incorporation within the adopted NDP of specific Policies on design principles and design criteria for each if the settlements of Lower Dicker, Lower Horsebridge, Hellingly Village and Roebuck Park |
| SA15  To support high quality housing in the most sustainable locations in accordance with Development Plan allocations and to meet needs of existing and future residents. | Monitoring of approved developments by the LPA against these Policies.  Use of Village Character Assessments to assist Developers in development of locally successful schemes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Indicators of Success |
| SA16  To conserve and enhance the environment. | Monitoring of developments to secure implementation of submitted ecological management plans.  Enhanced monitoring of local flooding including surface water flooding.  Enhanced flood mitigation measures incorporated in all developments within the Parish. |

1. As an integral part of the Sustainability Appraisal process it is also considered important to consider those broader, higher level, objectives that have been developed and set down within the Hellingly NDP following consultation and feedback from residents and other interested parties.
2. This includes the overall vision for the NDP together with its 2 widely supported broad aims.

The Vision

“That the growth proposed for Hellingly Parish within the emerging Wealden Local Plan will have been successfully delivered, with all appropriate supporting infrastructure and in the most suitable locations locally. Hellingly will remain an essentially rural parish providing a green and accessible lung for the growing town of Hailsham”.

Broad Aims

1. To protect the rural character of the area
2. To retain the separate character and identity of the 4 main settlements in the parish (Hellingly Village, Lower Horsebridge, Lower Dicker and Roebuck Park).
3. Both the vision for the NDP and its 2 broad aims are considered to support the concept of and help to deliver sustainable development.
4. Delivery of the vision and these aims has been developed through consideration of and consultation upon a range of Policy options together with recommendations to service providers.
5. Detailed appraisal of these against a number of sustainability indicators is set down within the following sections of this sustainbility appraisal.

**Appraisal of the Policy Options**

1. Extensive consultation has been carried out regarding the nature and number of policies to be included within the NDP in order to help deliver this vision and these broad aims whilst encouraging and supporting the delivery of sustainable development.
2. This has resulted in the development of 20 Policies in total together with 17 Recommendations to appropriate providers (e.g. infrastructure) and where it is not legislatively possible to cover such matters as Policies within a NDP.
3. As noted within the Introduction to the NDP these Recommendations are not Policies. They do however, reflect local opinion as expressed in extensive consultations and which should be taken into account by relevant service providers in the future planning and provision of their services. For the sake of completeness in this sustainability appraisal these Recommendations, or more precisely the possible implementation of them, have also been appraised against the sustainability framework and SA objectives contained within it.
4. The range of policies selected for inclusion within the Plan has now been appraised in order to determine their potential contribution to the delivery of sustainable development, both positive or negative, using the Sustainability Framework.
5. In preparing the NDP a range of policy areas has been considered including through the medium of a detailed questionnaire sent to all households within the parish. These policies have also been developed having regard to a review of existing other Development Plan Policies, National Guidance and in liaison with WDC who have offered advice and support on earlier versions of the NDP.
6. Each Policy is now assessed in the following section of this Sustainability Appraisal having regard to these other plans and the agreed 15 sustainability objectives of the NDP itself.

**Overall Policy Approach and Development**

1. Through the emerging Wealden Local Plan it is recognised that there will be growth within Hellingly. In view of the likely scale of growth it was felt appropriate, in order to better guide such development to the most sustainable and appropriate locations locally for the NDP to be developed in significant part identifying where new development should be resisted – whether that be by reason of landscape quality/sensitivity, biodiversity, amenity or sustainability reasons.
2. This early view was subsequently endorsed not least by the significant uncertainties as to Wealdens own housing and development needs as the District Council developed its own submission plan.
3. Through its Vision for Hellingly and its 2 broad stated Aims various alternative policy options were considered but screened out during early stages of the Plan.
4. Within the adopted WDC Core Strategy Policy WCS6 Rural Areas Strategy seeks to ensure appropriate development which protects, supports and increases the range and quality of facilities and services available to the rural areas, sustains rural living, reinforces the accessibility settlements whilst meeting local community needs and aspirations. In developing the NDP it is considered that implementation of its policies (and recommendations) will assist in meeting this overall spatial strategy.
5. In respect of housing provision and finding an approach suitable for Hellingly it was not considered appropriate for the reasons set out above, to seek to allocate additional sites (over and above Wealdens Plan) for development. Rather to support applications where the principal of development was acceptable and in accordance with the Development Plan especially proposals that provide for a high percentage of homes for the elderly and for starter homes. This approach strongly reflected views expressed and reaffirmed throughout the many consultation phases in the development of the NDP.
6. In considering the fostering of economic growth and options available support was expressed for farm and other land based business diversification and for limited (very) exceptions where a need to live on the land to manage that land was evidenced.

**Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan – Appraisal of the proposed Policies**

1. A wide range of policies is included in the draft submission NDP. These reflect the policy issues and areas of concern to local residents and where inclusion of such policies was felt appropriate to help ensure delivery of sustainable development.
2. This assessment, carried out for each Policy against the 15 sustainability appraisal objectives, enables an easy comparison of policies in assisting delivery of sustainable development.
3. The following symbols have been used in order to identify how each Policy ‘measures up’ to each identified sustainability objective. Where a prediction as to likely impact is less certain or depends for example, upon how rigidly a Policy is applied, the notation used in the Table below allows for a possible or slight positive or negative impact and is shown as below. This has been used successfully in the SA of other local Neighbourhood Development Plans.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green | **✓✓** | Positive impact upon sustainability objective |
| Light green | **✓** | Possible or slight positive impact |
| Grey | **~** | Neutral or no identified impact |
| Amber | **–** | Possible or slight negative impact |
| Red | **--** | Negative impact upon sustainability objectives |

1. Whilst noting the inclusion of a number of Recommendations withhin the draft NDP and acknowledging their different status from Policies the screening opinion received from WDC also concluded that appraisal should also be carried out in respect of these.[[6]](#footnote-6) The same notation as that used for appraisal of the Policies has been used for this exercise.
2. Each of the proposed policies within the NDP and its Recommendations, have been the subject of widespread consultation. This has led to a number of amendments having been incorporated, as appropriate, to reflect consultation responses. This process has included helpful and ongoing advice received from officers of WDC as part of an agreed close liaison.
3. Tables P1-P20 (Policies) and R1-R17 (Recommendations) set out for each of the Policies as drafted an assessment against each of the objectives set out in the Sustainability Framework. Also identified within each Table are those reasonable alternatives considered but not progressed with as an integral part of the plan making process. A brief appraisal of these options set out why the proposed policy approach was chosen.
4. Tables R1-R17 (Recommendations) assesses the impact that implementation, or part implementation, of the recommendations could have upon the delivery of sustainable development. However, since these recommendations reflect locally held views, in some cases very strongely held views, they are included within the appraisal but are not specifically considered to have ”reasonable alternatives”. They are, as indicated locally held views, put forward for consideration by service providers and the wording of the recommendations has been agreed following consultation upon them as part of the Plan making process.
5. It is considered that early implementation of the Recommendations contained within the NDP will greatly assist in ensuring assimilation of new development in a locally sustainable and acceptable way.

