

West Sussex Waste Local Plan

Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (Regulation 18)

August 2012



Working in Partnership



Page left intentionally blank

Executive Summary

Chapter 1: Background and Context

The County Council is required to prepare the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF). The MWDF is a portfolio which contains 'saved' plans prepared under the former planning system until they are replaced by new Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). In 2011, the South Downs National Park Authority took over responsibility for waste planning in the park area. The 'Authorities' are jointly preparing a Waste Local Plan (WLP) which will cover the period until 2031. The WLP will include a county-wide vision and strategic objectives together with generic development management policies against which will be used to assess proposals for waste management. It also allocates strategic waste sites for new commercial facilities and will include a monitoring and implementation framework. A sustainability appraisal (SA), incorporating the requirements of the SEA Directive, is required to inform preparation of the WLP.

The draft SA Report will be subject to public consultation. The WLP will be finalised for submission to the Secretary of State. The draft SA Report may be amended if the submitted Plan is changed significantly from the draft Plan. The Inspector, as part of their examination of the 'soundness' of the Plan, will consider the final SA Report.

Chapter 2: Appraisal Methodology

The general process is to assess the likely significant social, economic, and environmental effects of strategies and policies, and the extent to which their implementation will achieve key sustainability objectives. The scope of the appraisal is defined in a 'Scoping Report'.

Chapter 3: Baseline, Context, and Sustainability Objectives

A large number of plans, programmes, and strategies were reviewed to identify their relevance to planning for waste in West Sussex. The findings of the review provide an important starting point for the preparation of the Plan to ensure that it meets the objectives and requirements of relevant national, regional, and local plans, strategies, and guidance. It has also been used to inform the identification of the baseline data.

To accurately predict the potential effects of the plan policies, it is first important to understand the current state of the environment and of social and economic factors, and the likely evolution of those factors without the implementation of the plan. Establishing a baseline of information helps to provide a basis for predicting and monitoring effects, and can also help to identify sustainability problems and ways of mitigating them.

An analysis of the baseline data and the review of relevant plans, policies, and programmes, helped identify the key economic, social and environmental issues for waste planning in West Sussex. With regard to waste, the overall effects of implementing the plan will be spread throughout the County because waste arises almost everywhere and the transport of waste will occur throughout the County. There will also be more localised impacts of waste management within the vicinity of waste management sites.

Based on the review of relevant plans and programmes, the baseline information, and the analysis of sustainability issues, key sustainability objectives were identified

through the preparation of the Scoping Report. These objectives form the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, against which the main strategic options and site options were tested.

Chapter 4: Waste Local Plan Policy Options

The objectives of the Plan have been tested for compatibility with the SA objectives. The main strategic options have been tested against the SA objectives to help inform the preparation of the draft WLP. It is recognised that policies in the WLP have impacts that need to be addressed through the policies that flow from them. In all cases, a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether the need for the proposal outweighs any adverse impacts.

Chapter 5: Strategies and Use-Specific Policies

The strategies and use-specific policies have been tested against the SA objectives to help refine the policies to contribute to sustainable development. The results of the assessment are summarised to highlight the key points that arose from the assessments, and to identify potential social, economic, and environmental problems.

Chapter 6: Strategic Waste Site Allocations

This section outlines the assessment of the potential sites to show how it has guided the selection of strategic site allocations in the draft WLP. The sites allocated in the draft WLP are acceptable 'in principle', in land-use planning terms. A 'long list' of 37 potential strategic waste sites was published in December 2009 which were assessed against the SA objectives.

Following a comprehensive assessment (including sustainability appraisal) of the 'long list' of 37 sites, a shortlist of 10 sites was produced. These sites were then subject to consultation between May and November 2011. Comments from the consultation were taken into consideration and the draft WLP now includes a shortlist of 6 strategic allocations which have been subject to sustainability appraisal.

Chapter 7: Implementation

This section outlines how the Plan will be implemented alongside other planning documents and waste management strategies. It also explains how the Plan will be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse effects. Possible indicators that flow from the strategic objectives have been identified to monitor the implementation of the Plan.

Contents

1. Background and Context	1
1.1 Waste Local Plan Development Plan Document	1
1.2 Strategic Objectives of the Waste Local Plan.....	2
1.3 Requirements for SA and SEA	3
1.4 Preparation process	3
1.5 Consultation arrangements	4
2. Appraisal Methodology	5
2.1 Links between the Waste Local Plan and the SA	5
2.2 How and when the SA was undertaken	5
2.3 Difficulties	6
2.4 Compliance with the SEA Directive.....	6
3. Baseline, Context, and Sustainability Objectives	8
3.1 Links to Plans, Policies, and Programmes	8
3.2 Social, Economic, and Environmental Baseline Characteristics	9
3.3 Main social, economic, and environmental issues and problems.....	11
3.4 Limitations	16
3.5 Appraisal Framework	16
4. Waste Local Plan Policy Options	22
4.1 Introduction.....	22
4.2 Testing the plan objectives against the SA Framework	22
4.3 Main strategic options considered and how they were developed	22
4.4 Comparison of the main strategic options.....	22
4.5 Proposed Mitigation Measures.....	28
5. Strategies and Use-Specific Policies.....	29
5.1. Introduction.....	29
5.2 Mitigation Measures	31
6. Strategic Waste Site Allocations.....	32
6.1 Introduction.....	32
6.2 Long List of Potential Waste Sites	32
6.3 Strategic Waste Site Allocations.....	33
7. Implementation.....	36
7.1 Links to Other Tiers of Plans and Programmes	36
7.2 Monitoring	36
Appendix A: Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks.....	37
Appendix B: Plans, Policies, and Programmes	41
Appendix C: Baseline Information	66
Appendix D: Targets and Indicators.....	98
Appendix E: Testing the Strategic Objectives against the Framework	102
Appendix F: Assessment of the Strategic Policy Options	106
Appendix G: Assessment of the Strategic Policies	167
Appendix H: Assessment of the Site Options.....	214
Appendix I: Assessment of the Strategic Allocations	326
Appendix J: Cumulative Assessment of all strategic policies in the plan	347

1. Background and Context

1.1 Waste Local Plan Development Plan Document

- 1.1.1 The County Council is the Waste Planning Authority (WPA) for the area of West Sussex which lies outside the South Downs National Park. In 2011, the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) came into effect and became responsible for waste planning within the park area. The County Council and SDNPA are responsible for preparing statutory land-use planning policies, and for determining applications for minerals and waste development against those policies.
- 1.1.2 The County Council is required to prepare the Minerals and Waste Development Framework (MWDF). The MWDF is a portfolio which contains 'saved' plans prepared under the former planning system until they are replaced by new Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
- 1.1.3 Four documents are being prepared to replace the approved West Sussex Waste Local Plan and the adopted West Sussex Minerals Local Plan:
- Waste Local Plan DPD (WLP);
 - Minerals Local Plan DPD (MLP);
 - Non-Strategic Sites Allocations DPD (if required);
 - High Quality Waste Facilities SPD.
- 1.1.4 The first document to be prepared by the County Council and the SDNPA (the 'Authorities') will be the Waste Local Plan the 'Plan'. It will cover the period to 2031 and replace the development control policies in the Revised Deposit Draft of the WLP (2004). It will include a county-wide vision and strategic objectives together with generic development management policies against which proposals for waste development will be assessed. It also allocates strategic waste sites for new commercial facilities and will include a monitoring and implementation framework.
- 1.1.5 The draft Plan has been prepared under regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. Public consultation on the document is taking place over an eight week period and is due to finish on 13 August 2012. The draft Plan has sought to address the points raised following the consultation on the Preferred Option draft Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2007) and points raised in engagement with consultees since then.
- 1.1.6. Comments from the consultation will be taken into consideration before the proposed Submission Draft Plan is prepared. In accordance with Regulation 19, this version of the Plan will be published for eight weeks for consultation on the 'soundness' of the plan. Following consideration of the representations received, it will be amended if necessary and formally submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.



Signposting:

Throughout the document, 'signposting' is used to direct the reader to documents where more detailed information is available rather than repeating it in the SA Report.

1.2 Strategic Objectives of the Waste Local Plan

1.2.1 The broad aims of the spatial vision in the draft Plan are supported by specific strategic objectives (the 'plan objectives'):

- Strategic Objective 1: To facilitate the implementation of the Joint Municipal Resource Management Strategy (JMRMS).
- Strategic Objective 2: To facilitate the implementation of the Commercial and Industrial Waste Strategy (CIWS) and to enable the progressive movement of non-municipal waste up the waste hierarchy away from landfill.
- Strategic Objective 3: To maintain net self-sufficiency¹ in managing the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste within West Sussex.
- Strategic Objective 4: To protect the network of waste management sites.
- Strategic Objective 5: To make provision for new transfer, recycling and treatment facilities as close as possible to where the waste arises.
- Strategic Objective 6: To only make provision for a declining amount of landfill over the plan period with 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031.
- Strategic Objective 7: To enable the use of rail and water transport for the movement of waste and to minimise the use of local roads for the movement of waste.
- Strategic Objective 8: To protect and, where possible, enhance the special landscape and townscape character of West Sussex.
- Strategic Objective 9: To protect the SDNP and the two AONB from unnecessary and inappropriate development.
- Strategic Objective 10: To protect and, where possible, enhance the natural and historic environment and resources of the County.
- Strategic Objective 11: To conserve and safeguard the County's important mineral resources.
- Strategic Objective 12: To minimise the risk to people and property from flooding.

¹ Net self-sufficiency means planning to deal with the equivalent of the county's own waste arisings, acknowledging that there will be some cross boundary movements.

- Strategic Objective 13: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and amenity of residents, businesses, and visitors.
- Strategic Objective 14: To minimise carbon emissions and to adapt to, and to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of, climate change.

1.3 Requirements for Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.3.1. Each document within the MWDF is required to help contribute towards achieving 'sustainable development', which is the idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. A widely-used definition is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland Commission, 1987).
- 1.3.2 Legislative changes enacted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, require all planning policy documents to be evaluated in terms of the likely social, economic and environmental implications. This means that a sustainability appraisal (SA) is required for each new document in the MWDF.
- 1.3.3 In addition to undertaking SA, the European Union Directive 2001/42/EC 'on the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment', requires planning authorities to produce a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as part of the preparation of their plans.
- 1.3.4 Although the requirements to carry out SA and SEA are distinct, it is possible to satisfy both through a single appraisal process. Accordingly, a SA, incorporating the requirements of the SEA Directive, of the Plan is required with the final SA report indicating how the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met.

1.4 Preparation process

- 1.4.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (and the Waste Local Plan) is being prepared by the Authorities in accordance with the approved West Sussex Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS), the County Council's statutory management plan, which is available on the website (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf).
- 1.4.2 The draft SA Report for the document will be subject to public consultation. Following the consideration of comments received during the consultation period, the Submission Draft Plan will be prepared followed by a period of consultation on its soundness.
- 1.4.3 The draft SA Report may be amended if the Submission Draft Plan is changed significantly. The final SA Report will be published alongside the submitted Plan. The Inspector, as part of their examination of the 'soundness' of the Plan, will consider the final SA Report.
- 1.4.4 The Inspector will publish a report, and the Plan will be amended as required and adopted by the Authorities. The implementation of the Plan will be

subject to monitoring and review. This will include measuring the sustainability performance of the Plan against the SA framework and may influence future revisions of the plan.

1.5 Consultation arrangements

- 1.5.1 Consultation arrangements for the Plan are in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) for West Sussex County Council and the South Downs National Park Authority which identifies how local communities and stakeholders can be actively, meaningfully and continuously involved in the preparation of the documents to be included in the MWDF.
- 1.5.2 The draft SA Report for the document will be subject to public consultation for six weeks from 15 August to 26 September 2012.
- 1.5.3 Copies of the draft SA Report are available for inspection online at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf.
- 1.5.4 Views on this draft are welcomed. All comments should be received by the County Council no later than 5.00pm on 26 September 2012. Comments can be made via the website, in writing to:

Strategic Planning, West Sussex County Council, County Hall, Chichester,
West Sussex, PO19 1RH; or

by email to mwdf@westsussex.gov.uk;
- 1.5.5 Please note that any comments received cannot be treated as confidential. The comments received will be made available for inspection. A summary of the comments and the suggested response, identifying any necessary changes, will be made available on the website as soon as possible after the closing date.
- 1.5.6 The County Council is a data controller for the purposes of the Data Protection Act 1998. Details will be entered into a database and may be used to inform respondents about other services. The details will not be passed on to other organisations. Security safeguards apply to both manual and computerised held data, and only relevant staff/named disclosures can access the information. For further information, please contact the Data Protection Officer on 01243 642118.

2. Appraisal Methodology

2.1 Links between the Waste Local Plan and the SA

- 2.1.1 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation of plans. The general process is to assess the likely significant social, economic, and environmental effects of strategies and policies, and the extent to which their implementation will achieve key sustainability objectives.
- 2.1.2 The SA of the Plan is based on the guidance in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's paper "A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive". See Appendix A for details about the stages.
- 2.1.3 As the preparation of the WLP progresses following the consultation on the draft Plan, it is possible that details of some of the sites and policies may be amended. If this happens, the amended proposals will be re-assessed against the SA objectives. The aim is that any amendments will help overcome any identified negative effects on SA objectives, and help the overall effects of the Plan on sustainable development.

2.2 How and when the SA was undertaken

- 2.2.1 The SA started as the preparation of the MWDF began in 2004, and has been progressed as an iterative process. Draft SA Reports were published for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the Strategic Waste Sites Allocation DPD in 2007. Comments from the consultation on these documents have been taken into account in preparing this SA Report and updates to the Scoping Reports.
- 2.2.2 The scope of the appraisal was defined in a 'Scoping Report' (Stage A). The purpose of the Scoping Report was to ensure that the SA will be comprehensive and robust enough to support the preparation of documents. It sets out the context and objectives for the SA, collected baseline data, and identified key sustainability issues. The first Scoping Report was published in 2006 and was prepared as a basis for appraising all documents in the MWDF. This was then updated in 2009. The latest Scoping Report (updated in July 2012) covers only waste and takes into account the changes in policy over the last 3 years and the creation of the South Downs National Park. One of the key changes in the 2012 Scoping Report is the Sustainability Objectives which have been refined and updated to reflect recent policy changes. Comments on the updated Scoping Report are also being sought from the statutory consultees alongside the draft SA Report.



Signposting:

The 2012 updated Scoping Report can be viewed online at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf under 'Evidence and Background Documents'.

- 2.2.3 The SA of the draft Plan was carried out in-house. Previous SA Reports of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and the Strategic Waste Sites Allocation DPD were carried out in-house and audited by consultants Levett-Therivel.

The consultants' comments have been taken into account in undertaking this SA Report.

2.3 Difficulties

- 2.3.1 One of the key difficulties with the assessment was the iterative nature of plan preparation and the central government changes to the plan making process which has resulted in changes to the documents being prepared as part of the MWDF.

2.4 Compliance with the SEA Directive

- 2.4.1 There is a distinct difference between SA and SEA. SEA is primarily focused on environmental effects and, therefore, focuses on issues such as biodiversity, water, air, human health, and soil, and the inter-relationships between them. SA however, has a broader scope to consider the potential social and economic impacts as well as environmental impacts of the plan.
- 2.4.2 The SEA Directive overall requires "preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated".
- 2.4.3 Table 1 sets out how the specific parts of the SEA requirements have been met in the SA process:

Table 1: Compliance with the SEA Directive	
Requirements of the SEA Directive	Location in draft report
An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans or programmes	Chapter 1
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	3.2
The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	3.3
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC	3.3
The environmental protection objectives, established at international Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	3.1 and Appendix B
The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationships between the above factors	Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Appendix F, G, H, and J
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme	As above
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	Chapters 2 and 4

Table 1: Compliance with the SEA Directive	
Requirements of the SEA Directive	Location in draft report
A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art.10	Chapter 7 and Appendix D
A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Executive Summary

3. Baseline, Context, and Sustainability Objectives

3.1 Links to Plans, Policies, and Programmes

- 3.1.1 This section identifies plans, policies, and programmes that are relevant to waste planning in West Sussex. The purpose is to document how the Plan can be affected by outside factors and suggest ideas for how constraints can be addressed. This section also identifies the likely implications of Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) for the preparation of the Plan.
- 3.1.2 A large number of plans, programmes, and strategies were reviewed to identify their relevance to planning for waste in West Sussex. The full review is presented in Appendix B. The findings of the review provide an important starting point for the preparation of the Plan to ensure that it meets the objectives and requirements of relevant national, regional, and local plans, strategies, and guidance. It has also been used to inform the identification of the baseline data.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

- 3.1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the requirement for Local Plans to be supported by Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRA). SFRA should be prepared in consultation with the EA and be used to inform them. The West Sussex County Council SFRA was undertaken by consultants, Capita Symonds, in 2010 and has informed the appraisal of sites through the SA process.