**Sustainability Appraisal Methodology**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green | **✓✓** | Positive impact upon sustainability objective |
| Light green | **✓** | Possible or slight positive impact |
| Grey | **~** | Neutral or no identified impact |
| Amber | **–** | Possible or slight negative impact |
| Red | **--** | Negative impact upon sustainability objectives |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P1**  **Policy HNDPE – This Policy seeks to prevent any potential significant effect upon the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Area, the Pevensey Levels Ramsar Site and Special Area of Conservation or the Lewes Downs Special Area of Conservation.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| Policy HNDPE | **✓** | **–** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **--** | **--** | **–** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | This Policy is included upon the advice of Wealden District Council as the designated “competent authority” in respect of Habitats Regulations and Appropriate Assessment. The Policy seeks to ensure that the Hellingly NDP will have no likely significant effect, alone or in combination with other plans or projects upon the internationally designated important sites of the Ashdown Forest, Pevensey Levels and the Lewes Downs. The wording of the Policy has been provided by Wealden District Council and is to help ensure that the NDP is compliant with European Regulations. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P2**  **Policy HNDP1 – Area of Locally Valued Landscape** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **–** | **--** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** |
| B | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **-** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| C | **--** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** |
| 1. Policy as drafted in progressing an Area of Locally Valued Landscape, identifying landscape most sensitive to change supported by evidence from landscape assessments carried out by WDC 2016 & 2017. Within this area new development generally resisted. 2. A smaller area than proposed offering more (potential) scope for development to take place. 3. No Policy of identifying locally valued landscape | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A has a significant and positive impact upon several of the Sustainability Objectives and additionally supports a key broad objective of the Plan in seeking to retain the rural character of the Parish. The area proposed to be designated is also based upon current evidence carried out by the District Council whereas Option B, which performs less well against SA Objectives, would be somewhat arbitrarily drawn. Options B & C but especially C perfom less effectively (Option C particularly) against a number of the SA objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P3**  **Policy HNDP2 – Local Green Space** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **–** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **--** | **~** |
| C | **–** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **--** | **~** |
| 1. Policy as drafted seeks to protect and enhance these Green Spaces that are locally valued, are well used by residents and community groups. This Option performs well against a number of the identified Sustainability Objectives. 2. Option B would run contrary, or risk running contrary to some of the SA Objectives in not protecting some identified green spaces that are used for recreational and social wellbeing as well as for community/group use. 3. Option C fares poorly and without such a Policy in place some local green space could be lost. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P4**  **Policy HNDP3 – Areas of Critical Flood and Drainage Concern** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| C | **–** | **–** | **--** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** |
| 1. Policy area which extends beyond identified Flood Zones 1-3 to allow for flood mitigation and resilience work alongside river courses. 2. Policy centred on existing identified Flood Zones 1-3. 3. No Policy but reliance on NPPF and Local District Plan. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | This Policy (HNDP3) best addresses key local issues of flooding, including surface water flooding within Hellingly. The Area identified extends beyond identified Flood Zones 1-3 to enable flood mitigation and resilience work to be carried out and supports work being carried out by ESCC as Lead Flood Authority which includes monitoring and recording of surface water flooding. Option A performs well against many SA objectives including of social benefits and biodiversity. Option B performs well whilst Option C does nothing to address a major local concern.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P5**  **Policy HNDP4 – Flood Risk and Run Off** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **-** | **–** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy designed to address local concerns and sustainability issues in respect of flooding, including surface water flooding and that which is casued by run off following land raise on developments. 2. To rely on NPPF guidance and existing Development Plan Policy and its interpretation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Reliance solely upon NPPF guidance and Development Plan policies or interpretation of these has led to issues of local sustainability concern. (Option B) A more locally defined Policy with specific criteria and guidance as to interpretation will prove a more sustainable route.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P6**  **Policy HNDP5 – Green and Blue Infrastructure** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| C | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. Policy identifies all relevant green and blue infrastructure locally including the identification of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas where biodiversity mitigation, habitat restoration and connectivity can be progressed and promoted. 2. Option B would identify Green and Blue Infrastructure but not Opportunity Areas for enhancement and reconnection of habitats. 3. Option C (no Policy) would rely solely upon those green and blue infrastructure assets already recognised as of national or county importance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A clearly fares best when assessed against most sustainability objectives including social objectives for sustainable healthy living. This option clearly identifies all assets of local value and importance to the parish, together with opportunities for all developments to contribute to biodiversity enhancements and habitat restoration.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P7**  **Policy HNDP6 – Biodiversity** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. Provides a Policy which seeks use of up to date information to inform developments, contributes to the improvement of biodiversity, minimises habitat fragmentation and looks to ensure implementation and management of biodiversity in developments. 2. Would rely upon existing NPPF broad guidance and existing Development Plan Policy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | A Policy specific to the issues of concern raised within the Parish, for example concerning habitat fragmentation and reconnecting of habitats is needed. Clear guidance on the need for upto date information to inform development and the need in certain instances for ecological management plans will help address local sustainability issues.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P8**  **Policy HNDP7 – Rural Economy (Diversification of agricultural and other rural land based businesses)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy that supports local rural businesses where they are able to demonstrate they are sustainable by providing local benefits economically, socially and environmentally. Required to also meet Development Plan Policies. 2. No Policy – reliance upon NPPF and Development Plan. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A provides for proposals that can show specific and local sustainability benefits for Hellingly thus providing opportunities to encourage and support businesses locally. Such opportunities would risk being lost by reliance solely on NPPF and wider (District Plan) policies.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P9**  **Policy HNDP8 – Isolated Dwellings** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **--** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. This Policy closely mirrors National Policy but provides greater clarity and guidance as to requirements for ensuring local protections and character are respected and enhanced. This approach would still enable appropriate schemes to be progressed in a sustainable fashion. 2. Option B of having no such Policy is the only ‘reasonable alternative’ but reliance on existing National Guidance is very broad. Indeed encouragement is given to development of local policies to provide locally based criteria. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | A specific Policy to encourage, in special circumstances and to specific local guidance and criteria, fares best when assessed against all agreed sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P10**  **Policy HNDP9 – Housing Type** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **–** |
| B | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **~** |
| 1. The Policy approach adopted seeks to support proposals that are in accordance with the Development Plan but to support especially those proposals with a high percentage of starter homes (2-3 bed or smaller) and homes for the elderly. This approach reflects locally expressed support, needs and concerns. 2. Reliance on existing Development Plan Policies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A most closely reflects local needs of existing residents and reflects concerns expressed generally regarding the nature of housing more often provided under existing Development Plan Policy.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P11**  **Policy HNDP10 – Sustainable Transport** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **~** |
| 1. A Policy to encourage use of sustainable transport was developed with encouragement, advice and support of the County Council as Highways Authority. Anticipated levels of growth within Hellingly and the surrounding town of Hailsham are considered to be at a level whereby the non inclusion of such a Policy would miss significant opportunity to address locally expressed concerns regarding air pollution and provision of more sustainable transport. 2. No Policy – would not support sustainable forms of transport. Current adopted Development Plan has no such detailed Policy. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Such approach will enable earlier adoption of a Policy to combat local issues in advance of likely date of adoption of the emerging Wealden Local Plan.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P12**  **Policy HV1– Hellingly Village – Design Principles** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. To include Policy and policy guidance on design principles for developments within Hellingly Village. Developed from Village Character Assessment work specific to Hellingly Village. 2. No Policy – but reliance on Development Plan and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A would help meet concerns expressed locally that recent developments have detracted from local character and/or have failed to meet a key NDP objective of conserving and enhancing the separate character of the 4 main settlements within the Parish. NDP Topic Paper No 7 – Village Character Assessments supports the Policy.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P13**  **Policy HV2– Design Criteria Hellingly Village** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy which contains design criteria to specifically support otherwise (i.e. Development Plan compliant) acceptable development in Hellingly Village. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan (inc District wide SPD) and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Incorporation of Policy on specific and local design criteria, based upon Village Character Assessments, provides for a more sustainable way of ensuring high quality appropriate development that respects, conserves and enhances the character of Hellingly. Option B fares less well when assessed against sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P14**  **Policy LHB1– Lower Horsebridge – Design Principles** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. To include a Policy and policy guidance on design principles for developments within Lower Horsebridge. Developed from Village Character Assessments work specific to Lower Horsebridge. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A would help meet concerns expressed locally that recent developments have detracted from local character and/or have failed to meet a key NDP objective of conserving and enhancing the separate character of the 4 main settlements within the Parish. NDP Topic Paper No 7 – Village Character Assessments supports the Policy.