Signposting:

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) can be viewed online at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf under 'Evidence and Background Documents'.

Habitat Regulation Assessment

- 3.1.4 The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of plans and proposals on the integrity of Special Protection Areas (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC). These are known as 'European Sites' and protected under the EU Habitats Directive. If the Assessment reveals any significant negative effects, mitigation measures and/or alternative options should be examined to avoid any potential damaging effects.
- 3.1.5 An HRA was undertaken by consultants Scott Wilson, and an HRA Screening Report was published in March 2010. Some site options were identified within the report as requiring Appropriate Assessment which was completed in March 2011. The findings revealed that, subject to the specified requirements (such as restrictions on the nature of development at certain sites, and requirements for some further assessment and mitigation work at planning application stage

on some sites), the site options would not have any unacceptable impact on any European sites.


	<p>Signposting:</p> <p>The Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) can be viewed online at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf under 'Evidence and Background Documents'.</p>
---	---

3.2 Social, Economic, and Environmental Baseline Characteristics

- 3.2.1 To accurately predict the potential effects of the plan policies, it is first important to understand the current state of the environment and of social and economic factors, and then to examine the likely evolution of those factors without the implementation of the plan. Establishing a baseline of information helps to provide a basis for predicting and monitoring effects, and can also help to identify sustainability problems and ways of mitigating them.

How the baseline data was collected

- 3.2.2 Environmental baseline information for the County had already been gathered for the first Scoping Report which was prepared in 2006 for the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, the Minerals Development Plan Document (MDPD) and the Strategic Waste Sites Allocations Document (SWSA DPD). It was subsequently updated in 2009 and the environmental baseline information has been reviewed again.
- 3.2.3. Environmental and sustainability data were collected from a wide range of sources; including national and regional government/agency websites and the 2001 census (the 2011 census data will not be available until summer 2012). For this update, a number of sources have been called upon including the Audit Commission's Best Value Performance Indicators, Natural England departments throughout the County Council itself and the SDNPA.
- 3.2.4. The raw baseline data has been updated to inform the preparation of the Plan and other DPD and is presented in Appendix C. It sets out information on the current condition, the likely future position, and any issues identified for the Plan. Maps have been produced for certain spatial characteristics. These are available on the Council's website at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf. An interpretation of that data follows.

	<p>Signposting:</p> <p>Baseline data maps for West Sussex can be viewed online at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf under 'Evidence and Background Documents'/'Sustainability Appraisal'.</p>
---	---

The West Sussex Context


- 3.2.5. West Sussex covers an area of approximately 2,000 km² and includes Adur, Arun, Chichester, Horsham and Mid Sussex Districts and Crawley and Worthing Boroughs. In 2011 the population of West Sussex had been forecast to reach just over 795,000 people, nearly 90% of which live in twenty-four towns and villages of over 4,000 population which cover just over 12% of the land area. There is a strongly defined settlement pattern of medium-sized and larger towns, villages and coastal settlements. Most development is on the coast and the eastern fringes leaving the centre almost wholly rural. Over half the County is covered by two nationally designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the South Downs National Park (SDNP). Woodlands and forests account for about 13% of the land area. Most of the farmland is arable or improved grassland and the best of agricultural land is on the coastal plain.
- 3.2.6. The main transport corridors are the South Coast rail and A27/A259 road corridor and the Crawley/Brighton rail and A23 road corridor. Secondary corridors are the Arun Valley rail corridor and the A24 road corridor, which link the north east of the County with the coast.

Waste in West Sussex

- 3.2.7 Waste is defined in the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) as any substance or object which the holder discards or intends or is required to discard. Waste arises from different streams including household waste, commercial and industrial waste (C&I) and construction and demolition waste (C&D). Municipal solid waste (MSW) is a term used for waste collected from homes and elsewhere by the Waste Collection Authorities (the District and Borough Councils) or left at Household Waste Recycling sites. C&I waste arises from premises which are used wholly or mainly, for trade, industry, business, sport, recreation or entertainment. C&D waste arises from the construction, repair maintenance and demolition of buildings and structures and mostly includes brick, concrete, hardcore, subsoil and topsoil. The term 'controlled waste' is applied to household, industrial, and commercial wastes (including construction and demolition and hazardous waste) that are subject to regulation by the Environment Agency.
- 3.2.8 Within West Sussex there are a number of organisations that are involved in waste planning, management and regulation. The County Council has two roles. First, it is the WPA responsible for all land use planning matters associated with waste. Second, it is the Waste Disposal Authority responsible for making arrangements for the disposal of municipal solid waste. Municipal waste currently makes up only about 40% of the total waste requiring management in West Sussex although the proportion does vary from year to year. There are also the Waste Collection Authorities (Districts and Borough Councils) and the Waste Regulation Authority (the Environment Agency).
- 3.2.9 Non-municipal waste (which makes up about 60% of the total waste arising in the County) is dealt with entirely by the private sector, which collects and manages the waste.
- 3.2.10 A key factor in waste planning, is that household and C&I waste streams are all likely to be affected by population growth in the County during the period of the MWDF. In West Sussex, the emphasis is increasingly on minimisation of waste and on regarding waste streams, as far as possible, as resources to be

re-used or recovered rather than as surplus materials for disposal. In 2010/11, 39% of MSW waste was recycled, 0.46% was treated and 52% was sent to landfill. 56% of C&I waste was recycled, 13% was treated and 32% was sent to landfill. 47% of C&D waste was recycled, 18% was recovered and 35% sent to landfill.

- 3.2.11 There are over 50 waste management sites in the County, excluding small scrap yards and wastewater treatment works. The Council deals with a steady flow of applications for new facilities. There remains, however, a pressing need for further new facilities for the collection, sorting, transfer, recovery and treatment of waste, and for the final disposal of unavoidable residues. These will be essential to a more sustainable approach to dealing with waste in the County.

	<p>Signposting:</p> <p>More information on the key characteristics of West Sussex and information on current waste management data are set out in:</p> <p>Background Paper 1: Spatial Portrait, Issues, Vision and Objectives, Version 2 (December, 2009); and</p> <p>Background Paper 2: Waste Arisings and Waste Management Capacity, version 2 (December, 2009)</p> <p>which can be found at www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf under 'Evidence and Background Documents'.</p>
---	--

3.3 Main social, economic, and environmental issues and problems

- 3.3.1 This section outlines the key sustainability issues that have been identified at this stage, relating to waste planning in West Sussex. An analysis of the baseline data and the review of relevant plans, policies, and programmes, from the previous stages of the SA process, helped identify the key economic, social and environmental issues for West Sussex.
- 3.3.2 As the purpose of SA is to identify the likely 'significant' effects of the Plan, the SA only deals with 'key' issues at the strategic, that is County, level and will not address some of the more detailed, site-specific issues. With regard to waste, the overall effects of implementing the plan will be spread throughout the County because waste arises almost everywhere and the transport of waste will occur throughout the County. There will also be more localised impacts of waste management within the vicinity of waste management sites.
- 3.3.3 **Amenity:** Community engagement has highlighted the concern of local communities about waste development. In particular, concerns about noise, litter, vermin and birds, light, odour, vibration, and dust or other nuisance, for example, mud on the road. In addition to the immediate impacts of development, it is recognised that there is a need to address potential long-term impacts, for example, the need to secure restoration of sites to appropriate after-uses. This is a key concern for local communities.

- 3.3.4 **Public Rights of Way:** In addition to affecting residents and other sensitive uses in close proximity to a site, waste proposals may also affect the amenity of users of the countryside, in particular those using the Public Rights of Way (PROW) network. Community engagement has highlighted concerns about direct impacts, such as alterations to the routing of PROW which cross or adjoin a site, as well as indirect impacts, such as the impact on views or changes in the character of an area used by visitors to the countryside. In 2012 there were 4146km of PROW within the county which has increased from 4071km in 2009. In 2008 there was one PROW diversion, one PROW stopped up and one new PROW opened as a result of waste development. There has been a general decrease in the percentage of land that is classed as tranquil. In the 1960s 69.94% of the county was considered tranquil and in 2007 it was 35%.
- 3.3.5 **Flooding:** The risk of flooding is an important issue in West Sussex and it is particularly vulnerable to the predicted impacts of climate change. These include more coastal, river (fluvial) and groundwater flooding resulting from sea-level rise, increased storminess, increased winter rainfall, and higher and more intensive waves. In 2009 there were 75 significant flood events resulting from 51 rainfall events. Although the risk of flooding cannot be eliminated, neither can flood damage be entirely prevented; the general aim is to reduce the risks to people, property and the natural environment from flooding. This applies as much to waste development as to other land-uses. There is also the potential for sewer flooding, which may occur where there is inadequate infrastructure ahead of development.
- 3.3.6 **Waste management:** Waste management is necessary for economic and social growth and well-being. It is necessary for maintaining and enhancing the environment we live in by providing appropriate and sufficient facilities to manage waste.
- 3.3.7 The waste industry currently plays a minor role in the local economy, comprising only 0.5% of the employed population of West Sussex in 2010. However, it is important to consider the effect on the local economy of ancillary industry associated with waste management. It is also important to consider the impacts that waste development may have on primary rural economic activities such as horticulture, agriculture and forestry. Where possible, negative impacts on the vitality and viability of the rural economy resulting from new minerals and waste development should be avoided or mitigated.
- 3.3.8 **Tourism:** Tourism is an important part of the local economy. Much of the attraction of West Sussex derives from the character and quality of the landscape; there are two AONB and the South Downs National Park which covers 807km² of West Sussex. It is important, therefore, that in considering the impact of development, the attractiveness to visitors of the County is maintained and protected.
- 3.3.9 **Transport of waste:** The transportation of waste is an important issue. It is also important to consider the impact of transportation on other users of the County's transport network including cyclists, walkers and equestrian uses. Access to the Advisory Lorry Route for road-based transportation is an important issue. The use of alternative modes of transport where practicable, such as rail and water, is also important particularly with regard to the need to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases.

- 3.3.10 Landscape and townscape:** Protecting and, where possible, enhancing the landscape and townscape character of West Sussex is a key issues for the County. In considering the impact of waste development, one of the key components of the character of the County is the distinctiveness of the main natural character areas – the South Coast Plain, the South Downs, the Wealden Fringe, the Low Weald, and the High Weald. These areas contain a number of smaller character areas, which give the different parts of West Sussex their distinctive character and sense of place. With regard to the issue of quality, more than half of the County is included in designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (High Weald, and Chichester Harbour) and National Park (South Downs). Regardless of the issue of quality, it is still important to recognise the contribution of the countryside around settlements in maintaining and enhancing their character and separate identity.
- 3.3.11 Historic environment:** In addition to the natural environment (accepting that the character of the landscape is largely 'man-made'), one of the key components of the character of West Sussex is its historic environment. This is characterised by the many Listed Buildings (7,585 in 2012) and other buildings of more local importance, the designated Conservation Areas (237 in 2012), and nationally and locally important historic parks and gardens (34 in 2012). It is important that such features and areas are protected. West Sussex also has an exceptionally rich archaeological heritage, which contributes to its character. The County contains important areas and sites from all eras of human activity including Scheduled Ancient Monuments (346 in 2012), and sites and places have been defined as Archaeologically Sensitive Areas worthy of protection. As archaeological remains are a finite, non-renewable resource and vulnerable to damage and destruction, there is a need to preserve and record important archaeological remains.
- 3.3.12 Greenfield land:** Land is a valuable resource that should be used wisely. One of the key principles of land-use planning in West Sussex is to make the best use of land which has to be developed and to reduce the need for greenfield development by maximising the reuse of previously-developed land. This principle also applies, where possible, to the identification and use of sites for waste development.
- 3.3.13 Biodiversity and geodiversity:** One of the major influences on the character of West Sussex is its biodiversity or "variety of life" and geodiversity. The range of habitats and species has a major impact on the quality of the environment and, consequently, on the well-being of the communities of West Sussex. The County's varied geology, its geographical location, and past land-use and management practices have contributed to its biodiversity. Much of West Sussex is formally designated as being of international, national, regional and local importance for nature conservation. Such designations include Ramsar Sites (3 in West Sussex in 2012), Special Protection Areas (3 in West Sussex in 2012), Special Areas of Conservation (8 in West Sussex in 2012), Regionally Important Geological Sites (66 in West Sussex in 2008), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (78 in West Sussex in 2012), National and Local Nature Reserves (2 NNR and 27 LNR in West Sussex in 2012), Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (282 in West Sussex in 2012), and Ancient Woodland (21,375 ha in 2010). The vital linkages between these sites and the areas around them are also of importance in maintaining this biodiversity and geodiversity. The range of habitats and species has decreased over the relatively recent past, to the point at which effort is

needed to reverse the trends. In considering potential waste sites, there is a need to maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by protecting designated sites and retaining important features and areas within new development sites. The after-use of sites provides the opportunity to create new habitats and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.

- 3.3.14 **Air, Soil and Water:** Natural resources such as air, soil, and water are essential to life and it is vitally important that any adverse impact of waste development upon them is minimised. Air quality in West Sussex is generally high but faces threats from pollution caused by industrial processes and traffic. In 2012 there were 10 Air Quality Management Areas in West Sussex which has increased from 5 in 2008. The importance of water as a resource, its conservation, supply and disposal, is self-evident; supply and quality must not be compromised by the need for waste sites. This includes the satisfactory provision of water and sewerage infrastructure. There is a need, therefore, to assess the impact of potential development on the occurrence, movement and quality of water under the ground (hydrogeology). In West Sussex there are 30 groundwater bodies and 33% are classified as good overall. Maintaining high quality soil is vital to the health of the land and to agriculture. The varied geology of West Sussex has generated wide variations in soil types and consequently in agricultural land productivity, although much high-grade agricultural land has effectively been produced by improvement through cultivation. A holistic view of the value of land needs to be taken, but where development of agricultural land is unavoidable, priority should be given to the use of poorer quality land.
- 3.3.15 **Climate change:** Climate change is the most serious environmental challenge in the 21st century. Scientists agree that human activities are increasing global warming and changing the climate. As well as changing temperatures and rainfall, climate change will impact on health, the economy, building and countryside. In 2011, it was estimated that there were 22.9 million tonnes (mt) of greenhouse gas emissions from HGVs, 0.3mt of greenhouse gas emissions from waste incineration and 701,000 tonnes of methane from landfill (2010 estimates) in the UK. Reducing the amount of greenhouse gases will need to be considered in assessing proposals, for example, by using alternative modes of transport, as well as looking at ways to adapt to climate change. Energy can also be recovered from waste and can provide the opportunity for low carbon energy networks. In 2010, 6.8% of energy was derived from renewable sources in the UK, this was an increase from 0.1% in 2009.
- 3.3.16 There are key existing sustainability problems related to the broad issues outlined above in relation to waste development. Table 2 identifies the problems and the implications for the WLP.