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P15**  **Policy LHB2– Design Criteria Lower Horsebridge** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy which contains design criteria to specifically support otherwise (i.e. Development Plan compliant) acceptable development in Lower Horsebridge. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan (inc District wide SPD) and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Incorporation of Policy on specific and local design criteria, based upon Village Character Assessments, provides for a more sustainable way of ensuring high quality, appropriate development that respects, conserves and enhances the character of Lower Horsebridge. Option B fares less well when assessed against sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P16**  **Policy LD1– Lower Dicker – Design Principles** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. To include a Policy and policy guidance on design principles for developments within Lower Dicker. Developed from Village Character Assessments work specific to Lower Dicker. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A would help meet concerns expressed locally that recent developments have detracted from local character and/or have failed to meet a key NDP objective of conserving and enhancing the separate character of the 4 main settlements within the Parish. NDP Topic Paper No 7 – Village Character Assessments supports the Policy.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P17**  **Policy LD2– Design Criteria Lower Dicker** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy which contains design criteria to specifically support otherwise (i.e. Development Plan compliant) acceptable development in Lower Dicker. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan (inc District wide SPD) and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Incorporation of Policy on specific and local design criteria, based upon Village Character Assessments, provides for a more sustainable way of ensuring high quality, appropriate development that respects, conserves and enhances the character of Lower Horsebridge. Option B fares less well when assessed against sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P18**  **Policy RP1– Roebuck Park – Design Principles** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. To include a Policy and policy guidance on design principles for developments within Roebuck Park including preservation of its parkland setting and retention of important view within and from Roebuck Park. Developed from Village Character Assessments work specific to Roebuck Park. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Option A would help meet concerns expressed locally that recent developments have detracted from local character and/or have failed to meet a key NDP objective of conserving and enhancing provision of local facilities. This Policy also seeks to retain and preserve a sense of Roebuck Parks open rural and parkland setting. Option A best meets a number of sustainability objectives and is supported by NDP Topic Paper No 7 – Village Character Assessments.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P19**  **Policy RP2– Design Criteria Roebuck Park** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. A Policy which contains design criteria to specifically support otherwise (i.e. Development Plan compliant) acceptable development in Roebuck Park. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan (inc District wide SPD) and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | Incorporation of Policy on specific and local design criteria, based upon Village Character Assessments, provides for a more sustainable way of ensuring high quality, appropriate development that reinforces local identity and character including by provision of suitable and appropriate levels of parking – thus addressing some locally expressed concerns. Option B fares less well when assessed against sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P20**  **Policy LHA1– Heritage Assets – Local Non Designated** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Policy Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| A | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| B | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **--** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** |
| 1. This Policy is designed to protect, conserve and enhance local non designated heritage assets (local list) and their settings. It seeks to support proposals for conversion, for restoration and conservation of such assets for social and community use subject to setting and character being conserved and no unacceptable impact upon any designated Heritage Asset. 2. No Policy but reliance on Development Plan and National Guidance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal | The identification of local non designated (local list) heritage assets and their protection, conservation and enhancement is key to meeting a number of sustainability objectives including possible conversion and restoration of such assets for community or other use. Option B, by not identifying or recognising ‘local list’ heritage assets fares badly against some key sustainability objectives.  **Selected Option – A** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table P21**  **POLICY APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY** | **SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL** | | | | | | | | **ECONOMIC** | | | **SOCIAL** | | | | |
| **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| HNDPE | **✓** | **–** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **--** | **--** | **–** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP1 | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **–** | **--** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP2 | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP3 | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP4 | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP5 | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP6 | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **–** | **–** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| HNDP7 | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** |
| HNDP8 | **--** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **–** |
| HNDP9 | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **–** |
| HNDP10 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| HV1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| HV2 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| LHB1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| LHB2 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| LD1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| LD2 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| RP1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| RP2 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** |
| LHA1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R1**  **Recommendation – HV R1 – Hellingly Village – for production of a Management Plan providing possible proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The recent significant enlargement of Hellingly Conservation Area by the District Council is considered to provide an excellent opportunity to undertake a review and Management Plan. This will better enable an understanding of the potential pressures on the area caused by recent and anticipated developments. Production of a Management Plan will produce positive proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area and help combat some of the concerns regarding possible diminuation in quality and character that have taken place. Implementation of HV R1 scores well in respect of a number of key SA objectives with no anticipated negative impacts. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R2**  **Recommendation – HV R2 – Hellingly Village Traffic Management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The impact of traffic within Hellingly Village was often mentioned in various responses and consultations on the NDP. The scale of recent, existing and anticipated development within the Parish is likely to lead to increased traffic impacts unless something is done to explore mechanisms and proposals to alleviate this. Without such initiatives the character and charm of the Conservation Area will be further impacted together with continued adverse effects upon local residents. Subject to any measures that may be implemented it is not anticipated these would adversely offset the overall character of the area. The Recommendation scores well in respect of a number of key SA objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R3**  **Recommendation – HV R3 – for the District Council not to proceed with proposals for an additional 30 houses within the Hellingly Core Area** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | NDP Topic Paper No 7 – Village Character Assessment for Hellingly Village strongly concluded that such scale of development as proposed within the emerging Wealden Local Plan would significantly compromise the character and quality of the Conservation Area and diminish the rural character. Other more suitable areas are available to the District Council, both within and outside of Hellingly Parish. Such a scale of development (at an increase of almost 150%) would adversely affect the setting of the Conservation Area and be in conflict with National Guidance and existing Development Plan. Recommendation scores well on key SA objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R4**  **Recommendation – LHB R1 – Lower Horsebridge growth in Wealdens emerging Local Plan** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | This area (site) within Lower Horsebridge has now been granted planning permission by Wealden District Council. Lower Horsebridge was previously identified as a non sustainable settlement by Wealden and indeed its post office is now closed. The Recommendation was framed at the time in the firm belief that alternative more sustainable sites existed within the Parish – unfortunately this recommended approach has now been superseded by the grant of planning permission on land east of North Street, Lower Horsebridge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R5**  **Recommendation – LHB R2 – Movement, access, car parking provision and improvements for cyclists and pedestrians** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The sinuous nature of the A271 traversing Lower Horsebridge does make crossing e.g. to the Recreation Ground difficult. Early consideration to improving matters regarding traffic calming and especially for the benefit of cyclists and pedestrians would improve matters for residents and generally for Lower Horsebridge. Consideration to location of additional parking should be given in the light of growth proposed for the village and the popularity of the recreation ground. Partnership working between the Parish Council and ESCC as Highways Authority is proposed. Successfully implemented, a locally devised scheme would score positively against a number of SA objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R6**  **Recommendation – LHB R3 – Consideration of enhanced facilities at Lower Horsebridge Recreation Ground** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **–** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | This recommendation relates to a previously submitted development proposal (since withdrawn) that would have donated land to the Parish Council for enhancement of facilities at Lower Horsebridge Recreation Ground. It is considered that this site provides an opportunity to provide sustainable growth whilst enhancing and enlarging much needed and much used recreation facilities locally. Subject to Wealden District Council’s consideration of any similarly submitted proposal meeting Development Plan policies this recommendation to support such a scheme would meet a number of key local concerns and identified SA objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R7**  **Recommendation – LD R1 – Provision of 38,600 sq m employment land and recognition by Wealden of Lower Dicker Village Character Assessment work** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | Whilst supporting the need for strategic employment space in this area as acknowledged in the emerging Wealden Local Plan this recommendation to the District Council is to utilise the work carried out in the Village Character Assessment for Lower Dicker (NDP Topic Paper 7) to better define those areas less sensitive to development for employment use. This approach identifies local issues and opportunities to deliver the 38,600 sq m of space required without risking a more ‘free for all’ approach that could result from Wealdens proposed Development Boundary Approach and a loss of land of historic or social significance in the development of Lower Dicker.  **Note:** The employment allocation of 38,600 sq m was reduced to a figure of 22,500 sq m in the Submission copy of the new Local Plan adopted for publication in July 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R8**  **Recommendation – LD R2 – Consideration by ESCC and WDC to accommodate any local waste transfer station from the former Dicker Pottery (Shep Plastics) site to the north of the A22 employment land allocation thus releasing the former Pottery site for residential.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The former Dicker Pottery Site is identified in the ESCC Waste Local Plan for a waste transfer station. The draft NDP considered that any such facility, were it to be required, would best be located north of the A22 and within the area now identified in Wealden’s emerging Local Plan for employment use. This would also have benefit in then releasing the former pottery site for residential use in Lower Dicker and mean that likely conflict and impact of a waste transfer station on existing residential properties adjoining this site would be avoided. The recommendation asks ESCC and WDC to consider this more sustainable option for development and respond positively to this local initiative. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R9**  **Recommendation – LD R3 – Enhancement of initiatives to monitor air pollution and reduce impacts of air pollution** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | A number of concerns were expressed during preparation of the NDP in respect of air pollution and especially in relation to the amount and nature of vehicles using the A22. Unless tackled more effectively these problems will only increase with the significant amounts of growth now proposed in the emerging Wealden Local Plan and its proposal for a strategic employment allocation of 38,600 sq m on land at Lower Dicker. ESCC is urged, together with other bodies responsible to design and implement solutions to help tackle this problem. The NDP is pleased to include a Policy (HNDP10) on sustainable transport as encouraged and suggested by the County Council. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R10**  **Recommendation – RP R1 – Early implementation of the ‘village centre’ focus identified in the Roebuck Park Masterplan – proposals for community and social use of the former Hellingly Chapel building** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The lack of any social or community facilities within the recently (fairly) completed development at Roebuck Park featured highly in concerns expressed locally. The ‘village centre’ proposals identified in the original Masterplan to support the development of Roebuck Park were a major boost to its acceptability as sustainable development but they still have yet to be implemented as detailed at the time of the application. Implementation was always intended to connect residents to and retain the history and character of the hospital buildings and prevent the effect of a somewhat isolated urban village. The District Council is urged to liaise with and encourage development and other interests as appropriate to secure early implementation of a multi purpose community and social use of the former chapel building. This recommendation scores well on many social SA objectives with no identified negative effects.  **Note:** The Parish Council has now contracted to build the new community building at Roebuck Park. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R11**  **Recommendation – RP R2 – Provision of outdoor playing space for youth and adult recreation as physical extension to Hellingly Country Park. Request Wealden District Council to urgently address the significant under provision of parks and recreational open space identified within the 2017 Wealden Open Space Study for Hellingly and Arlington parishes.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | There is an acknowledged and significant under provision of parks and recreational space within the local area (Wealden Open Space Study 2017). This can only be exacerbated by the scale of new development proposed for Hellingly and close to Roebuck Park identified in Wealden’s emerging Local Plan. Matters such as this must be urgently addressed if residents and neighbourhoods are expected to be more accepting of new developments and the concept of “sustainable development” (See also Table 10 – recommendation RP R1). Wealden is recommended to require provision of outdoor recreational space of a minimum of 2.8 ha as a physical extension to Hellingly Country Park to meet existing needs and further proposed development north of New Road. The District Council is further requested to address the significant wider under provision. Considered critical to meeting many SA objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R12**  **Recommendation – Roads and Transport – For East Sussex County Council to explore comprehensive traffic movement and access plans with the parish, consideration to imposition of speed limits in some areas and opportunities for delivering improved cycling and walking infrastructure within the Parish. All in partnership with Hellingly Parish Council and Wealden District Councils.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | In order to assimilate existing recent growth, together with the not insignificant housing land allocations within Hellingly Parish now proposed in the emerging Wealden Local Plan such measures are considered key to delivery of development in a sustainable fashion. This should include consideration of traffic calming and the imposition of speed limits where appropriate together with provision of enhanced cycling and walking infrastructure. The recent and anticipated increase in traffic was a major concern for many and a detractor from quality of life and the overall rural character of the parish. Implementation of such measures scores highly with regard to a number of key social sustainability objectives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R13**  **Recommendation – Education – ESCC be requested to urgently address the development of a new primary school on land at Park Road, Hellingly.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **✓✓** | **~** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | The need for a new primary school to serve new and anticipated growth in the north Hailsham and Hellingly area has long been acknowledged. (HNDP Topic Paper 4 Infrastructure refers). Indeed land has already been identified at Park Road. Consideration should also be given to the future of the existing Victorian primary school – somewhat remote from main proposed growth. This recommendation suggests a logical solution to be to relocate to the new site as a 3 form entry school. Current under provision of primary school places coupled with the recent rate of new building requires a solution to be developed quickly to better support sustainability of housing growth.  The shortage in Hailsham of secondary places also requires resolution. The NDP recommends that a separate and enhanced facility for sixth form provision be found for Hailsham Community College although recent ESCC decisions might suggest this is no longer a favoured option.  **Note:** Work has now started on the new 2 form entry primary school off Park Road and should be completed by September 2019. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R14**  **Recommendation – Sport and Leisure – That Wealden District Council ensure that existing significant levels of underprovision of facilities are urgently addressed. Require provision to meet new residential development north of New Road. Bring forward clear and enforceable proposals for early implementation of sporting and leisure facilities following a strategic review of needs to support proposed growth in the Hellingly/Hailsham area.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **--** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **–** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | This Recommendation mirrors RP R2 (Table R11) but additionally requests early attention to addressing wider strategic needs for Sport and Leisure arising from the significant growth proposed for Hailsham and Hellingly in the emerging Wealden Local Plan.  In the absence of timely and early provision such scale of development cannot be said to be truly sustainable and is unlikely to be seen so by residents who are already deprived of appropriate levels of provision. Implementation of this recommendation scores highly in respect of key SA objectives relating to sustainable living choices – wellbeing, exercise and clean air. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R15**  **Recommendation – Digital Communications – That existing or future providers meet the Governments minimum recommended download speed of not less than 10 mgs to all properties within the Parish.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | Digital communication, and the ability to do so effectively, is key to a number of sustainability issues in modern society. It can significantly reduce the need to travel to obtain goods and services, enable businesses to set up at home or in non town centre locations such as diversified farm building complexes. It is also able to help people who are less able to travel, to stay connected and access goods and services. Existing digital coverage and broadband is poor over parts of Hellingly affecting residents and businesses alike. Meeting the Governments recommended minimum speeds would enhance the quality of sustainable living and sustainable business – including attracting new businesses. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R16**  **Recommendation – Retail, Employment and Other Services**   1. **Provision of healthcare facilities by the Eastbourne, Hailsham and Seaford Clinical Commissionin Group** 2. **Wealden District Council to encourage and seek provision of local service shops as integral to significant new housing proposals within Hellingly.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | HNDP Topic Paper 4 – Infrastructure, details the limited facilities currently available within the Parish. To help deliver a more sustainable form of development it is considered that additional facilities – particularly in health care and retail should be developed. The Eastbourne, Hailsham and Seaford Clinical Commissioning Group is requested to look at providing a healthcare facility to support new housing growth locally possibly with any community ‘village centre’ proposal associated with Roebuck Park. Wealden District Council as Local Planning Authority is requested to encourage and seek provision of local service shops as an integral part of new and proposed housing developments within Hellingly. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R17**  **Recommendation – Sewerage. To request that Wealden District Council as Local Planning Authority require all new developments within the Parish that are capable of being connected to mains drains to be connected to mains sewers.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Options or Alternatives** | **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| N/A please see text of Sustainability Appraisal report | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appraisal/Commentary | With few exceptions it is considered that new developments can reasonably be connected to mains drainage. This is clearly the approach favoured by providers of wastewater infrastructure and the recommended approach is considered wholly reasonable. Limited wastewater capacity at the Hailsham north pumping station has stalled some development proposals in light of otherwise adverse impacts on the internationally designated Pevensey Levels Ramsar and SSSI. Providers (in this case Southern Water) need to invest in order to meet housing requirements without damaging the Levels and to avoid proposals pursuing bespoke wastewater treatment plants. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table R18**  **RECOMMENDATIONS APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN RECOMMENDATION** | **SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL** | | | | | | | | **ECONOMIC** | | | **SOCIAL** | | | | |
| **SA1** | **SA2** | **SA3** | **SA4** | **SA5** | **SA6** | **SA7** | **SA8** | **SA9** | **SA10** | **SA11** | **SA12** | **SA13** | **SA14** | **SA15** | **SA16** |
| HV R1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓✓** |
| HV R2 | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
| HV R3 | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| LH B1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** |
| LH B2 | **~** | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** |
| LH B3 | **–** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
| LD R1 | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **✓** |
| LD R2 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
| LD R3 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** |
| RP R1 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
| RP R2 | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **✓✓** | **~** |
| R 12 | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
| R 13 | **–** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **–** | **✓✓** | **~** |
| R 14 | **--** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **–** |
| R 15 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** |
| R 16 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓✓** | **~** |
| R 17 | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓✓** | **✓** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **~** | **✓** | **~** | **✓** | **✓** |