Table 2: Key Social, Economic, and Environmental Problems		
Existing Problem	Supporting Data	Implications
Tranquillity	Percentage of landscape classified as tranquil: 69% early 1960s 47% early 1990s 35% in 2007	Waste development has potential to reduce amount of land classified as tranquil. WLP needs to consider impact of waste allocations on the tranquillity of the landscape and include policies to ensure development does not undermine the objectives of protected landscapes. DM process should consider acceptable hours of operation at waste sites.
Flooding	Certain areas in West Sussex are becoming more prone to coastal, fluvial and groundwater flooding flood events (West Sussex SFRA, 2010).	WLP should comply with National Policy on flooding, adopting the sequential approach to allocating sites. Policies on flooding should not increase flooding elsewhere and reduce causes and impacts of flooding.
Unsustainable growth in household waste generated	The rate of household waste growth in West Sussex has declined from 7% in 1998/99 to 2% in 2001/02 and current base case predications are 0% as waste growth has plateaued.	Largely a management issue but WLP can encourage waste minimisation and resource efficiency. District and Borough Local Development Frameworks can include policies encourage waste minimisation, reuse and recycling.
Predominance of landfill over more sustainable methods of waste management	In 2010/11: MSW: 39% recycled, 0.46% treated, 52% landfill. C&I: 56% recycled, 13% treated, 32% landfill. C&D: 47% recycled, 18% recovered and 35% landfill.	WLP should support the movement of waste up the hierarchy. Movement away from landfill will also reduce the level of landfill gas.
Traffic Growth	Local Transport Plan aims to limit growth of road traffic by 10%pa by 2011 and 50% by 2016.	Spatial strategies in WLP need to consider location of waste facilities in relation to waste arisings and consider opportunities for co-location of waste facilities. DM process needs to consider routing/daily timing of waste transportation.
Contaminated Land	Insufficient data on amount of contaminated land.	Contaminated land can represent opportunity for improvement through waste development via higher quality restoration. Measures should be taken to reduce the instability of land as a result of landfill.
Climate change: warmer, wetter winters; hot dry summers.	Average monthly rainfall and temperatures.	Impact on water usage. Waste site restoration provides opportunity for improved water retention and storage. WLP should evaluate restoration alternatives and their possible mitigation of climate change effects.

Table 2: Key Social, Economic, and Environmental Problems		
Existing Problem	Supporting Data	Implications
Declining biodiversity and geodiversity	Overall the county has lost 28% of the semi-natural habitat that existed in 1971. The decline is now slowing. Likely reason is due to government incentives i.e. Countryside Stewardship.	WLP should aim to minimise the impact of waste facilities on habitats; put measures in place to enhance and protect biodiversity and geodiversity.
Air Pollution/ greenhouse gas emissions	UK Greenhouse gas emissions: 22.9 million tonnes (mt) from HGVs (2012 data), 0.3mt from waste incineration (2012 data); and 701,000 tonnes of methane from landfill (2010 estimates). The number of AQMA has increased from 5 in 2008 to 10 in 2012.	The WLP should consider the impact of waste development in areas where AQMPs are in place. WLP should consider alternatives to transportation of waste by road and the potential for energy from waste facilities. Reducing the amount of waste going to landfill will also help to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases.
Water Quality	30 groundwater bodies and 33% are classified as good overall.	The WLP should consider the impact of waste development on water resources, quality and the function of the water environment.

3.4 Limitations

- 3.4.1 One of the difficulties in collecting the baseline data is identifying data that relates to West Sussex rather than just to the UK. Some information particularly that relating to nature conservation and the historic environment, is available at the County level. However, information on other matters such as commercially sensitive economic data, or the modes of transport for waste is frequently not available, which means it will be difficult to assess those impacts of implementing the Plan. Information on such matters may become available during the subsequent stages in the preparation of the Plan.

3.5 Appraisal Framework

Sustainability Objectives

- 3.5.1 Based on the review of relevant plans and programmes, the baseline information, and the analysis of sustainability issues, key sustainability objectives were identified through the preparation of the Scoping Report. These objectives form the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, against which the main strategic option, policies and sites in the Plan can be tested.
- 3.5.2 The SA objectives (table 3) were initially developed in 2006 and were worded to take account of national and local objectives and concerns that were identified from the analysis of sustainability issues. They have subsequently

been updated to take into account the changes in policy and to provide more clarification and reduction in duplication between objectives. The changes have resulted in a reduction in the number of objectives from 18 to 16.

3.5.3 Table 3 sets out the decision making criteria and assumptions that need to be taken into consideration when applying each objective. This gives an indication of the way that each objective was approached during the Assessment. Table 4 identifies how the objectives fulfil the requirements of the SEA Directive.

Table 3: SA Objectives		
Objective		Interpretation/Decision Making Criteria and Assumptions
A	To protect and, where possible, enhance health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would the option/policy/site be likely to impact on public amenity, such as noise and public views? ○ Would the option/policy/site give rise to adverse impacts to the health and well being of residents and neighbouring land uses? This includes the perceived effects. ○ Would the option/policy/site present any opportunities for improvements to health, well being and amenity through enhancements? <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is assumed that the regulatory bodies will ensure that emissions are within safe and acceptable limits.
B	To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would the option/policy/site be likely to impact on PROW or other users of the countryside including road and rail users, for example, by blocking PROW, increased traffic in the area, or by affecting public views? ○ Would the option/policy/site reduce the tranquillity of the area, specific consideration to protected landscapes? <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is assumed that PROW can be diverted or temporarily stopped up to enable development.
C	To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would the option/policy/site affect the likelihood of flooding or lead to inappropriate development in a flood risk zone contrary to national policy on flooding. ○ Would the option/policy/site impact on flood defences? ○ Would the option/policy/site provide opportunities for alleviation/mitigation?

Table 3: SA Objectives		
Objective		Interpretation/Decision Making Criteria and Assumptions
D	To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site be likely to affect the provision of an adequate supply of waste facilities in the county? <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate means achievement of net self-sufficiency. Suitable is defined within the context of waste types, waste quantities and distribution of arisings.
E	To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site help the local economy, for example by generating new jobs, and how might implementing the policy impact on local businesses? Would the option/policy/site affect tourists' decisions to visit an area?
F	To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site make non road transport modes possible? Would the option/policy/site optimise the use of the Advisory Lorry Route and reduce the use of rural roads thus reducing the disruption and emissions caused by HGVs? Would the option/policy/site give rise to traffic-derived pollutants, including CO2, NO2 and PM10? Would the option/policy/site encourage disposal/treatment of waste in the nearest appropriate facility to the source of waste?
G	To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site help enable protection of landscape (particularly AONB and SNDP) and townscape character?
H	To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site help enable the protection of features of archaeological and other historic interest in the county, such as conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments and areas of archaeological potential?
I	To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site maximise use of existing vacant built development? Would the option/policy/site make the best use of previously developed land and reduce the need for Greenfield sites? Would the option/policy/site minimise the permanent loss of the best and most versatile land? Would the option/policy/site avoid sterilising strategically significant mineral resources?

Table 3: SA Objectives		
Objective		Interpretation/Decision Making Criteria and Assumptions
J	To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site have a significant adverse effect on biodiversity and geodiversity, including protection of designated sites and geological features (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, Ramsars, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves and Ancient Woodland, RIGS) Would the option/policy/site provide opportunities for enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity as part of the development or restoration?
K	To reduce the amount of waste and increase the reuse and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site affect rates of re-use and recycling in the county, either directly or by enabling change in people's behaviour, or by enabling development of waste management facilities to recycle materials? Would the option/policy/site encourage the use of secondary resources within the county by enabling development of facilities producing high quality recycled products such as aggregate suitable for use in the economy?
L	Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site support 'zero waste to landfill' objective? Would the option/policy/site encourage recovery via energy from waste and other routes?
M	To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site lead to a change in local air quality? Would the option/policy/site cause further deterioration of air quality in AQMA? <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on emissions from facilities, such as bio-aerosols, landfill gas, and dust but within the thresholds defined by EA permit. It is assumed that the regulatory bodies will ensure that emissions are within safe and acceptable limits.
N	To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site lead to a change in soil quality or the loss rare soil types and functions? Would the option/policy/site safeguard high quality agricultural land (1,2 and 3a) from development? Would the option/policy/site encourage the de-contamination of contaminated soils
O	To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site affect the quality of water bodies and/or interfere with the flows of these waters, including the potential risk to, and impacts on, the quality of aquifers and groundwater? <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that the regulatory bodies will ensure that emissions to water bodies are within safe and acceptable limits. Wastewater discharged from sites would be subject to Trade Effluent Consents.

Table 3: SA Objectives		
Objective		Interpretation/Decision Making Criteria and Assumptions
P	To reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option/policy/site affect carbon dioxide and methane emissions in the county? E.g. reduce the quantity of biologically active waste landfilled? Would the options/policy/site encourage and increase renewable or lower carbon energy supplies?

Table 4: SEA Directive Requirements	
SEA Directive Issue	SA Objectives
Biodiversity and geodiversity	J
Population*	A, B, D, E
Human health	A
Fauna	K
Flora	K
Soil	N
Water	C, O
Air	M, P
Climatic factors	C, P
Material assets*	A, B, C, D, E, H, I, J, K, M, N, O, P
Cultural heritage inc. architectural and archaeological	H
Landscape	G
* These terms are not clearly defined in the Directive	

Significance

- 3.5.4 The identification of the sustainability objectives raises important questions about how the framework is used to assess the potential impact of the Plan. This is the degree or extent to which policy impacts upon an objective, that is, how significant is the effect? This is inevitably a subjective assessment but one which needs to be applied consistently to ensure that the sustainability appraisal is 'sound' in its application. When carrying out the assessment, various 'impact dimensions' need to be addressed, including; secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term, permanent, temporary, positive and negative effects. When forming a judgement as to whether an effect is significant, the various impact dimensions will need to be taken into account.
- 3.5.5 The assessment of the short, medium and long term effects raises the question whether there is a need to weight the impacts, that is, is a short-term adverse impact comparable in terms of significance with a long-term adverse impact? This is particularly important as the concept of significance addresses issues relating to quality of life for current and (however defined) future generations. In terms of waste sites, for the purposes of this SA, short term has been defined as 0-5 years, incorporating the construction period and

just beyond. Medium term is the life of the waste facility (6-25 years) and long term is the period after, e.g. the legacy the waste facility would leave.

- 3.5.6 It is appropriate to assess not only the impacts of a single scheme but also the cumulative impact of schemes. This may include the cumulative impact in a particular area or over the plan area, and may result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. For the draft WLP policies, consideration of the cumulative impacts has been undertaken as a separate task. Appendix J shows the effects of all the draft WLP policies as a whole. Previous iterations of the SA have considered the cumulative impacts of single policies; however, they need to be assessed in terms of their impact in conjunction with other policies in the plan, therefore the new approach is considered to be more comprehensive. With regard to the sites, the cumulative impact of the site under consideration together with any other waste sites nearby was considered in the site assessments in Appendix H.
- 3.5.7 The extent to which a harmful impact can be mitigated will also be addressed in the Appraisal. It is assumed that if an impact could (reasonably) be satisfactorily mitigated by a condition or legal agreement at the planning application stage, that this is reflected in the SA. Any potential for enhancement should also be identified.
- 3.5.8 Appraisal of the 2007 Core Strategy and Strategic Waste Sites Allocation Documents and the policy options included appraisal of the direct and indirect effects of the policies and sites. However, it was considered that this introduced an arbitrary distinction and that the effects as a whole should be assessed.

Targets and Indicators

- 3.5.9 A list of indicators is contained in Table D1 in Appendix D. These indicators will be used to monitor the implementation of the Plan and flow from the strategic objectives. The links to the sustainability objectives are also identified.

4. Waste Local Plan Policy Options

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 There are several aspects of the Plan that must be tested through the SA process:

- the objectives of the Plan must be tested for compatibility with the SA objectives;
- the main strategic options must be tested against the SA objectives to help inform the preparation of the draft Plan; and
- the draft policies must be tested against the SA objectives to help refine the policies to contribute to sustainable development, including, where appropriate, identifying mitigation measures.

4.2 Testing the plan objectives against the SA Framework

4.2.1 The strategic objectives have been tested against the SA objectives to determine their potential to help deliver sustainable development (Stage B). The strategic (or plan) objectives must provide a suitable basis from which to develop the main strategic options. The assessment is presented in Table E1 of Appendix E.

4.3 Main strategic options considered and how they were developed

4.3.1 Specific options were identified in the draft Minerals and Waste Core Strategy (2007) and were subject to SA which was published for consultation between January and March 2007. Options were also set out in Background Paper 2: Waste Arisings and Waste Management Capacity (December, 2009) and subject to informal consultation between October 2008 and February 2009. The options presented in this SA report have been developed from the options in both documents and represent 'reasonable' alternatives against which comparisons can be made. Options that are not considered 'reasonable' were not appraised.

4.4 Comparison of the main strategic options

4.4.1 The strategic options have been assessed against the SA objectives (see Appendix F).

4.4.2 The results of the assessment are summarised below to highlight the key points that arose from the assessments and community engagement. In some instances, the differences between the options are minimal and decisions about which option should go forward in the Plan will be guided by planning and other criteria.

Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management

4.4.3 The strategic options for the general approach to non landfill capacity are:

- (a) Planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex;
- (b) Making capacity available for net imports to the County;

- (c) Planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.

4.4.4 The preferred option is (a) as this is most likely to conform to the proximity principle for transporting waste within West Sussex. Accepting that the movement of waste is not constrained by municipal boundaries and therefore moves in and out of the County, this option is expected to lead to the provision of sufficient sites to deal with waste generated in the County and adjoining areas. This option also has benefits to the local economy, improving the management of waste and reducing waste to landfill. This option is taken forward as Policy W1(a).

4.4.5 The strategic options for meeting the capacity shortfall for non-inert landfill are:

- (a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on the need to ensure that there is no over-provision.
- (b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.
- (c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that any under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.
- (d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.

4.4.6 The preferred option is (d) as this option is most likely to bring about improvements in the way that waste is managed. As methane from landfill is a powerful greenhouse gas, this option reduces overall greenhouse gas emissions whilst also benefiting soil quality and water resources. As landfill sites are geologically dependent, this option will overall have less impact on amenity as built waste facilities can be more appropriately located. It is recognised that some additional capacity for landfill will be required in the short term while new facilities to manage waste are built. This option is taken forward as Policy W1(b).

4.4.7 The strategic options for disposing to land of waste arising from outside the County are:

- (a) Making capacity available for net imports to the County for landfill, including non-inert waste from London;
- (b) Planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency in landfill for West Sussex;
- (c) Making no further provision for landfill capacity within the County.

4.4.8 The preferred option is (c) as this option overall has the least impacts on the local environment and due to the reduction in landfilling, reduces overall greenhouse gas emissions and is consistent with sections (a) and (b) of the policy. This option, taken in isolation, may have a negative impact on the local economy due to the lack of landfill capacity and lead to some residual waste travelling further distances as a result which requires mitigation through other policies in the Plan. This option is taken forward as Policy W1(c).

Safeguarding Waste Management Sites

4.4.9 The strategic options for safeguarding existing waste management sites are:

- (a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.
- (b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and
- (c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.

4.4.10 The preferred option is option (a) because this option provides sufficient protection to sites that are important to the management of waste; helping to ensure there is sufficient capacity to manage waste in the County, whilst also allowing less suitable sites which may have developed historically to be replaced or relocated. This option is taken forward as Policy W2.

Location of Built Waste Management Facilities

4.4.11 The strategic options for locating built waste management facilities are:

- (a) A limited number of medium/large sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, giving priority to sites close to the Strategic Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;
- (b) Distribution of a larger number of smaller sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, and the larger settlements in the rural areas, giving priority to sites close to Advisory Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;
- (c) Wider distribution of sites of varying sizes across the County, including the predominantly rural areas, close to the Advisory Lorry Route (with a preference for large scale sites to be close to the Strategic Lorry Route) and with a preference for previously developed sites and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives.

4.4.12 The preferred option is option (b) as this offers increased flexibility over the location of new waste sites which helps ensure sufficient provision of sites. This option seeks sites in main urban areas and larger settlements in rural areas close to where waste is generated and in accordance with the proximity principle. It will be necessary to mitigate negative impacts on amenity and transport through other policies in the Plan. This option is taken forward as Policy W3.

Inert Waste Recycling

4.4.13 The strategic options for inert waste recycling are:

One permanent large site

- (a) Identify one site suitable for a large inert waste recycling facility (capacity of approximately 0.2mtpa) in a centralised location in relation to where waste arises, with good access to the ALR. The site will not be located

within the AONB or National Park, unless a suitable previously-developed site is available. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.

Four small sites

(b) Identify four sites suitable for small recycling facilities (capacity of up to 50,000tpa) to serve the north east, south east and south west of the County. Sites will have good access to the ALR. Sites may be located within the AONB or National Park, although preference will be given to sites outside these areas. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.

Facilities only linked to existing sites and mineral workings

(c) Develop a policy to guide the location of inert waste recycling sites and mobile facilities linked to existing sites and mineral workings that are well-related to the ALR.