**Next Steps**

1. The SA forms an integral part of the NDP process and will be submitted alongside it for examination purposes. The SA report helps to identify how the NDP will help in the encouragement and delivery of sustainable development. Its predicted effectiveness in doing this is set down in tabular form within this report.
2. Information contained within the appraisal process is taken into account in the preparation of the submission NDP. Once the Plan proceeds to adoption, following its examination and referendum, the impact of the NDP can be monitored using various indicators as set down within the Scoping Report. This can then be used to assess the effectiveness of the Policies contained within the Plan itself.

**Appendix 1**

**NDP Screening Opinion Wealden District Council**

Document provided separately to this Appraisal

**Appendix 2**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**PARISH OF HELLINGLY**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT**

**REPORT OF THE PROJECT TEAM**

**OCTOBER 2018**

**INDEX**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Page |
| Background | 1 |
| Introduction – Sustainability Appraisal | 1 |
| Context for Hellingly | 2 |
| Baseline Information, Context and Key Issues | 2 |
| Building a Sustainability Framework | 7 |
| Sustainability Objectives and Indicators | 8 |
| Progression to Adoption of the NDP – Next Steps | 10 |
| Appendices | 11 |

**Background**

1. Hellingly Parish Council is developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for the Parish in order to help guide development in the period to 2028. In particular the Plan is seeking to embody a number of key policies and objectives that will help in the delivery of sustainable development within the parish when assessed in respect of environmental, economic and social objectives. Sustainable development is a key concept in land use planning as set down within and supported through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
2. “The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”[[7]](#footnote-7)
3. In this regard the planning system has three overarching objectives which the NPPF confirms are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways: an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective.