- 4.4.14 The preferred option is option (b) because this option seeks to provide sufficient capacity for inert waste recycling, thereby diverting inert waste from landfill and also guiding sites to the most appropriate locations. It will be necessary to mitigate negative impacts on amenity, transport, landscape and townscape through other policies in the Plan. This option is taken forward as Policy W4.

Open Windrow Composting

- 4.4.15 The strategic options for open windrow composting and associated facilities are.

- a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.
- b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.
- c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.
- d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.
- e) A combination of options (a) and (c).

(f) A combination of options (b) and (d)

4.4.16 The preferred option is (f) as this would enable small and large scale facilities to come forward, offering more flexibility. It will be necessary to mitigate negative impacts on transport through other policies in the Plan. This option could result in loss of most versatile land and criteria should be added to the policy to mitigate this. This option is taken forward as Policy W5.

Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge

4.4.17 The strategic options for managing wastewater and sewage sludge are:

(a) Develop a policy to only allow the expansion of existing sites;

(b) Develop a policy to allow only new sites to be developed;

(c) Develop a policy to allow for the expansion of existing sites and new sites to be developed.

4.4.18 The preferred option is (c) as this concentrates development at existing facilities whilst providing sufficient flexibility to respond to future changes in demand or treatment standards. It will be necessary to mitigate negative impacts on amenity through other policies in the Plan. This option is taken forward as Policy W6.

Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste

4.4.19 The strategic options for managing hazardous and low level radioactive waste are:

(a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex;

(b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex;

(c) Combination of (a) and (b);

(d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex;

(e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex;

(f) Combination of options (d) and (e).

4.4.20 The preferred option is (b) as this would allow sites to come forward for whilst recognising that facilities used to manage this waste stream tend to have a regional significance. Negative impacts on amenity and transport would need to be mitigated through other policies in the Plan. This option is taken forward as Policy W7.

Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Landfill

4.4.21 The strategic options for the overall approach to disposing non-inert waste to landfill are:

- (a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex's waste;
- (b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;
- (c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex
- (d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.

4.4.22 The preferred option is (c) as this is in accordance with the proximity principle and other policies in the Plan, in particular Policy W1. As the option restricts the provision of additional capacity and relies on alternative management facilities to come forward. There are potential negative impacts on the local economy and economic growth. The option has a positive impact on amenity, soil and water quality and will contribute to improving the way that waste is managed. In accordance with Policy W1(a), this option is taken forward as Policy W8(a).

4.4.23 The strategic options for proposals for disposing non-inert waste to landfill are:

- (a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact;
- (b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available;
- (c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land;
- (d) Combination of (a), (b) and (c);
- (e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county.

4.4.24 Taken in accordance with Policy W8(a) and W1(a), the preferred option is (e) as this option has a positive impact on most sustainability appraisal objectives. This option is taken forward as Policy W8(b).

Depositing of Inert Waste to Land

4.4.25 The strategic options for depositing of inert waste to land are:

(a) Identify new landfill void capacity, well related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park unless no suitable alternative sites are available;

(b) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land raise will not be located on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land;

(c) Not allocating sites but identifying criteria to guide proposals to restoration of mineral sites, non-inert waste sites, and suitable engineering projects.

4.4.26 The preferred option is (c) because this option has least negative impacts overall and is expected to have positive impacts in the long term through restoration opportunities. Negative impacts on transport will need to be mitigated through other policies in the Plan. This option may result in sterilisation of mineral resources and criteria should be added to the policy to mitigate this. This option is taken forward as Policy W9.

4.5 Proposed Mitigation Measures

4.5.1 The preferred approach identified above are those that perform best in comparative terms for each strategic option. It is recognised, however, that each preferred option has impacts that need to be addressed through the policies that flow from them. These are addressed in the following chapter which covers the assessment of the draft policies.

5. Strategies and Use-Specific Policies

5.1. Introduction

- 5.1.1 Having assessed the main strategic options for waste and identified a preferred approach, the next task is to assess the strategies and use-specific policies in the draft WLP. They must be tested against the SA objectives to help refine the policies to contribute to sustainable development, including, where appropriate, identifying mitigation measures.
- 5.1.2 The draft policies have been assessed against the SA objectives (see Appendix G). The results of the assessment are summarised here to highlight the key points that arose from the assessments, and to identify potential social, economic, and environmental problems.

W1: Self Sufficiency in Waste Management

- 5.1.3 The policy seeks to provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to deal with waste generated in the County, which has beneficial impacts on waste management and the local economy. Its contribution towards minimising the transport of waste is unknown as waste destined for landfill may travel further while waste destined for other management should be dealt with within the County and adjacent areas. The objective to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' could lead to a net export of residual waste for disposal to land. The policy duplicates part of policy W8 therefore consideration could be given to addressing this in the proposed submission draft.

W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites

- 5.1.4 The policy supports retention of existing sites at minimum and at best replacement of undesirable sites so it should result in overall improvement on waste management facility 'stock' over time. The definition of 'important contribution' should be clarified in the proposed submission draft.

W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities

- 5.1.5 The policy helps to provide an adequate supply of suitable built waste facilities and therefore provides facilities for the re-use, recycling and treatment of materials, driving waste up the hierarchy. The definition of 'well-related' could be defined to provide clarity over how policy should be applied.

W4: Inert Waste Recycling

- 5.1.6 The policy helps provide an adequate supply of suitable inert recycling sites and therefore diverts inert waste from landfill and helps provide a supply of recycled aggregates to replace primary aggregates. The definition of 'well-related' could be defined to provide clarity over how policy should be applied. The policy is also similar to W3 (Built Waste Facilities) and therefore could be incorporated into it.

W5: Open Windrow Composting

- 5.1.7 The policy helps provide an adequate supply of suitable composting sites and therefore diverts green waste from landfill. Consideration could be given to

including reference to a 250 metre buffer zone in policy to protect public health and amenity. The policy does not make reference to National Park and AONB therefore sites could be located in these areas if there is no distinction between protected landscapes and the rest of the countryside.

W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewerage Sludge

- 5.1.8 The policy prioritises development at existing facilities, on PDL, sites allocated for waste management facilities, or on general industrial sites. The broader implications of the policy are likely to be negligible and/or mitigated as it aims to concentrate development at existing wastewater treatment works and/or within industrial areas and development elsewhere has to be acceptable in environmental terms.

W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste

- 5.1.9 The policy would develop an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities; however, no reference is made to how the waste will be managed. There is likely to be concern and anxiety about hazardous waste being dealt with anywhere in the County, due to negative perceptions about that type of waste. There may be concern caused by the uncertainty of not knowing where sites may be located. Another possible negative impact is that management of hazardous waste may not support movement up the waste hierarchy. However, this kind of facility is currently necessary for specific types of waste and the relevant treatments are not known at this stage. Other impacts will depend on the location, scale and design of facilities.

W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land

- 5.1.10 The policy restricts, to some degree, an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill is essential in order to enable disposal of residues from other waste treatment processes that are higher up the waste hierarchy. There is a possible risk of sterilising mineral resources but this is unlikely, as it might be possible to extract prior to development and stockpile resources if appropriate. The Policy seeks to promote the recovery of energy from landfill gas. There may be indirect negative impacts on health due to the public perception about the health risks of landfill sites, especially for non-inert waste which could cause stress and anxiety. In the long term, restoration would minimise impacts. Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites. The policy duplicates part of policy W1 therefore consideration could be given to addressing this in the proposed submission draft.

W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land

- 5.1.11 The policy restricts, to some degree, an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill is essential in order to enable disposal of residues from other waste treatment processes that are higher up the waste hierarchy. In terms of public health and amenity, the policy would give rise to overall neutral effects in the short and medium term as the positive effects of restricting landfilling in the county are off-set by the negative effects of having to find alternative facilities. In the long term the phasing out of inert landfill is likely to produce a negative legacy as alternative means of restoring mineral

sites may be limited. Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites.

W10: Strategic Waste Site Allocations

- 5.1.12 The policy seeks to provide land of sufficient scale and a suitable distribution of sites in line with the spatial strategy to meet the shortfall in capacity for management of the different waste streams. The policy requires satisfactory resolution of a series of 'development principles' for each strategic waste site allocation which seek to address site-specific issues including negative impacts on sustainability objectives that have been identified through the appraisal process.

5.2 Mitigation Measures

- 5.2.1 Policies related to the development of waste sites, are still likely to result in some inevitable and unavoidable effects. Therefore, an important part of the SA is also to identify how those effects could be minimised or offset. Mitigation measures can either be those to mitigate significant adverse effects predicted as a result of implementing the plan, or measures to enhance positive and beneficial effects.
- 5.2.2 Mitigation measures have been identified on a policy-by-policy basis in the individual assessments in Appendix G. One of the key measures is to apply the range of policies that may apply to a proposal rather than to consider the application of a policy in isolation. There are also more general mitigation measures that apply to many of the policies, many of which would be implemented anyway as good practice, for example, considering impact on public amenity.


6. Strategic Waste Site Allocations

6.1 Introduction


- 6.1.1 This section outlines the assessment of the potential sites to show how it has guided the selection of strategic site allocations in the draft WLP.
- 6.1.2 The sites allocated in the draft WLP are acceptable 'in principle', in land-use planning terms. The focus for site selection was on the land-use implications of potential waste management activities on the site rather than on a particular facility or technology. Technologies will change over time and it is important that flexibility is built into the Plan.

6.2 Long List of Potential Waste Sites

- 6.2.1 A 'long list' of 37 potential strategic waste sites was published in December 2009. 11 of the sites have been identified for inert landfill, 3 for non-inert landfill and the rest are identified for built waste management facilities. 30 Sites were rejected where there were clear reasons why they site was not suitable or if it could not be delivered.
- 6.2.2. A summary of the site assessment and selection process is explained in Background Papers 6, version 1 (October, 2008) and version 2 (December, 2009). The 'long list' of 37 potential waste sites is presented in version 2 together with maps and summary information about each site. 30 sites that are no long being considered are also presented together with their reason for being discounted.

	<p>Signpost: For more information, please refer to:</p> <p>Background Paper 6: Strategic Waste Sites version 1 (October, 2008) and version 2 (December, 2009) which are available on the Council's website (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf).</p>
---	---

- 6.2.3 The 37 site options were subject to SA (see Appendix H) at an earlier stage in the Plan preparation process in 2010 and were therefore assessed against the Sustainability Objectives set out in the 2009 Scoping Report. Proformas have been produced for each site which set out the results of the SA, comments from stakeholder engagement and the site assessments. An overall summary and recommendation for each site is also given.
- 6.2.4 A further 6 sites were assessed after the publication of the 'long list' of potential waste sites in Background Paper 6: Strategic Waste Sites, version 2 (December, 2009). These sites were subject to the same assessment as the 'long list' of 37 sites but were not considered to be 'reasonable alternatives' and therefore not subject to SA or taken forward into the draft WLP.

	<p>Signpost: For more information, please refer to the site assessment proformas which are available on the Council's website (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf).</p>
---	--

6.3 Strategic Waste Site Allocations

- 6.3.1 Following a comprehensive assessment (including SA) of the 'long list' of sites, a shortlist of 10 sites was produced. These sites were then subject to consultation between May and November 2011. Comments from the consultation were taken into consideration and the draft WLP now includes a short list of 7 strategic allocations. The 7 strategic waste site allocations have been assessed against the revised SA objectives (see Appendix I). The results of the assessment are summarised below to highlight the key points that arose from the assessments, and to identify potential social, economic, and environmental problems.
- 6.3.2 It is important to note that it is not the role of the SA to determine which sites are chosen as potential allocations. The SA, however, helps in identifying the most sustainable sites of those proposed in order to meet the requirements for waste management provision set out in the WLP. It is also worth noting that while the sites, due to the nature of waste management development, may not score positively in respect of all objectives, sites need to be allocated as additional capacity is needed to deal with waste arisings throughout the lifespan of the WLP (to 2031).
- 6.3.4 Specific uses have not yet been identified for the sites, therefore, the SA can only consider the physical characteristics of the sites. Broad assumptions about the type of built waste facility likely to be developed on each site were informed by site information collected by the Authorities, the existing knowledge of officers and ongoing consultation with stakeholders for individual sites.
- 6.3.5 The precise effects of waste development of any of the potential sites will be considered in more detail at the application stage when more information about a proposed facility is known. At that time, a more detailed assessment would be carried out and, where appropriate, a proposal-specific Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

Site north of Wastewater Treatment Works, Ford

- 6.3.6 Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the building establishes itself into its surroundings. Development of the site would bring benefits to users of the PROW as the footpath could be diverted, avoiding the need to share with vehicular traffic. There may be potential to provide a local heat network to surrounding uses or new development in the future and the site would be adjacent to existing waste

uses therefore bringing potential benefits of co-location. The site offer opportunities for improvements to the appearance of the area and controls on noise, dust and odour that the previous use may not have had, however, consideration should be given to the height of any chimneys.

Hobbs Barn, near Climping

- 6.3.7 Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to have positive impacts over time as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the site would provide additional waste management capacity. The site is well screened and there are existing commercial uses which would be compatible with a waste use. The site is not affected by any major nature, landscape or historic designations but it should be subject to FRA to ensure that it would have no further impact on flood risk.

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester

- 6.3.8 The site is well-located to manage waste in the county due to its proximity to waste arisings in the south west of the county, proximity to the A27 and it has potential to move waste by rail (subject to viability assessment). Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the building establishes itself into its surroundings. Development of the site presents an opportunity for an iconic building and for a local energy network which could have a positive effect on the local economy and public attitudes to waste. Consideration should be given to the height of any chimney to protect views of Chichester Cathedral and the South Downs National Park.

Brookhurst Wood, near Warnham

- 6.3.9 The site is well-located to manage waste due to its proximity to waste arisings in the north of the county, close to the ALR and it has potential to move waste by rail (subject to viability assessment). Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as it would benefit from co-location of other waste facilities and replace existing derelict buildings.

Land west of Wastewater Treatment Works, Goddards Green

- 6.3.10 Although the site is Greenfield, it presents an opportunity for comprehensive development as part of the 'Northern Arc' development north of Burgess Hill. The site would be close to waste arisings in the east of the county and close to the ALR. An EfW facility could provide a local energy network for other development in the 'Northern Arc'. The site boundary has been amended to exclude the flood risk area to the north and SUDs could be incorporated to alleviate flood risk in the area. Development of the site could also present opportunities to improve the water quality of the river Adur and the PROW.

Decoy Farm, Worthing

- 6.3.11 The site is well-located to manage waste due to its proximity to waste arisings in the south east of the county, close to the ALR. It is within an existing industrial area therefore any impacts over and above the surrounding uses are considered to be minimal. Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as it would benefit from co-location of other waste facilities, help to remediate the former landfill site and improve the quality of the Teville Stream. The site is not affected by any major nature, landscaping or historic designations but it should be subject to FRA to ensure that it would have no further impact on flood risk. Consideration would need to be given to the access to the site as there are residential properties in the surrounding area.

Extension to Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site

- 6.3.12 Although the site scores negatively against objective L to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill, it would be an extension to an existing site, providing a short term need. The site is also close to other waste facilities bring potential benefits of co-location. In the medium to long term the site would be restored.

7. Implementation

7.1 Links to Other Tiers of Plans and Programmes

- 7.1.1. The Plan works alongside national planning policies as outlined in Appendix B. It also works alongside the planning documents prepared by the District and Borough Councils as part of their Local Development Frameworks that deal with issues other than waste. It must be implemented to work with the strategies of adjoining mineral and waste planning authorities.
- 7.1.3 The implementation of the Plan also serves to work with waste management strategies in particular those that seek to waste to be managed as a resource, as much as possible, through recycling, composting and energy recovery. This is also linked to the strategies to enable a progressive movement up the waste hierarchy in the management of waste. The Plan will help national and local waste management targets to be achieved.