**Introduction – Sustainability Appraisal**

1. The purpose of this sustainability appraisal scoping report is to identify the broad scope and level of detail of information to be included in the Sustainability Appraisal that will accompany the Hellingly NDP. It aims to set down the context in which the Plan is being prepared, the broad approach and objectives of the assessment, as well as a framework for relevant environmental, economic and social issues and objectives. These will then feed into the Sustainability Appraisal Report itself.
2. Although the production of a formal scoping report is not a specific legislative requirement it is a helpful way of presenting information at an early stage in the production of the final Sustainability Appraisal. A key aim of the scoping procedure, and one that is considered especially important in the context of Neighbourhood Development Plans, is to help ensure that the sustainability appraisal process is proportionate and relevant to the Plan being assessed.
3. Sustainability Appraisal is the process by which a Plan may be assessed, when judged against reasonable alternatives, to deliver sustainable development. It is an opportunity to consider ways in which the emerging Plan, in this case the Hellingly NDP, can contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions as well as a means of identifying and mitigating any potential adverse impacts of the Plan.
4. This process of sustainability appraisal incorporates the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 – more usually referred to as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and implements the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of plans and programmes on the environment. The Sustainability Appraisal process helps to ensure that potential environmental impacts of plans are given full consideration alongside social and economic issues.

**Context for Hellingly**

1. Prior to preparation of this scoping report an initial screening opinion was requested from Wealden District Council as Local Planning Authority which considered the need for Strategic Environmental Assessment of the NDP. Following their consultation with Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency as statutory consultees. This Screening Opinion (which is attached as a separate document to this report) confirmed that the Plan had the potential for impacts of environmental significance and that a sustainability appraisal was therefore required. The screening opinion has also taken into account recent European Court judgements in respect of Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment.
2. This scoping report sets out a broad framework and sustainability objectives for assessment of the Hellingly NDP. These build upon those core planning principles and objectives set down within the Development Plan (Wealden District Council’s adopted Core Strategy 2013) together with its accompanying sustainability appraisal. Also of especial relevance in this regard is the emerging Wealden Local Plan (approved for submission August 2018). The NDP seeks to provide a more local/bespoke approach to the identified issues, needs and sustainability objectives of Hellingly Parish.
3. The scoping report will be subject to a five week consultation with a number of statutory consultees together with other agencies and partners including the District and County Councils. A list of consultees is appended at Appendix B. Any comments and suggestions received will be considered and incorporated as appropriate within the submission NDP and Sustainability Appraisal Report.
4. All comments should be sent to the Parish Clerk at the following address:

Mrs J Hoodless

Hellingly Parish Council

Village Hall

North Street

Hellingly

East Sussex. BN27 4DS

Or to: [clerk@hellingly-pc.org.uk](mailto:clerk@hellingly-pc.org.uk)

Telephone: 01323 449415

The consultation period runs for a period of 5 weeks from XXX. Comments should be received by no later than midnight on XXX.

**Hellingly – Baseline Information, Context and Key Issues**

1. Through a wide range of consultation and engagement the NDP process has endeavoured (including the sending of a comprehensive questionnaire to all those in the Parish who are on the electoral role) to identify those key sustainability issues and objectives that face Hellingly. These have been augmented through a number of themed focus groups covering matters such as local businesses, farmers and environment as well as ones for each of the 4 principal settlements within the Parish.
2. Additionally, the evolution of policies and objectives has had to take into account and be informed by an appraisal of existing (adopted) Development Plan documents – in particular Wealden’s adopted Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal 2013.
3. The emerging Wealden Local Plan and its SA report both for the published Issues and Options document (2015) and the recently approved Submission Plan (August 2018) are also key to setting the scope and context for sustainability appraisal of the Hellingly NDP.
4. In addition to legislation requiring any NDP to not be in strategic conflict with the Development Plan, the Hellingly NDP also has to have regard to background studies and new evidence as work on Wealden’s emerging Local Plan progresses.
5. In seeking to ensure a local focus upon those sustainability issues facing the Parish a number of topic papers and support papers have been produced. These include matters relating to the demographic ‘parish profile’, agriculture, flooding, landscape, green and blue infrastructure, heritage and village character assessments. (Appendix D)
6. All of this baseline information has helped to identify key issues and objectives relating to Hellingly Parish.

Baseline Information – Key Issues

1. Hellingly is an essentially rural parish located within the southern part of Wealden District. As a rural parish lying immediately to the north of the rapidly expanding town of Hailsham Hellingly faces particular and significant challenges in meeting the broad aims of the NDP whilst reasonably contributing to meeting wider housing needs in Wealden District.
2. The population of Hellingly ward (which includes part of north Hailsham and all Arlington Parish) in 2014 was 7,158 a significant percentage increase (20%) from its 2011 figure of 5,959. The recent development of Roebuck Park at some 450 residential units has contributed significantly to this population increase over the last 5 years. Current planning permissions now being built out and significant (c1,500 units) proposed allocations within Wealden’s proposed submission Local Plan (August 2018) further contribute to concerns surrounding the sustainability of such growth together with a fear of rurality being lost and of the parish becoming suburbanised.
3. Whilst it is recognised that there will be growth within Hellingly it is felt appropriate, in terms of helping deliver sustainable development, to guide development to the best and locally most sustainable locations. This has in significant part meant developing the NDP to identify where such development should be resisted – whether by reason of landscape quality, flooding, biodiversity, amenity or sustainability reasons.
4. Where development is supported in the adopted and emerging District Plans, the NDP seeks to improve the quality of that development in terms of local character, design and materials.
5. Population and Housing Composition

* Hellingly’s population in 2014 was 7,158 a 20% increase on the 2011 figure (5,959)
* Over 20% of the population (2014) are aged 65+
* 2,308 households (2011) with 43.8% owned outright and a further 42% through either a mortgage or a loan
* Household composition identifies a significant percentage (24%) occupied as one person households, 12.5% occupied by a person aged 65+
* Families with children represent highest sector in terms of household composition at 28.6%
* Compared with the rest of Wealden figures for the 16-29 age group are markedly higher for Hellingly (13.1% for Wealden, 17.8 % for Hellingly ward)

Landscape Character

1. The northern part of the parish is included in the East Sussex County Landscape Assessment for the south slopes of the High Weald as:

“an intricate and small scale landscape with a strong pattern of hedgerows” and “this landscape of gentle valleys and slopes afford good views of the downs”

1. This contrasts with the predominantly pastoral undulating southern slopes of the High Weald and the more open arable countryside to the south of the Parish.
2. The Parish of Hellingly falls into three separate National Character Areas (NCA’s) as defined by Natural England under their responsibilities as set out in the Natural Environment White Paper, Biodiversity 2020 and the European Landscape Convention.
3. The Parish is dominated by the High Weald NCA an area of ancient countryside ad one of the best surviving medieval landscapes in Europe. The Low Weald NCA which is a broad, low lying clay vale which wraps around the High Weald, is a landscape of predominantly pastoral agriculture. A small part of the south east corner of the parish lies within the Pevensey Levels NCA providing an important link to the Pevensey wetlands of international conservation importance.

Flooding

1. Flooding is a major issue for the Parish with many instances being recorded locally. Flooding and the issue of flooding is a particular and regular occurrence including especially surface water flooding which has historically not been covered in any comprehensive way by official records. Wealden’s Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment provides additional evidence regarding the vulnerability of much of the Parish to flooding issues.

Nature Conservation

1. Hellingly has no internationally or nationally recognised sites within its boundaries but hosts three Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) Hellingly Cemetery, Cowden Wood Meadow and the Jarvis’s, Nobody’s Wood and Park Wood complex.
2. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) are designed to promote a targeted landscape scale approach to conserving biodiversity in Sussex and identify the greatest opportunities for habitat creation and restoration at a County level. Three BOAs intersect and cover significant areas of Hellingly – the Pevensey and Cuckmere Valley link, the River Cuckmere Habitat link and the Cuckoo Trail Habitat link.
3. Ancient woodlands are recognised nationally as being of nature conservation importance and the parish has a significant number of designated ancient woods, many incorporating ghyll woodlands so characteristic of this part of Sussex and its preserved medieval landscape features.
4. The Parish is considered to be likely to be under recorded in terms of its biodiversity interest and work has now been commissioned on a Phase I Habitat Survey to incorporate identification and recording of notable species, priority habitats and opportunities for connectivity/wildlife corridors. This work will assist greatly in the implementation of policies designed to help conserve and enhance biodiversity within the parish.

Employment and Economy

1. From the 2011 census some 64% of the parish population is shown as employed, part time or self employed with just 2.2% unemployed. This may suggest a reasonably high percentage of retired residents but also needs to account for those who may choose not to work for other reasons such as bringing up family.
2. There is little retail offer in the Parish which supports 1 petrol station (with small convenience offer), 1 garden centre, 2 public houses, 1 hotel, 1 motel and a limited number of other individual outlets. The local sub post office has now closed. Given the proximity of Hailsham this is not surprising. There are no professional offices and no healthcare (doctors or dentists) facilities although there is a veterinary practice at Lower Horsebridge.
3. Some employment opportunities exist through farm diversification, particularly at Broad Farm which hosts a number of successful rural workshops employing some 250 people.

Broadband

1. Only parts of the Parish receive mobile telephone coverage and the cover is patchy and reception intermittent. The existence of several providers means that quality of connection varies from one to another.
2. Equally fast fibre optic connection is not widely available. Although Government and BT boast of the service being available to 95% of the population the local experience is somewhat different. This is proving a positive disadvantage to businesses wishing to set themselves up other than in the centre of a town, as well as proving disadvantageous to residents who increasingly find other local infrastructure stretched or declining.

Infrastructure

1. There is no rail connection in either Hellingly or Hailsham the nearest station being Polegate. Some residents frequently choose to travel to Berwick or Etchingham to catch a train.
2. In addition to school services there are 4 regular bus services linking Hellingly to Eastbourne through Hailsham, through Uckfield and Heathfield to Tunbridge Wells and through Herstmonceux to Hastings.
3. The parish currently has a single form entry primary school catering for 240 children aged 4-11. Older children travel to secondary schools in Hailsham, Ringmer Heathfield and Willingdon. Work should begin soon upon delivering a 2-form entry primary school, an idea put forward some 10 years ago in respect of the then proposed development at Roebuck Park and elsewhere.
4. In respect of sports and recreation there is a recreation ground at Horsebridge, a cricket pitch at Hellingly Country Park, a golf course off the A267 and a specialist cycle speedway track at Lower Dicker. There are other open spaces with public access including a significant area of ancient woodland at Park Wood. The Hellingly Country Park at Roebuck Park and a number of smaller children’s play spaces. A number of these facilities are shared with clubs from Hailsham in terms of usage.
5. There is an acknowledged (by the District Council) shortage of outdoor playing space in the north of Hailsham and Hellingly area. Without planned provision with the extensive amount of new residential development proposed in the immediate vicinity, this situation will only worsen.

Heritage and the built environment of the settlements in Hellingly

1. There are 60 dwellings or structures within Hellingly parish that are statutorily listed for their architectural and historic importance (2 Grade I, 4 Grade II\* and 54 Grade II). The majority of these (21) are in Hellingly Village.
2. There is 1 Conservation Area – Hellingly Village which was first designated in 1972. The District Council has recently reviewed and significantly enlarged this Conservation Area.
3. Following evidence specifically commissioned as part of the NDP work upon Village Character Assessments for the 4 principal settlements of the parish has identified a number of buildings recommended for ‘local listing’ by Wealden as non-designated heritage assets.
4. From consultation upon the NDP, residents of the 4 principal settlements strongly support the retention of their separate character and identity. This has been supported by evidence from Village Character Assessments to help develop policies to support sympathetic and appropriate developments within these settlements.

**Building a Sustainability Framework**

Sustainability Issues for Hellingly

1. The Parish and its residents are acutely aware of the broad issues facing the District Council in the preparation of its Local Plan. In particular there is clear acknowledgement of the significant housing pressures faced by Wealden. Since publication in December 2015 of the District Council’s Issues, Options and Recommendations document it is apparent that a not inconsiderable amount of the new development likely to be proposed in the Wealden Plan will be located within Hellingly Parish.
2. Against this background and in addition to those other issues raised from the baseline evidence the NDP is being developed with 2 broad but widely supported objectives.
3. To protect the essentially rural character of Hellingly Parish.
4. To seek to protect the distinctive character of the 4 principal settlements within the Parish (Hellingly Village, Lower Dicker, Lower Horsebridge, and Roebuck Park.
5. Following extensive consultation upon the type and range of Policies that can be developed to support assimilation of future development in the most locally sustainable way these 2 broad objectives have led to a proposed suite of Policies geared to helping achieve this aim.

Sustainability Framework - Objectives

1. Extensive consultation has been carried out regarding the number and nature of Policies to be included within the NDP in order to help achieve sustainable development. The proposed sustainability objectives and indicators of success to provide the framework for the SA of the NDP are set out in Table 1. These can be broadly divided into the 3 accepted pillars or categories of sustainable development: namely environmental, economic and social. They are being developed to assist in the assessment and delivery of identified sustainability objectives together with proposed indicators by which to measure their success. They have been considered alongside the objectives and policies within the adopted Core Strategy of Wealden District Council and the emerging Wealden Local Plan and are complimentary to them.