7.2 Monitoring

- 7.2.1 The effects of implementing the Plan will need to be monitored to identify any unforeseen adverse effects and to, where appropriate, allow for mitigation action to be taken. Waste Planning Authorities are required to produce a monitoring report outlining the progress of writing Waste Development Framework documents and how effective they have been in delivering against the objectives.
- 7.2.2 A list of indicators, linked to the SA objectives, have been identified in Table D1 in Appendix D. A realistic monitoring programme can, however, only be prepared at a later stage in the preparation of the Plan because public consultation on the document could help identify different effects as 'significant'.
- 7.2.3 The baseline data will be revised on regular basis, and any gaps in the data will be filled in as and when data becomes available. It should be noted that some data is not measured annually. The findings from monitoring will be included in the West Sussex Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

Appendix A: Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks

A1 This Sustainability Appraisal is based on the guidance in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's paper "A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive" (September 2005).

Stages in the SEA Process	
SEA Stages and Tasks	Purpose
Identifying other relevant plans, programmes and environmental protection objectives	To establish how the plan or programme is affected by outside factors, to suggest ideas for how any constraints can be addressed, and to help to identify SEA objectives.
Collecting baseline information	To provide an evidence base for environmental problems, prediction of effects, and monitoring; to help in the development of SEA objectives.
Identifying environmental problems	To help focus the SEA and streamline the subsequent stages, including baseline information analysis, setting of the SEA objectives, prediction of effects and monitoring.
Developing SEA objectives	To provide a means by which the environmental performance of the plan or programme and alternatives can be assessed.
Consulting on the scope of SEA	To ensure that the SEA covers the likely significant environmental effects of the plan or programme.
Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects	
Testing the plan or programme objectives against the SEA objectives	To identify potential synergies or inconsistencies between the objectives of the plan or programme and the SEA objectives and help in developing alternatives.
Developing strategic alternatives	To develop and refine strategic alternatives.
Predicting the effects of the plan or programme, including alternatives	To predict the significant environmental effects of the plan or programme
Evaluating the effects of the plan or programme, including and alternatives.	To evaluate the predicted effects of the plan or programme and its alternative and assist in the refinement of the plan or programme.
Mitigating adverse effects	To ensure that adverse effects are identified and potential mitigation measures are considered.
Proposing measures to monitor the environmental effects of plan or programme implementation.	To detail the means by which the environmental performance of the plan can be assessed.
Stage C: Preparing the Environmental Report	

Preparing the Environmental Report	To present the predicted environmental effects of the plan or programme, including alternatives, in a form suitable for public consultation and use by decision-makers.
Stage D: Consulting on the draft plan or programme and the Environmental Report	
Consulting the public and Consultation Bodies on the draft plan or programme and the Environmental Report	<p>To give the public and the Consultation Bodies an opportunity to express their opinions on the findings of the Environmental Report and to use it as a reference point in commenting on the plan or programme.</p> <p>To gather more information through the opinions and concerns of the public.</p>
Assessing significant changes	To ensure that the environmental implications of any significant changes to the draft plan or programme at this stage are assessed and taken into account.
Making decisions and providing information	To provide information on how the Environmental Report and consultees' opinions were taken into account in deciding the final form of the plan or programme to be adopted.
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan or programme on the environment	
Developing aims and methods for monitoring	To track the environmental effects of the plan or programme to show whether they are as predicted; to help identify adverse effects.
Responding to adverse effects	To prepare for appropriate responses where adverse effects are identified.

Appendix B: Plans, Policies, and Programmes

B1 The review of plans, policies, and programmes is shown in the following table. The documents are subdivided into the different levels (international to local) and the table clearly identifies:

- the title of the plan, programme, policy or legislation;
- the relevant objective(s);
- the key relevant targets and indicators (where applicable)
- the key implications for the DPD; and
- the key implications for the SA.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
INTERNATIONAL				
Kyoto Climate Change Protocol (1997)	To limit and/or reduce methane emissions through recovery and use in waste management, as well as in production, transport and distribution of energy (Art. 2.1/a/viii)	UK target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% of 1990 levels by 2012. By the end of the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol in 2012, a new international framework needs to have been negotiated and ratified that can deliver the stringent emission reductions the <u>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)</u> has clearly indicated are needed.	Plan should support reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases.
The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), Johannesburg Commitments arising from the Johannesburg Summit (2002)	A number of the sustainable development commitments originating from the WSSD, are relevant to land use planning, and include: Integrate energy into country-led poverty reduction processes; Remove market barriers and create a level playing field for renewable energy efficiency; Greater resource efficiency (incl. decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation);	There are a number of follow-up processes, but no specific targets associated with the summit.	Plan must implement the sustainable development commitments agreed at the World Summit, where applicable.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support the principles of greater resource efficiency such as through the waste hierarchy.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	Support business innovation and take-up of best practice technology and management; work on waste and producer responsibility.			
Ramsar Convention – Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Treaty signed in 1971)	To promote the conservation and wise use of all wetlands through local, regional and national actions and international co-operation, as a contribution towards achieving sustainable development throughout the world	The number of Ramsar sites being designated in the UK.	Plan should promote the conservation and make wise use of all wetland areas.	Consider inclusion of objectives which aim to promote conservation and wise use of wetland areas.
EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and EU Conservation of Wild Birds Directive (79/409/EEC), implemented by UK Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) 1994 and UK Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) (Amendment) Regulations 07 (07/1843) A codified version of the Wild Birds Directive 2009/147/EC contains the most up to date annexes arising from successive EU enlargements including the accession of Bulgaria and Romania	To conserve fauna and flora and natural habitats of EU importance. To establish a network of protected areas throughout the European Community designed to maintain both the distribution and abundance of threatened species and habitats. The UK Regulations transpose the EU Directive into national law. The Regulations require the compilation and maintenance of a register of European sites (Special Areas of Conservation - SACs, Special Protection Areas – SPAs). The 2007 Amendments simplifies the species protection regime to better reflect the Habitats Directive.	Identifies endangered species and sub-species in need of protection prior to development. Target actions include: Creation of protected areas Upkeep and management Re-establishment of destroyed biotopes.	Plan should take into account the location of SPA and SAC during site/area selection. Plan should ensure that provision is made for undertaking appropriate assessments in locations that could impact negatively on the environment.	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity.
EU Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC)	To prevent, or reduce as far as possible, negative effects on the environment, in particular the pollution of surface water, groundwater, soil and air, and on the global environment, including the greenhouse effect, as well as any resulting risk to human health, from landfilling of waste. Since October 2007, the pre-	Sets targets to reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste that is sent to landfill: To 75% of baseline (1995) levels by 2010 To 50% of baseline levels by 2013 To 35% of baseline levels by 2020	Plan should include policies on environmental protection and EIA requirement for proposals likely to have negative impacts on the environment. Plan policies should ensure that where landfilling takes place the environmental impacts are understood and mitigated against.	Consider inclusion of objectives to increase recovery of value from waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	treatment requirements of the Landfill Directive have included the need to treat all non-hazardous waste (including commercial and industrial) before it can go to landfill. This treatment must include a physical, thermal, chemical or biological process - which can include sorting - to change the characteristics of the waste to either reduce its volume, reduce its hazardous nature, facilitate its handling, or enhance its recovery.		Plan should include policies that define standards for the design and operation of landfills. Plan should include policies encouraging movement up the waste management hierarchy. Plan should include policies that support the provision of facilities for the treatment of waste before it can go to landfill.	
EU Hazardous Waste Directive (1975, amended 1991/689/EEC)	Aims to safeguard a high level of environmental protection. The differentiation it introduces between hazardous and non hazardous waste is, along with the differentiation between recovery and disposal laid down in the Waste Framework Directive, a key element of waste management policy.	The directive does not contain any targets.	Plan must adhere to the requirements of the Directive, as appropriate.	Objectives should reflect the requirements of the Directive.
EU Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive (2002/96/EC)	Producers should take responsibility for the collection and processing of end of life consumer and professional electrical and electronic goods. Sets conditions for pollution prevention and control at waste treatment facilities.	UK target of an average rate of collection of 4kg of WEEE per household per year. WEEE sites must have appropriate permits	Plan should consider the potential requirements for collection, storage and processing facilities and describe relevant criteria for determining the suitability of potential locations.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support waste reduction and the reuse and recycling of materials.
EU Waste Incineration Directive (2000/76/EC)	To prevent or to limit, as far as practicable, negative effects on the environment, in particular pollution by emissions into air, soil, surface water and groundwater, and the resulting risks to human health, from the incineration and co-incineration of waste.	Sets out limit values for emissions to atmosphere, and technical operating requirements.	Plan should adopt appropriate pollution prevention criteria to assess potential locations for new waste incineration and co-incineration facilities.	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect, as far as is practicably possible, the environment, air, soil and water from the impacts of development.
EU Packaging Directive (1994/62/EC)	This Directive aims to harmonise national measures in order to prevent or reduce the impact of packaging and packaging waste on the environment and to ensure the	The Directive does not contain any targets.	Plan must adhere to the requirements of the Directive, as appropriate.	Objectives should reflect the requirements of the Directive.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	functioning of the Internal Market. It contains provisions on the prevention of packaging waste, on the re-use of packaging and on the recovery and recycling of packaging waste.			
EU End of Life Vehicles (ELV) Directive (2000/53/EC)	Producers should take responsibility for the collection and processing of end of life motor vehicles. Annex 1 sets conditions for pollution prevention and control at waste treatment facilities	Sets targets for recovery and recycling of ELV by beginning of 2006 and beginning of 2015.	Plan should consider the potential requirements for collection, storage and processing facilities and describe relevant criteria for determining the suitability of potential locations.	Consider the potential needs for ELV management facilities.
EU Air Quality Directive (2008/50/EC).	Establishes limit values and alert thresholds for concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead in ambient air. Maintain ambient air quality where it is good and improve it in other cases.	Sets limit values and alert thresholds for concentrations of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead which must be abided by.	Plan should consider the levels of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead in ambient air. Plan should consider maintaining ambient air quality where it is good and improve it in other cases with respect to sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead.	Consider inclusion of objectives with the aim of reducing air pollution and, where possible, enhancing air quality in respect of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen, particulate matter and lead.
Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (1991/271/EEC)	Its objective is to protect the environment from the adverse effects of urban waste water discharges and discharges from certain industrial sectors and concerns the collection, treatment and discharge of: waste water.	The Directive does not contain any targets.	Plan must adhere to the requirements of the Directive and ensure the effective management of urban waste water treatment.	Objectives should reflect the requirements of the Directive.
EU Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC)	Expanding the scope of water protection to all waters, surface waters and groundwater Achieving 'good status' for all waters by a set deadline Water management to be based on river basins 'Combined approach' of emission limit values and quality standards		Plan should ensure that all potential mineral and waste sites are assessed in relation to the impact that extraction may have on hydrological and hydrogeological factors. Adequate consultation with appropriate authorities, i.e. Environment Agency and water providers as part of plan process to ensure integration with existing catchment management plans.	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	Closer involvement of community			
EU Bathing Water Quality Directive (2006/7/EC)	The revised Bathing Water Directive entered into force in March 2006. The overall objective of the revised Directive remains the protection of public health whilst bathing.	There is a requirement for all bathing waters to be classed as 'sufficient' by 2015.	Plan must adhere to the requirements of the Directive, as appropriate.	Objectives should reflect the requirements of the Directive.
EU Thematic Strategy on the Prevention and Recycling of waste (2005)	The aim of the strategy is to reduce the negative impact on the environment that is caused by waste throughout its life-span, from production to disposal, via recycling.	The strategy does not contain any targets.	Plan should support the objectives of the Strategy promoting the prevention of waste and increased recycling.	Objectives should reflect the aims of the Strategy.
EU Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC)	Aims to reduce landfill and associated greenhouse gas emissions through increasing waste prevention and recycling rates and encouraging use of waste as a secondary resource. Applies a 5-step hierarchy of waste prevention – reuse – recycling – recovery – disposal.	Sets targets for recycling rates; 50% recycling rates for household waste and 70% for C&D waste by 2020.	Plan should reflect the waste hierarchy. Plan should make provision for sufficient recycling facilities to ensure targets can be met.	Consider objectives to provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities, to reduce waste, and to reduce waste sent to landfill.
NATIONAL				

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)	<p>Planning should drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver infrastructure that the country needs.</p> <p>Always seek to secure high quality design and good standard of amenity for existing and future occupants.</p> <p>Take account of different roles and character of areas, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking account of flood risk and encourage the reuse of existing resources and encourage the use of renewable resources.</p> <p>Contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution.</p> <p>Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed.</p> <p>Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>Focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made sustainable.</p>	Supports local and national targets with regard to biodiversity and geodiversity.	Plan should contribute to the objective of achieving sustainable development (social, economic and environmental).	SA Objectives should reflect the core planning principles and policies set out in the NPPF.
The Waste (England & Wales) Regulations 2011	To encourage waste up the waste hierarchy and away from landfill	Target of 50% of household waste to be recycled.	<p>Plan must have regard to the amended waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Policies should be included which encourage waste to be re-used or prepared for re-use, recycled or have value or energy recovered from it. Plan should discourage landfilling of waste.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce, re-use, recycle and recover waste.</p> <p>Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce landfill.</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
Flood and Water Management Act 2010	To improve the management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses. To protect water supplies.	Local Authorities to prepare flood risk assessments, flood maps and plans EA to prepare Local flood risk management strategies	Plan should take account of flooding and water management issues and strategies	Consider inclusion of objective to reduce flood risk and other impacts on the water environment
Climate Change: The UK Programme (March 2006)	Strategic package of policies and measures to cut greenhouse gases. Energy supply: Emphasises the role that renewable energy sources may have in reducing future green house gas emissions. Transport: Emphasises the contribution that LPA can make to reducing transport related emissions of green house gases. Key objective of reducing the number of car journeys. Waste: Reduce methane emissions through reducing the amount of waste sent to Landfill, combined with increased collection of Landfill gas. Use waste to generate energy.	Reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2010.	Plan should contain policies that encourage movement of waste by rail and water where practicable. Council should consider having a Climate Change strategy within the Plan due to the important role local action could have. Plan should contain policies to encourage sustainable generation of energy from waste. Plan location criteria for siting of waste management facilities should include accessibility without need for car journeys. Plan policies should promote sustainable waste management.	Consider inclusion of objectives to increase the supply of energy from renewable sources. Consider inclusion of objectives to increase the volume of waste transported by water and rail, where practicable, and reduce the number of car journeys generated. Consider inclusion of objectives that serve to increase access to facilities, either during operation or after-use, without generating additional car journeys. Consider inclusion of objectives which promote sustainable waste management.
UK Climate Change Act 2008	The Climate Change Act 2008 introduced a statutory target of reducing carbon emissions.	Target of reducing carbon emissions by 80 per cent below 1990 levels by 2050, with an interim target of 34% by 2020.	Planning makes a significant contribution to both mitigating and adapting to climate change through its ability to influence the location, scale, mix and character of development. The plan should include policies that contribute towards achieving lower carbon emissions and greater resilience to the impacts of climate change.	Objectives should reflect the aims set in the Climate Change Act to reduce carbon emissions.
The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan (2009)	Plan plots how the UK will meet the 34 percent cut in emissions on 1990 levels by 2020. The Plan shows how reductions in the power sector and heavy industry; transport; homes and communities; workplaces and jobs; and farming, land and waste sectors could enable carbon	The plan includes a 5-point Action Plan covering the following areas: -	Plan should include policies that contribute towards achieving lower carbon emissions.	Objectives should reflect the aims set in the UK Low Carbon Transition Plan.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	budgets to 2022 to be met			
Carbon Plan: Delivering our low carbon future (2011)	The Carbon Plan is a Government-wide plan of action on climate change, including domestic and international activity.	The plan includes a range of sectoral plans and targets for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low carbon buildings, - low carbon transport, - low carbon industry, - low carbon electricity, and - agriculture, land use, forestry and waste 	Plan should include policies that contribute towards achieving lower carbon emissions.	Objectives should reflect the aims set in the Plan.
Waste Strategy for England (2007) A new National Waste Management Plan is expected to be published in 2013	Principal objectives to: Decouple waste growth in all sectors from economic growth and put more emphasis on waste prevention and re-use. Meet and exceed the Landfill Directive diversion targets for biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) in 2010, 2013, 2020. Increase diversion from landfill of non-municipal waste and secure better integration of treatments for municipal and non municipal waste. Secure the investment in infrastructure needed to divert waste from landfill and for the management of hazardous waste Get the most environmental benefit from that investment, through increased recycling of resources and recovery of energy from residual waste using a mixture of techniques.	Reduce the amount of household waste not re-used, recycled or composted from over 22.2 million tonnes in 2000 with an aspiration to reduce it to 12.2 million tonnes in 2020 – a reduction of 45%. Recycling and composting of household waste – at least 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020 Recovery of municipal waste – 53% by 2010, 67% by 2015 and 75% by 2020. The Government is considering, in conjunction with the construction industry, a target to halve the amount of construction, demolition and excavation wastes going to landfill by 2012 as a result of waste reduction, re-use and recycling.	Plan policies should promote recovery of value from waste through reduction, reuse and recovery. Recycling and composting should be promoted.	Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce, recover and recycle waste.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
Government Review of Waste Policy in England 2011	The Government's review was guided by the 'waste hierarchy', which is both a guide to sustainable waste management and a legal requirement of the revised EU Waste Framework Directive, enshrined in law through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. The hierarchy gives top priority to waste prevention, followed by preparing for re-use, then recycling, other types of recovery (including energy recovery), and last of all disposal (e.g. Landfill). The Coalition Government describes the need to move beyond our current throwaway society to a "zero waste economy".	An associated Action Plan to the Review includes actions for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - working with businesses, - preventing waste, - rewarding individuals and businesses for positive behaviour, - promoting energy from waste, - modernising waste regulation and enforcement, and - supporting the public sector to lead by example. 	Plan should consider the provisions of the review.	Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce, recover and recycle waste, and to enable provision of facilities to manage waste.
Anaerobic Digestion Strategy and Action Plan (2011)	This Strategy and Action Plan sets out a need to increase energy from waste through Anaerobic Digestion (AD). The Strategy believes that AD "offers a local, environmentally sound option for waste management which helps us divert waste from landfill, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and produce renewable energy which could be used to power our homes and vehicles.	The strategy does not set any targets relevant to Waste Plan but the provisions of the strategy should be taken into account through the plan making process, as appropriate.	Plan should consider the provisions of the Strategy and Action Plan.	Objectives should reflect the aims set in the Strategy and Action Plan.
English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010	<p>The purpose of this circular, which applies only in England, is to provide updated policy guidance on the English National Parks (including the South Downs in West Sussex) and the Broads ('the Parks').</p> <p>This circular has been produced to create a vision for National Parks. By 2030 English National Parks and the Broads will be places where:</p>	The vision and circular does not set any targets relevant to the Waste Local Plan.	Plan should support the vision for the South Downs National Park. Key considerations include conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP and promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the SDNP by the public.	Objectives should reflect the aims set in the Strategy and Action Plan.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are thriving, living, working landscapes notable for their natural beauty and cultural heritage; - They inspire visitors and local communities to live within environmental limits and to tackle climate change; - The wide-range of services they provide (from clean water to sustainable food) are in good condition and valued by society; - Sustainable development can be seen in action. The communities of the Parks take an active part in decisions about their future. They are known for having been pivotal in the transformation to a low carbon society and sustainable living. Renewable energy, sustainable agriculture, low carbon transport and travel and healthy, prosperous communities have long been the norm; - Wildlife flourishes and habitats are maintained, restored and expanded and linked effectively to other ecological networks. Woodland cover has increased and all woodlands are sustainably managed, with the right trees in the right places. Landscapes and habitats are managed to create resilience and enable adaptation; - Everyone can discover the rich variety of England's natural and historic environment, and have the chance to value them as places for escape, adventure, enjoyment, inspiration and reflection, and a source of national pride and identity. They will be recognised as fundamental to our prosperity and well-being. <p>Section 11A(2) of the 1949</p>			

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	National Park Act (inserted by section 62 of the 1995 Act) requires any relevant authority (such as various public bodies and statutory undertakers), when exercising or performing functions which relate to or affect land in a National Park, to attach greater weight to the purpose of 'conserving and enhancing' if it appears that there is a conflict between these two National Park purposes.			
England's statutory landscape designations: a practical guide to your duty of regard	Conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP and promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the SDNP by the public.	None	<p>Plan should have regard to the duties of the relevant authorities of the purposes of National parks and AONB.</p> <p>Plan should support the vision for the South Downs National Park. Key considerations include conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the SDNP and promotion of opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the SDNP by the public</p>	Objectives should reflect the vision and objectives of the SDNP and AONB.
A Strategy for England's Trees, Woods and Forests (2007)	<p>To provide, in England, a resource of trees, woods and forests in places where they can contribute most in terms of environmental, economic and social benefit now and for future generations;</p> <p>Ensure that existing and newly planted trees, woods and forests are resilient to the impacts of climate change and also contribute to the way in which biodiversity and natural resources adjust to a changing climate</p> <p>Protect and enhance the environmental resources of water, soil, air, biodiversity and</p>	<p>The strategy identifies some possible indicators including:</p> <p>Proportion of woodland Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) in favourable condition;</p> <p>Woodland bird indicator - bird population associated with woodland;</p> <p>Access to and use of woodland; and</p> <p>Trends in all plants and ancient woodland indicator plants.</p>	<p>Plan should to promote the sustainable management of our existing woods and forests.</p> <p>Plan should, where appropriate, seek a steady expansion of woodland areas to provide more benefits for society and our environment.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to promote sustainable management of our existing woods and forests.</p> <p>Consider inclusion of objectives which aim to promote the expansion, enjoyment and understanding of woodland areas</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>landscapes (both woodland and non-woodland), and the cultural and amenity values of trees and woodland</p> <p>Increase the contribution that trees, woods and forests make to the quality of life for those living in, working in or visiting England</p> <p>Improve the competitiveness of woodland businesses and promote the development of new or improved markets for sustainable woodland products and ecosystem services where this will deliver identifiable public benefits, nationally or locally, including the reduction of carbon emissions</p>			
The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (2007)	The strategy contains policies for the assessment and management of UK air quality and implementation of European Union (EU) and International agreements. The strategy sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues, sets out the air quality standards and objectives to be achieved, introduces a new policy framework for tackling fine particles, and identifies potential new national policy measures which modelling indicates could give further health benefits and move closer towards meeting the strategy's objectives.	Sets out EU Directive targets and objectives for each pollutant	Plan must help meet the objectives of the Strategy by taking air quality into consideration in the factors for appraising potential sites.	Consider inclusion of objectives that aim to reduce air pollution and enhance air quality.
Securing the Future: UK Sustainable Development Strategy (2005)	Prioritising four key issues of sustainable consumption and production, climate change, natural resource protection and sustainable communities.	Lists UK Government Strategy Indicators and relevant targets.	Plan should take account of climate change and promote sustainability.	Consider objectives to mitigate and adapt to climate change, to use mineral resources responsibly, promoting secondary aggregate use where possible and increase reuse and recycling to reduce waste landfilled.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
Underground, Under Threat - Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (GP3)	To prevent pollution of groundwater.	To meet Water Framework Directive requirements for groundwater quality.	Plan should recognise the importance and vulnerability of groundwater resources and ensure that they are not detrimentally affected by waste development.	Consider objective to protect water quality.
	Promote sustainable economic growth to support efficient competitive and innovative business, commercial and industrial sectors. Enhance as well as protect biodiversity	No specific targets identified.	Plan policies should promote sustainable economic growth Plan should include policies to enhance and protect biodiversity.	Consider inclusion of objectives to promote economic growth and encourage investment. Consider inclusion of objectives that recognise the importance to enhance, as well as protect, biodiversity
	Address the causes and impacts of climate change, pollution and waste and resource management impacts	No specific targets identified.	Policies should encourage minimisation of the use of primary mineral resources, maximisation of the production and use of recycled aggregates and other recyclable material resources, and increased development and use of renewable energy resources.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support waste reduction and the re-use and recycling of materials. Check that Plan location policies promote management of waste close to source
	Reduce the need to travel and encourage use of public transport	No specific targets identified.	Plan should include policies to maintain and improve local employment levels.	Consider inclusion of objectives that promote management of waste close to source; and consider inclusion of objectives compatible with enhancing economic growth and encouraging investment.
	Promote communities which are inclusive, healthy, safe and crime free, whilst respecting the diverse needs of communities.	No specific targets identified.	Plan Should include policies to protect and, where possible, enhance public amenity, health and well-being.	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance public amenity, health and well-being.
	Promote the more efficient use of land through higher density mixed-use development and the use of suitable previously developed land and buildings.	No specific targets identified.	Plan should include policies to protect the countryside and promote development, where possible, on previously developed land.	Consider inclusion of objectives to make the best use of previously developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites.
PPS10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management (2005) Updated 2011 PPS10 will remain in place until the National	Planning authorities should: drive waste management up the waste hierarchy provide a framework in which communities take more responsibility for their own waste	Support national waste strategy targets	Plan should promote reduction, reuse and recovery as well as providing facilities for disposal. Sites/areas for waste management facilities should help to support PPS10; consider physical and environmental constraints,	Objectives should address the waste hierarchy and recognise the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management. Check policies support increasing the recovery, reuse and reducing

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
Waste Management Plan is published	<p>help implement the national waste strategy</p> <p>prevent harm to human health and the environment</p> <p>enable waste to be disposed near its point of origin</p> <p>protect green belts</p> <p>The 2011 update incorporates the new waste hierarchy set out in the revised Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC). The new waste hierarchy differs from the existing hierarchy in how it defines re-use of materials and in how it distinguishes between recycling and other recovery. It will ensure that local authorities have regard to the hierarchy in the preparation of their waste plans; and that the hierarchy is capable of being a material consideration in determining individual planning applications.</p>		<p>cumulative effects of previous waste disposal facilities, capacity of the transport infrastructure; and give priority to previously developed land and redundant agricultural/forestry buildings.</p>	<p>waste.</p> <p>Check Plan sets a framework to provide sufficient and timely waste management facilities to meet the needs of the local community and to enable regional self-sufficiency.</p>
REGIONAL				