**Proposed Sustainability Objectives**

1. Table 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL** | |
| 1. Countryside Heritage   Protection of the rural character of the Parish. To identify and conserve the most sensitive and valued landscapes for their environmental and social benefit. | Indicators of Success  Designation as Area of Locally Valued Landscape in adopted NDP. Development of land in lower landscape sensitivity area only. |
| 1. Local Green Space   To identify and protect valued Local Green Space for social, recreational and biodiversity benefit. | Designation of Local Green Space in adopted NDP. Retention of all designated Local Green Spaces over the period of the NDP. |
| 1. Flood Avoidance and Mitigation   To identify land at risk of flooding, including surface water flooding and to seek to guide development away from such areas. | Designation of Area at Risk of Flooding’ within adopted NDP. Development in this area resisted or strictly controlled. |
| 1. To minimise the risk of flooding within Hellingly Parish and of climate change upon flooding incidence. | Monitoring of flood incidents recorded by LFA (ESCC). Enhanced flood mitigation measures in all developments within the Parish. |
| 1. Biodiversity   To identify, protect and enhance green and blue infrastructure assets within Hellingly Parish. | Designation of all green and blue infrastructure assets in adopted NDP. |
| 1. To improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity gains including use of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas to seek such gains. | Improved design, mitigation and connectivity for biodiversity in all developments.  Widespread use of biodiversity opportunity areas and re-connection of wildlife corridors through developer contributions and use of Community Infrastructure Levies. |
| 1. Heritage and Protection of the Built Environment   To identify, conserve and enhance the historic and built environment. | Adoption of Policy on designated and non-designated (local list) heritage assets in NDP.  Acceptance and support by LPA/EH of recommendations for local listing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Indicators of Success |
|  | Production of a Management Plan for the Hellingly Conservation Area. |
| 1. To contribute to the reduction of air pollution and improve air quality within the area. | Incorporation of appropriate policy within the adopted NDP.  Inclusion within all major developments of electric vehicle charging points.  Monitoring of air quality by appropriate bodies to assess improvements to local air quality. |
| **ECONOMIC** | |
| 1. To support diversification of agricultural and other land based rural business within the Parish. | Rural Economy Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of new or diversified rural businesses or expanded existing businesses. |
| 1. To support new agricultural or other appropriate rural businesses where a new dwelling is considered necessary. | Isolated dwellings Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of new agricultural start-ups. |
| 1. To support as appropriate truly innovative designs for new isolated dwellings. |  |
| **SOCIAL** | |
| 1. To support residential developments that are in accordance with the Development Plan and where a high percentage of starter homes/homes for the elderly are incorporated. | Appropriate Policy within adopted NDP.  No. of such schemes approved by the Local Planning Authority. |
| 1. To support developments in the most sustainable locations locally. | No. of developments outside of Flood Areas and Area of Locally Valued Landscapes or of Blue/Green Infrastructure. |
| **SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC** | |
| To retain the separate character of the 4 main settlements in the Parish (Hellingly Village, Lower Horsebridge, Lower Dicker and Roebuck Park) is one of the 2 high level objectives of the NDP. Policies consulted upon and being developed to deliver this aim are considered to be able to help deliver key sustainability objectives across all 3 criteria – namely social, economic and environmental. They are accordingly dealt with here in the scoping reports sustainability framework. | |
| 1. To retain, conserve and enhance the separate character of the 4 main settlements in the Parish. | The incorporation within the adopted NDP of specific Policies on design principles and design criteria for each if the settlements of Lower Dicker, Lower Horsebridge, Hellingly Village and |
|  | Indicators of Success |
|  | Roebuck Park. |
| 1. To support high quality housing in the most sustainable locations in accordance with Development Plan allocations and to meet needs of existing and future residents. | Monitoring of approved developments by the LPA against these Policies.  Use of Village Character Assessments to assist Developers in development of locally successful schemes. |

**Progression to Adoption of the Neighbourhood Development Plan – Next Steps**


1. This Scoping Report has set out a brief analysis of the background and context for the Hellingly NDP together with a proposed framework of sustainability objectives and indicators. These will inform the Sustainability Assessment of the NDP itself.
2. Also set out are some of the key issues facing the parish following assessment of key policy documents and plans as well as from widespread consultation and locally defined evidence.
3. The Parish Council is now seeking views and comments on the scoping report which has been sent to all of those organisations set down in Appendix B.
4. Once received all comments will be carefully considered and taken on board as appropriate in the preparation of the Sustainability Report of the NDP (SA). This will be used to assess the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan and its various policies against reasonable alternatives for the purposes of delivering sustainable development.
5. Both the NDP and its Sustainability Appraisal will be published and then submitted for examination by an independently appointed Inspector.

**Appendices**

1. Map of Hellingly Parish – area covered by the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan
2. List of Consultees for the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
3. Key Policy Documents and Strategies
4. List of Topic Papers to support the NDP

**Appendix A**

**Map of Hellingly Parish – the area designated for preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan**



**Appendix B**

**List of Consultees for Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan Sustainability Appraisal – Scoping Report**

Statutory Consultees

Natural England

Historic England

Environment Agency

Other Consultees

Wealden District Council

East Sussex County Council

Southern Water

District and County Councillors for Hellingly

**Appendix C**

**Key Policy Documents**

National Planning Policy Framework March 2018

Wealden District Council (WDC) Core Strategy

Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal 2011 Adopted 2013

Wealden Local Plan – Issues, Options and Recommendations 2015

Wealden Local Plan Proposed Submission Plan July 2018

WDC Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – Level 1 July 2017

WDC Open Space Study 2016-28

WDC Landscape Assessment (C Blandford Associates) 2014

Register of Listed Buildings (held by LPA) Historic England

Hellingly NDP Topic Papers 1-10 See Appendix D

**Appendix D**

**List of Hellingly Topic papers to support the Neighbourhood Development Plan\***

Topic Paper No 1 Hellingly Parish Profile

Topic Paper No 2 Landscape

Topic Paper No 3 Heritage Assets

Topic Paper No 4 Infrastructure

Topic Paper No 5 Flooding

Topic Paper No 6 Farming in Hellingly

Topic Paper No 7 Village Character Assessments

Topic Paper No 8 Nature, Conservation and Biodiversity

Topic Paper No 9 Outdoor Playing Space

Topic Paper No 10 Housing

**Support Papers**

Public Consultation Phase 1 June 2016

Public Consultation Phase 2 November 2016

Public Consultation Phase 3 February 2018

\* All papers can be found on the Hellingly Parish Council website at

<http://www.hellingly-pc.org.uk/council/neighbourhood-plan/plan-documents>

**Appendix 3**

**Scoping Report Consultation Responses Table and Comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Comment** | **Response** |
| *Historic England*  No comments | Noted |
| *Natural England*  Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Hellingly Neighbourhood Plan.  However, we stand by our comments on the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening assessment for the Hellingly Neighbourhood Plan (NDP) issued on the 19 October 2018, is so far that further SEA and a HRA appropriate assessment are required for the Hellingly NDP | Comments noted and appreciated. A full sustainability Appraisal Report (incorporating SEA) has been produced. This SA will be submitted alongside the NDP. Wealden District Council as competent authority will carry out Appropriate Assessment of the Plan. |
| *Environment Agency*  The Environment Agency is a statutory consultee for Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) and provides advice to Local Planning Authorities on the scope and findings of the SEA.    We recommend an objective is included to protect and enhance the environment. Indicators should relate to the environmental constraints in your local area. This may include flood risk, water quality, and biodiversity.    We also recommend your SEA takes account of relevant policies, plans and strategies including your local Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, flood risk strategies and the South East River Basin Management Plan.    Please refer to the attached Neighbourhood Plan Checklist for your area for more details. | Comments noted and appreciated. This further SA objective has been incorporated within the final sustainability Appraisal. The predicted impacts of all proposed policies have been assessed against this additional objective. |

1. National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) for Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, Paragraph 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Appendix A WDC Screening Report – Paragraph 7.7 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly 42/187 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 7 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Sustainability Appraisal Guidance DCLG Plan Making, A Practical Guide to Strategic Environmental Assessment. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Wealden District Council SEA/HRA Screening Opinion Oct 2018 para 7.4 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly 42/187 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)