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
<p>The South East Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (2009)</p> <p><i>On 6 July 2010 the Secretary of State attempted to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies. This included the South East Plan. However in November 2010 following a legal challenge the High Court ruled that the revocation was unlawful. As a result the South East Plan remains in force.</i></p> <p><i>On 10th November 2010 the Chief Planner at the Department for Communities and Local Government wrote to Local Planning Authorities advising that was the Government's intention to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies through the Localism Act. The Localism Act is now in force and it is anticipated that the South East Plan will be revoked during 2012.</i></p>	<p>Provides a regional framework of a broad development strategy for the period to 2025.</p> <p>Waste: To achieve a 'resource Management' approach to waste, reflecting the waste hierarchy and treating waste as a resource with value.</p> <p>Promote sustainable construction and on-site re-use and recycling of materials where possible.</p> <p>Separation of waste should be facilitated and encouraged.</p> <p>High quality restoration and, where appropriate, aftercare should be secured.</p>	<p>Waste: Reduce the growth of waste to 1% per annum by 2010 and 0.5% per annum by 2020.</p> <p>Provide sufficient waste management capacity to achieve net self-sufficiency and provide extra capacity for a declining amount of London waste – for West Sussex this amount is 1.23mt for the period 2006-2015 plus 0.69 for 2016-2025.</p> <p>Diversion from landfill of 86% of all waste by 2025.</p> <p>65% of all waste to be recycled or composted by 2025.</p> <p>Provide an appropriate mix of development opportunities to manage tonnage of waste set out in the table within policy W7. Note: these figures are a benchmark for further testing as part of MWDF preparation, more recent data should be used, where Available, to assess and plan for capacity.</p> <p>Provision should be made for a declining amount of landfill as set out in the table within Policy W13. Landfill gas and energy recovery should be standard practice at non-inert landfill sites.</p>	<p>Waste Strategy:</p> <p>Plan policies should;</p> <p>Promote waste reduction;</p> <p>Promote recycling and composting;</p> <p>Divert waste from landfill;</p> <p>Provide opportunities for waste management facilities;</p> <p>Plan should allow for enough capacity to take London Waste;</p> <p>Promote waste separation;</p> <p>Promote the use of biomass and the treatment of waste;</p> <p>Promote high quality restoration;</p> <p>Promote sustainable transport.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce waste; improve recycling waste, waste separation and diversion of waste from landfill; to ensure that there is sufficient capacity for waste management; to achieve high quality restoration; to locate sites close to road network and close to where waste is generated.</p>
<p>Regional Sustainability Framework (2008)</p>	<p>The Regional Sustainability Framework (RSF) sets a common vision, 25 objectives and four priorities that will help guide sustainable development in the South East.</p> <p>The Document states the following</p>	<p>The Framework contains a range of indicators covering these issues, including indicators around service accessibility, flooding, air quality, water quality, greenhouse gas emissions, habitats and species protection.</p>	<p>The Plan should include policies to support the priority issues raised in the framework, and in particular to support targets around landfill diversion, reducing waste, and increasing recycling and composting.</p>	<p>Objectives should reflect the aims set in the Framework.</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>priorities:</p> <p>Achieving sustainable levels of resource use;</p> <p>Reducing the region's carbon footprint;</p> <p>Ensuring that the South East is prepared for the inevitable impacts of climate change;</p> <p>Ensuring that everyone, including the most deprived people, has an equal opportunity to benefit from and contribute to the region's sustainable prosperity.</p> <p>The Framework also includes objectives covering the following issues: accessibility to services, supporting economic growth, reducing the risk of flooding, reduce air quality problems, address climate change issues, supporting biodiversity, protecting the region's countryside and historic environment, consider resource consumption, reduce waste generation and achieve sustainable management of waste, to preserve water quality and resources, and to increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.</p>	<p>The framework contains targets to increase the diversion of all waste from landfill in the region to 86% by 2025. Targets also include increasing recycling and composting of all waste in the region to 65% by 2025, and reducing growth of all waste in the region to 0.5% per annum by 2020.</p>		
South East Regional Economic Strategy (2007)	To increase GVA generated per tonne of materials entering the waste stream.	Target 12: '30% increase over the 2003 baseline in GVA generated per tonne of materials entering the waste stream by 2016' to be achieved by providing infrastructure to increase recycling, re-use and energy recovery to reduce landfill.	Sufficient Infrastructure must be provided to increase recycling, re-use and energy recovery so as to reduce landfill.	Consider inclusion of objectives to treat waste as a resource and provide sufficient facilities for waste re-use, recycling and energy recovery.
Water for Life and Livelihoods: River Basin Management Plan, South East River Basin District, 2009	Improved water quality within the South East River Basin District.	Good status and good potential to be met where possible by 2015.	Increasing percentage of river length to achieve good environmental status by target dates of 2015, 2021 and 2027.	Consider inclusion of objective to protect and enhance water quality.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
LOCAL				
West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2016	<p>The main objective of this Plan is to improve quality of life for the people of West Sussex through four key strategies to maintain, manage and invest in transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - promoting economic growth - tackling climate change - providing access to services, employment & housing, and - improving safety, security & health 	<p>The West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2016 contains a range of monitoring indicators. Issues covered include the following:</p> <p>Congestion, mode of travel to work and school, cycling trips, accessibility, road traffic accidents, road and footway maintenance, street lighting, conditions of highway structures, road flooding, air quality and transport emissions.</p>	<p>Plan should include policy which should contribute to sustainable forms of transport and reducing carbon emissions</p> <p>Plan should include policies which consider road safety and personal safety for the travelling public</p> <p>Plan should include policies which should consider the efficiency of transport systems</p> <p>Plan should include policies which should assist in the promotion of an efficient economy and the achievement of sustainable economic growth</p> <p>Plan should include policies which should aim to reduce traffic growth, pollution and congestion in order to protect and enhance the built and natural environment</p> <p>Plan should include policies which should promote access for services and facilities for all</p>	<p>Consider objectives aiming to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the strategic road network and advisory lorry routes</p> <p>Consider objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance the well being of the public</p> <p>Consider objectives to sustain economic growth and through the provision of an adequate supply of construction and other materials.</p> <p>Consider objectives to protect the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-users</p> <p>Consider objectives to reduce air pollution, minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect water quality and the function of the water environment</p> <p>Consider objectives to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases</p>
<p>West Sussex Waste Local Plan (Revised Deposit Draft)</p> <p>NB: Although not part of the statutory development plan, the draft WLP was approved by the County Council for development control purposes in December 2005.</p>	<p>To protect and enhance the character and environment of the County;</p> <p>To meet the community's needs for land for waste management to maintain self-sufficiency in West Sussex;</p> <p>To enable both national and regional reduction and recovery rates to be achieved or exceeded;</p> <p>To reduce the rate at which both land and natural resources are consumed.</p>	<p>National Waste Strategy 2000 targets included.</p> <p>Reduce the amount of industrial and commercial waste landfilled to 85% of the 1998 levels by 2005;</p> <p>Recover value from 40% of municipal waste and to recycle or compost at least 25% of household waste by 2005.</p> <p>Recover value from 67% of municipal waste, and to recycle or compost at least 33% of household waste by 2015.</p>	<p>Plan should include sites and policies to meet the need for waste management facilities to promote the management of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>To include objectives which encourage waste minimisation and increase recycling and recovery.</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
		To make provision for the amount of waste being recycled and recovered to be at least 50% of total arisings and the amount going to disposal reduced to no more than 50% of total arisings by 2015.		
Building A Sustainable Future: A strategy for delivering the corporate priority (2012)	<p>This Strategy focuses on four key priority areas that address the main challenges facing West Sussex County Council as an authority, and where we believe we can make the biggest difference.</p> <p>The four priorities for action are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduce carbon emissions; - adapt to a changing climate; - use resources efficiently and effectively; - make sustainability business as usual. 	The Strategy contains information about why these areas are a challenge to us and sets out what we are going to do about it, including clear and challenging targets against each priority.	Plan to include policies which support reductions in carbon emissions, and consider adaptation to a changing climate.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support the: reduction in carbon emissions, adaptation to a changing climate and efficient use of resources.
West Sussex Environment and Climate Change Board and draft Action Plan	<p>The Board is made up of representatives across all sectors and aims to ensure that shared environment and climate change objectives and priorities, both now and in the future, are fully understood, effectively communicated and embedded in the development and delivery of policy and proposals across the County.</p> <p>In 2010, four thematic subgroups were set up to work on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • low carbon and energy; • green economy and skills; • environmental quality; 	<p>Board partners share the vision of 'Using Less, Living Better', and have signed up to the commitment to use its influence to help reduce emissions in West Sussex by at least 50% by 2025, use natural resources wisely and ensure that people, landscape and wildlife are able to adapt to climate change.</p> <p>.</p>	Plan to include policies which support the vision and the commitments of the Board.	Consider inclusion of objectives to support the vision and the commitments of the Board.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustainable transport and infrastructure. <p>A draft Action Plan has been consulted on during 2011/12 and is expected to be published later in 2012.</p>			
Sustainable Community Strategy for West Sussex 2008 - 2020	<p>Relieve the pressures on the road network</p> <p>Explore local opportunities for renewable energy.</p> <p>Integrate water resource requirements in new development</p> <p>Reduce the carbon footprint of West Sussex</p> <p>Improving waste management to reduce waste generation and increase recycling.</p> <p>Making best appropriate use of innovation and new technology to reduce harmful emissions</p> <p>Improving access for all to the natural and historic environment and a range of sporting, leisure, cultural and arts</p>	No specific targets	<p>The Plan should include policies to reduce as far as possible the pressure on the road network.</p> <p>Plan should explore opportunity for renewable energy in site development</p> <p>Promote the reduction of harmful emissions and waste creation.</p> <p>Policies should protect the natural and historic environment.</p>	<p>Objectives to ensure that waste sites make use of alternative forms of transport and are sited as close as possible to the source of waste.</p> <p>Objectives should be set to identify the opportunity for renewable energy.</p> <p>Consider objective to reduce harmful emissions.</p> <p>Consider objective to protect the natural and historic environment.</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
Joint Materials Resource Management Strategy 2005-2035	<p>The Strategy aims to meet national objectives as well as taking into account wider sustainable development issues important to West Sussex.</p> <p>It aims to develop a sustainable and cost effective waste management approach.</p> <p>Relevant Themes include: To raise awareness of waste, to consider it as a resource and promote waste minimisation.</p> <p>To maximise the amount of waste that is recovered and recycled.</p> <p>To provide good access to waste management services.</p> <p>To protect the environment by reducing the movement of vehicles in accordance with the proximity principle.</p> <p>To provide facilities which maximise opportunities to reduce, reuse, compost and recycle waste.</p>	<p>45% recycling and composting through the Recycling and Waste Handling Contract in partnership with the District and Borough Councils by 2015.</p> <p>80,000 tonnes of waste diverted from landfill through waste prevention per year by 2015.</p> <p>0% waste growth by 2015.</p> <p>Deliver the necessary waste infrastructure to meet the Landfill Directive targets and increase recycling.</p> <p>By 2020 the West Sussex Waste Disposal Authority will only be permitted to landfill 130,000 tonnes of Household Waste per annum.</p>	<p>Plan should include policies to encourage waste minimisation and to maximise the recovery and recycling of waste.</p> <p>The plan should provide a network of high quality waste management facilities to maximise the amount of waste that is recovered and recycled.</p> <p>The plan should include policies which reduce vehicle movements associated with the transport of municipal waste in accordance with the proximity principle</p>	<p>SA should include objectives that promote the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>SA should include objectives that encourage the reduction of vehicle movements.</p>
Sussex Biodiversity Action Plan	<p>To maintain and, where practicable, enhance the wildlife and habitats that give Sussex its character and natural diversity</p> <p>To identify priority habitats and species that which are important in Sussex and/or where there is a special responsibility to care for something which is important on a national or international scale</p> <p>To set realistic but ambitious targets and timescales for priority habitats and species and to</p>	<p>Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre inventory statistics for species and habitats e.g.</p> <p>Rare Species Inventory</p> <p>Biodiversity Action Plan Species Inventory</p> <p>Pond Inventory</p>	<p>Plan should include policies to enhance, where possible, the wildlife and habitats that give West Sussex its character and natural diversity</p> <p>Plan should include policies that are as consistent, as practicably possible, with a dynamic nature conservation framework.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and landscape character</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>monitor progress of action plans against those targets</p> <p>To ensure that biodiversity action continues as a joint initiative, evolving a dynamic framework for nature conservation</p> <p>To raise public awareness and encourage involvement in biodiversity action</p>			
West Sussex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2010)	<p>The main objective of the SFRA is to provide flood information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So that an evidence based and risk based sequential approach can be adopted when making planning decisions, in line with Planning Policy Statement 25 (Development and Flood Risk) – PPS25; - That it is strategic in that it covers a wide spatial area and looks at flood risk today and in the future; - That supports sustainability appraisals of the local development frameworks; and - That identifies what further investigations may be required in flood risk assessments for specific development proposals. 	<p>The assessment investigates flood risk issues for each specific site and makes recommendations.</p>	<p>The Plan must take into account the SFRA's sequential testing and guidance for selecting suitable sites for waste development.</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives related to flood risk.</p>
Groundwater Protection in Southern Region	<p>Protect all groundwater resources from pollution</p> <p>Protect groundwater resources from long-term depletion</p> <p>Monitor and report on the status of groundwater, with respect to both quality and quantity</p> <p>Reverse unacceptable anthropogenic trends in groundwater status</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p>Coastal and fluvial flood frequency;</p> <p>Environment Agency annual indicative flood zone updates</p> <p>Environment Agency quarterly indicative flood plain mapping</p> <p>Groundwater quality in West Sussex</p>	<p>Plan should include policies consistent with protecting all groundwater resources from pollution and long-term depletion</p> <p>Plan should include policies that should where feasible, remediate historic groundwater pollution; and have due regard to the needs of the public water supply</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance water quality and the function of the water environment</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>Use its powers and duties, and influence others, to take appropriate action to reverse these trends</p> <p>Where feasible, remediate historic groundwater pollution; and Have due regard to the needs of the public water supply</p>			
Shoreline Management Plans for Beachy Head to Selsey (2006)	<p>To define, in general terms, the flooding and erosion risks to people and the developed, historic and natural environment in the SMP area over the next century</p> <p>To identify the preferred policies of managing those risks</p> <p>To identify the consequences of implementing the preferred policies</p> <p>To set out procedures for monitoring the effectiveness of the SMP policies</p> <p>To ensure that developers and planners take due account of the risks identified in the SMP and the preferred SMP policies</p>	<p>Indicator:</p> <p>Coastal and fluvial flood frequency;</p> <p>Environment Agency annual indicative flood zone updates</p> <p>Environment Agency quarterly indicative flood plain mapping</p>	<p>Plan should include policies that are consistent, as far as practicably possible, with managing the risks of flooding and erosion to people and the developed, historic and natural environment in the Shoreline Management Plan area over the next century</p> <p>PLAN should include policies that take the risks of development in the SMP into account</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce the risk of flooding and the impact on society, the economy and the environment and to protect and enhance the historic environment</p>
Rivers Arun to Adur flood and erosion management strategy 2010 - 2020	<p>The River Arun to Adur Flood and Erosion Management Strategy sets out our plan to manage flood and erosion risks along this coastline. The final strategy was approved (April 2010) by the Environment Agency and Arun District, Worthing Borough and Adur District Councils. Through this management strategy, the partnership has identified ways to protect 9,800 properties that are at risk of flooding and erosion over the next 100 years. The plan is to sustain or improve all of the defences</p>	<p>The strategy sets out a work programme to be undertaken for stretches of coastline, subject to funding coming forward.</p>	<p>Plan should include policies that are as consistent, as far as practicably possible, with the sustainable management of coastal defences between the rivers Arun and Adur</p>	<p>Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce the risk of flooding and the impact on society, the economy and the environment and to protect and enhance the historic environment</p>

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	between the River Arun and the River Adur, except for a small section of the River Adur east bank where the potential to create some new intertidal habitat is being investigated.			
Pagham to East Head Coastal Defence Strategy (2009)	Ensure a sustainable form of coastal defence which does not burden future generations with defences which are too costly to maintain.	The strategy includes recommended options and work cost estimates for different sections of seafront, which are subject to funding coming forward.	Policies within the PLAN should not contribute to flooding and should be consistent with the sustainable management of coastal defences at Pagham to East Head	Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce the risk of flooding and its impact on society, the economy and the environment
Catchment Flood Management Plans for River Adur, and Arun and Western Streams Catchment (2009)	To identify and develop policies for sustainable flood risk management Policies must take into account the likely impacts of climate change, the effects of land use and land management, as well as delivering multiple benefits and contributing to sustainable development. Plans set out our preferred plan for sustainable flood risk management over the next 50 to 100 years.	Indicator: Coastal and fluvial flood frequency; Environment Agency annual indicative flood zone updates Environment Agency quarterly indicative flood plain mapping	Plan should include policies consistent with sustainable flood risk management	Consider inclusion of objectives to reduce the risk of flooding and the impact on society, the economy and the environment and to protect and enhance the historic environment
High Weald AONB Management Plan (2009)	The Management Plan contains a range of objectives related to the protection of: - Geology, landform, water systems and climate - Settlements - Ancient routeways - Woodland - Fields and Heathland, and - Public understanding and enjoyment	The 2009 plan contains a range of targets for objectives through to 2014.	Plan should be consistent, as far as possible, with strategies to reconnect settlements, residents and their supporting economic activity with the surrounding countryside Plan should include policies consistent with maintaining and protecting, where possible, the archaeology of AONB woodlands Plan should include policies to protect and, where possible, enhance the character and environmental quality of the West Sussex landscape Plan should include policies	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance landscape character and the historic environment. Consider inclusion of objectives to reconnect and maintain stable levels of employment in the local waste industry Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and landscape character

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
			consistent with securing agriculturally productive use for the fields of the High Weald AONB, especially for local markets, as part of sustainable land management.	Consider inclusion of objectives to make the best use of previously developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites
Chichester Harbour AONB Management Plan 2009-2014	<p>To strike a balance between the needs of those who live, work and enjoy the harbour, with the integrity of the protected habitats and species which make up the rich and diverse land and seascape of Chichester Harbour AONB.</p> <p>To encourage sustainable and safe enjoyment of the harbour and AONB, through education and awareness-raising, to safeguard its special qualities for future generations.</p> <p>Protecting and improving the special qualities of the AONB.</p> <p>Sustainability and wise use of the AONB.</p> <p>Increasing knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Helping people enjoy the AONB Supporting the local community and economy.</p> <p>Working in partnership.</p>	<p>Biodiversity – Inventories of flora and fauna, wildlife and habitats.</p> <p>Landscape – Tree and hedgerow planting.</p> <p>Historic environment – Condition of recorded archaeological sites at risk.</p> <p>Education – numbers of student sessions offered, educational trips arranged and volunteer work parties held.</p> <p>Recreation and amenity – length and number of PROW, land and water based recreation.</p> <p>Planning – number of CHC recommendations accepted by LPA, development within AONB.</p> <p>Water – Meeting Shellfish Directive standards, Number of berths and harbour dues subscriptions, water quality meeting Bathing water standards.</p> <p>Delivery of Management Plan actions</p>	<p>Plan should be consistent with conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of Chichester Harbour AONB</p> <p>Plan should be consistent, as far as possible, with supporting landscape and nature conservation designations of Chichester Harbour AONB.</p>	Consider inclusion of objectives to protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and landscape character
East Sussex Proposed Submission Waste and Minerals Plan (2012)	The plan explains that some waste is exported to other areas for management including non-inert waste to landfill, due to exhaustion in landfill capacity in East Sussex. In order to comply with the South East Plan policy for net self-sufficiency a capacity shortfall has also been estimated to	Policies are monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.	There are cross county movements of some waste to and from East Sussex, including importing of waste from London, as well as exporting of waste to other counties.	Consider objectives which minimise the movement of waste as far as is practical.

Document title and reference points	Key Relevant Objectives	Key Relevant Targets and Indicators	Key Implications	Key Implications for the SA
	<p>additionally cover the equivalent to the amount of waste that could potentially be exported out of the Plan Area for land disposal.</p> <p>Policies in the plan include reducing the amount of waste that needs to go to landfill including by increasing recovery of waste.</p>			
Hampshire Submission Minerals and Waste Plan (2012)	The Plan sets out the spatial policy for Minerals and Waste management in Hampshire.	Policies are monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.	There are cross county movements of some waste to and from Hampshire and the plan states the intention for the county to be 'net self sufficient' in its waste management capacity.	Consider objectives which minimise the movement of waste as far as is practical.
Surrey Waste Plan (2008)	The Surrey Waste Plan sets out the spatial policy for waste management in Surrey, as well as a policy for net self-sufficiency in waste management capacity.	Policies are monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.	There are cross county movements of some waste to and from Surrey, including importing of waste from London, as well as exporting of waste to other counties	Consider objectives which minimise the movement of waste as far as is practical.

Appendix C: Baseline Information

C1 The findings of the collection of baseline information is presented in the following table. The table clearly identifies:

- the relevant data set or indicator;
- the current (quantified) position (if applicable);
- comparators and targets (if applicable);
- the likely future position/trend (if applicable);
- issues identified (if applicable); and
- the source of the data/indicator and update frequency.

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Ramsar Sites	2012 3 Ramsar Sites covering 6,975.33 Ha	See SSSI target (all Ramsar Sites must first be designated SSSI)	2008 3 Ramsar Sites covering 6,970 Ha	Continued improved protection of existing Ramsar	Ensure no unacceptable impact on Ramsar sites. Site selection criteria should take Ramsar sites into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/ http://www.wetlands.org/
Special Protection Areas (SPA)	2012 3 SPA (coincident with Ramsar) covering 6,975.33 Ha	See SSSI target (all SPA must first be designated SSSI)	2008 3 SPA (coincident with Ramsar) covering 6,970 Ha	Continued improved protection of existing SPA	Ensure no unacceptable impact on SPA. Site selection criteria should take SPA into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/ http://www.wetlands.org/
Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)	2012 8 Special Areas of Conservation covering 12,688 Ha	See SSSI target (all SAC must first be designated SSSI)	2008 6 Special Areas of Conservation covering 12,095 Ha	Continued improved protection of existing SAC	Ensure no unacceptable impact on SAC. Site selection criteria should take SAC into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	2012 78 in West Sussex 77% Favourable or recovering condition	Government target of 95% of all SSSI to be in favourable or recovering condition by 2010	2008 78 in West Sussex 85% Favourable condition	Continued improved protection of existing SSSI	Ensure no unacceptable impact on SSSI. Site selection criteria should take SSSI into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/
Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS)	2008 66 in West Sussex	Number of RIGS in West Sussex There are no specific targets and indicators for Sussex RIGS other than area based statistics.	2006 60 in West Sussex	Continued improved protection of existing RIGS	Ensure no unacceptable impact on RIGS. Site selection criteria should take RIGS into account.	Sussex RIGS Group c/o Booth Museum of Natural History
Ancient Woodland (AW)	2010 21,375 Ha of Ancient Woodland (Ancient Woodland Inventory, now includes woodland <2ha)	20 th century has seen a decline in area: i.e., approximately 3,000 Ha lost in West Sussex between 1930 and 2001 Revised inventory contains woodland under 2ha leading to increase of 4,501ha	2003/04 16,500 Ha of Ancient Woodland 2008 17,634ha of Ancient Woodland	Continued improved protection of existing AW under Voluntary Action Plans and Forestry Commission / Natural England Policies	Ensure no development on AW. Site selection criteria should take AW into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/ Sussex BRC Ancient Woodland Inventory West Sussex
National Nature Reserves (NNR)	2012 2 NNR covering 219 Ha	No targets identified	2008 2 NNR covering 219 Ha	Continued improved protection of existing NNR (note that both West Sussex NNR are SSSI)	Ensure no unacceptable impact on NNR. Site selection criteria should take NNR into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/
Local Nature Reserves (LNR)	2012 27 LNR covering 2,115 Ha	No targets identified	2008 22 LNR covering 1,898 Ha	Continued Improvement.	Ensure no unacceptable impact on LNR. Site selection criteria should take LNR into account.	Natural England: Annually http://www.natural-england.org.uk/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI)	2008 282 SNCI covering 9,891 Ha	Increased percentage of SNCIs in positive conservation management.	2006 278 SNCI covering 9,891 Ha 67% in sympathetic management	Continued improvement.	Ensure no unacceptable impact on SPA. Site selection criteria should take SPA into account.	WSCC, Customer & Communities, Environment & Heritage Biannually
Sussex Ponds	2011 7,715 ponds	No targets identified.		Uncertain as ponds have an unpredictable relationship with longer-term climatic conditions. E.g. Global warming may lead to increased numbers of ephemeral ponds with them drying up in hot, dry summers but more ponds appearing in milder, wetter winters in West Sussex.	Ensure no unacceptable impact on ponds where biodiversity is a key characteristic.	Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre in 2002 http://www.sxbrc.org.uk
Rare Species Inventory	2011 Covers 21,960 species across West Sussex.	No targets identified.	2003 Covers 3,400 species across Sussex.	Insufficient data	Ensure no unacceptable impact on rare species in West Sussex. Plan should enhance the number of rare species found in the county where practicable.	Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre in 2003 http://www.sxbrc.org.uk/biodiversity/speciesinventories/
Biodiversity Action Plan Species Inventory	West Sussex Minerals BAP now in place.	No targets identified.	Species Action Plans for 382 species across the UK. Joint Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) being prepared for Sussex. Currently 21 Species Action Plans prepared for Sussex.		Site selection criteria should take BAP into account. Plan should enhance biodiversity where practicable.	UK Biodiversity Action Plan http://www.ukbap.org.uk http://www.biodiversitysussex.org

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Waste deposits by type (000 tonnes)	2010/11 WSCC AMR C&D = 1340 Municipal = 436 C&I = 517 Total = 2293	Regional target to reduce growth of all waste arisings to: 1% pa by 2010 0.5% pa by 2020	2009/10 MSW: 436 C&I: 716 C&D: 1340 Total: 2492	Although absolute arisings are increasing, the rate of growth is decreasing.	Plan should support minimisation of waste, recycling and reuse	Environment Agency http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/apps/wastesurvey3/Report.do AEAT Waste Forecast report and West Sussex County Council AMR
Municipal Waste production kg/capita/year	2010/11= 443kg/person/yr Last year BVPI184 reported – replaced by NIS	2000/01= 562kg/person/yr 2001/02= 568kg/person/yr 2002/03 = 578kg/person/yr 2003/2004 = 558kg/person/yr 2004/05= 542.9 kg/person/yr	2007/8 = 541.4kg/person/yr 2003/2004 = 558kg/person/yr 2006/07= 551.5kg/person/yr	Waste generation per person has decreased.	Plan should support minimisation of waste, recycling and reuse.	BVPI number: BV84 http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/ http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/waste/wrfg22-wrmswqtr/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
% Municipal waste landfilled/recycled/composted/energy recovery	2010/11 WSCC AMR: Landfilled (L)= 52%, Recycled (R) & Composted (C)= 39%, Energy Recovery (ER) = 0.46%	2005/06: L=66% R&C= 34% E=<1% 2006/07: L=64% R&C = 36% E=<1% 2007/08: L=63% R&C=36% E=0% 2008/09 L= 60% R & C= 40% ER= 0% 2009/10: L=51% R&C=44% E=5% UK target to recycle/compost municipal waste: at least: 45% by 2015 50% by 2020 Recovery of municipal waste: 67% by 2015 75% by 2020	There is a general downward trend in landfilling and an upward trend in recycling/composting and energy recovery.	General trend is towards increasing recycling and composting of municipal waste, and decreasing use of landfill for municipal waste.	Plan should aim to move up the waste hierarchy	BVPI numbers: BV82a-d. http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/ West Sussex Annual Monitoring Report (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf)

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
% Industrial and Commercial waste deposits landfilled/recycled/composted/treatment/ transfer (000 tonnes)	2010/11 WSCC AMR (000s tonnes) Recycled and Composted (R&C) = 288 (56%) Landfilled (L) = 163 (32%) Other (O) = 65 (13%) Total = 517	2005/06: R&C = 243 (33%), O= 116 (16%) L = 380 (51%) 2006/07: R&C = 247 (33%), O= 117 (16%), L= 383 (51%) 2007/08: R&C = 249 (32%), O= 118 (16%), L = 388 (51%) 2008/09: R&C = 250 (34%), O= 116 (15%), L= 374 (51%) 2009/10: R&C= 364 (51%), O= 31 (4%), L= 322 (45%)	Recycling has stayed broadly the same over the period 2005 – 2011. Over the same period, landfilling stayed the same for a number of year but is recently showing a downward trend.	General trend is towards increasing recycling and composting and energy recovery of C&I waste, and decreasing use of landfill.	Plan should support minimisation of industrial and commercial waste, recycling and reuse.	Environment Agency http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/apps/wastesurvey3 Defra, UK climate Change Programme 2006 Defra, UK Waste Strategy 20 West Sussex AEAT Report 2011 - 2031 (2011) West Sussex AMR 2010/11 (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf).

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
% C&D waste deposits landfilled/recycled/ composted/physical treatment/ transfer (000 tonnes)	2010/11 WSCC AMR (000s tonnes) Recycled = 630 (47%) Landfilled = 469 (35%) Other = 241 (18%)	2005/06: R= 519 (36%), O = 532 (37%), L = 383 (27%) 2006/07: R = 519 (36%), O = 533 (37%), L = 383 (27%) 2007/08: R= 622 (46%),) = 236 (18%), L= 481 (36%) 2008/09: R= 629 (47%), O = 239 (18%), L = 474 (35%) 2009/10: R = 630 (47%), 241 (18%), L = 469 (35%) Waste Framework Directive target to recovery at least 70% of construction and demolition waste by 2020	Recycling of C&D has varied over the period 2005 – 2011. There has been a downward trend in other management of C&D waste and an increase in landfill.	Aggregates Levy (2002) should help tackle wastage in the use of construction materials, and encourage demand for mineral wastes and recycled construction and demolition waste.	Plan should support minimisation of construction and demolition waste, recycling and reuse.	Environment Agency (update frequency not stated) http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/apps/wastesurvey3 Defra, UK Waste Strategy 2007 AEAT report 2011 – 2031. West Sussex AMR 2010/11 (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf)

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Remaining capacity at landfill sites (million tonnes)	WSSC AMR 2010/11 (millions of tonnes) Inert = 0.021 Non-Inert = 2.17		2005/06: Inert = 0.6 Non-inert = 1.3 2006/07: Inert = 0.7 Non-inert = 2.1 2007/08: Inert = 0.4 Non-inert = 3.2 2008/09: Inert = 0 Non-inert = 3.2 2009/10: Inert = 0.0028 Non-inert = 1.8		Plan should support recovery and diversion from landfill.	Environment Agency (update frequency not stated) http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/apps/wastesurvey3/Report.do# South East Plan AEAT report 2011-2031 West Sussex AMR 2010/11 (www.westsussex.gov.uk/mwdf)
Capacity at biological treatment facilities	WSSC AMR 2010/11 (000s tonnes) Inert = 122 Non-inert = 327 Special = 81 Total = 530	National = 2.7% (2003) Regional target by: 2010 to achieve 620MW 2016 = 895 2020 = 1130	At 01.04.2001 (000s tonnes): Inert = 0 Non-inert = 40 Special = 0 Total = 40	Production dropped in 2003 due to low output from hydro-electric power stations	Plan should support the development of renewable energy.	http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/ BERR http://www.berr.gov.uk/ West Sussex Annual Monitoring Report

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Production of secondary and recycled aggregates	2010/11 WSCC AMR Aggregate recycling = 0.563mtpa	Waste Framework Directive target to recovery at least 70% of construction and demolition waste by 2020. Regional target: Policy M1=Demand for primary aggregates will not grow from forecasted 2016 levels in subsequent years Policy M2=Regional Target for West Sussex to make provision for 0.8mtpa of recycled and secondary aggregates by 2016.	2008: 0.622mtpa 2009: 0.620mtpa 2010: 0.630mtpa	Gradual increase between 2008 to 2010 but a fall in 2011.	Plan should make positive provision for an adequate number of suitably located recycling facilities.	SEERA Regional Minerals Strategy http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/ West Sussex Annual Monitoring Report
Reuse of construction/demolition debris in new developments	No local data source identified	Approximately 70mtpa of aggregates used each year in UK are from recycled or secondary aggregated.	No previous data identified	Insufficient data	Plan should encourage reduction, re-use and recycling of C&D waste.	WRAP http://www.aggregain.org.uk/sustainable_2.html
Agricultural land resource	Grades 1/2: 9%; Grade 3: 44%; Grades 4/5: 16%, non-agricultural: 22%, urban: 8% (2001)	Where development on agricultural land in the countryside is unavoidable, should seek to use areas of poor quality land (grades 3b, 4, 5)	Grades 1/2: 9%; Grade 3: 44%; Grades 4/5: 16%, non-agricultural: 22%, urban: 8% (2001)	Increased pressure for development on Grades 1 & 2 as result of increased development demand.	Plan should support preservation of the best agricultural land (grades 1-3)	WSCC Local Transport Plan SEA baseline data DEFRA http://www.defra.gov.uk/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Stock of vacant/ brownfield land	2009 regional data (as % of developed land) All vacant and derelict land = 1.6% (comprised of previously developed vacant land (0.9%), derelict land and buildings (0.7%)) (NLUD)	No targets identified	2003 regional data (as % of developed land) Vacant previously developed land = 1.5% (Comprised of Vacant Land (1.2%) and Vacant buildings (0.3%)) (NLUD) 2007 regional data (as % of developed land) All vacant and derelict land = 3.2% (comprised of previously developed vacant land (1.5%), derelict land and buildings (1.2%) and vacant buildings (0.5%)) (NLUD)	Increasing since 2001	Where possible, allocate new development on previously developed land and therefore reduce proportion of brownfield	DTI Regional Competitiveness Report 2008 BERR http://www.dtistats.net/
Use of brownfield land	2011 Gross Housing Completions mid 2001 to 31 st March 2011 = 78.6% on brownfield land	UK target: 60% new houses built on previously used land by 2008	Average for housing: 1996-99 = 45% 2000/03 = 63% on brownfield land 2003-2004 = 73.9% 2004-2005 = 80.2% 2005-2006 = 82.9% 2006-2007 = 78.9% 2007-2008 = 72.7% 2008-2009 = 74.9%	Uncertain	Where possible, allocate new development on previously developed land and therefore reduce proportion of brownfield	ODPM Land Use Change (LUCS 20) 2005 CLG http://www.communities.gov.uk/corporate/ West Sussex Land Availability Survey 2011

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
NO _x /NO ₂ levels	17.2ppb (1999) down from 21 ppb (1998) NO _x levels – 10ppbn (2009)	UK target: West Sussex target of 40ppb/year (2001-2010) NB. Nature of this indicator makes it inappropriate to compare at regional or national level.	17.2ppb (1999) down from 21 ppb (1998)	Catalytic converters on petrol cars and reductions in emissions from large combustion plants helped reduce levels in the 1990s.	Well below 2010 target, though a number of local problems exist.	WSSC Local Transport Plan SEA baseline data DEFRA http://www.defra.gov.uk/
NO ₂	91.3 tonnes in 2007	NO ₂ emissions should be below 1181 tonnes by 2010.		Catalytic converters on petrol cars and reductions in emissions from large combustion plants helped reduce levels in the 1990s.	Well below 2010 target, though a number of local problems exist.	Environment Agency (in response to SA Scoping report consultation).
Particulate (PM ₁₀) levels	No local data identified National 2010 data: Urban Background = 20 Roadside = 22 (National Statistics, Air quality indicator for sustainable development 2010 (final) 26 April 2012)	West Sussex target of 40ppb/year (2001-2010) NB. Nature of this indicator makes it inappropriate to compare at regional or national level.	National 2006 data: Urban Background = 24 Roadside = 35 (National Statistics, Air Quality indicator for sustainable development 2006 (provisional) 13 January 2007) 2007 data (provided by EA) Emissions from regulated sources = 18.85	UK emissions of PM ₁₀ fell by 58 per cent between 1980 and 2003. Emissions from road transport increased by 27 per cent between 1980 - 1988 but by 2003 had fallen to 26 per cent below the 1980 level.	Change in PM ₁₀ threshold in 2010 will bring much of West Sussex to near legal threshold.	WSSC Local Transport Plan SEA baseline data DEFRA http://www.defra.gov.uk/ Sussex Air Quality Partnership http://www.sussex-air.net/local_areas.html 2007 data from EA in response to SA scoping report consultation.

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Greenhouse gas emissions from sources regulated by EA.	Greenhouse gas emissions from regulated sources in 2011: 549,000 tonnes equivalent of Carbon dioxide.	National target of 60% reduction from 1990 levels of carbon dioxide emissions by 2050.	Greenhouse gas emissions from regulated sources in 2007: 565,187.5 tonnes equivalent of Carbon dioxide.	DECC reports that greenhouse gas emissions are reducing year on year. This has been helped by power stations changing from coal power to natural gas.	Continued reduction in carbon dioxide emissions should be supported where possible.	EA response to SA scoping report consultation.
Number of moderate or poor air quality days	No local data identified National 2011 data: Urban Sites = 16 Rural Sites = 30 (National Statistics, Air quality indicator for sustainable development 2010 (final) 26 April 2012)		UK number of days of moderate or higher air pollution per site 2004: Rural = 42, Urban = 22 2003 R = 61, U = 50 2002 R = 30, U = 20 No local data identified National 2006 data: Urban Sites = 41 Rural Sites = 57 (National Statistics, Air quality indicator for sustainable development 2006 (provisional) 13 January 2007)	Weather can cause significant variation from year to year making it difficult to predict.	Consider impact of potential sites and vehicle movements on air quality	Sustainable Development http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/ DEFRA, Annually http://www.defra.gov.uk/ Office of National Statistics http://www.ons.gov.uk/about/our-statistics/index.html

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Existence of air quality management programme	2012 Number of declared AQMAs Adur District - 2 Chichester District - 3 Horsham District - 2 Mid Sussex District - 2 Worthing - 1	None identified.	2006 No management areas designated 2008 Chichester District has 3 AQMA Adur District has 2 AQMA	Currently several hotspots which may require AQMA in the future.	If AQMA are declared, consider transport-related means to address them.	Sussex Air Quality http://www.sussex-air.net/local_areas.html Chichester Air Quality Action Plan Adur Air Quality Action Plan Horsham (draft Storrington & Cowfold AQAP) Mid Sussex (Hassocks draft AQAP) Worthing Grove Lodge AQAP
Road traffic growth (County wide)	Actual Figures (DfT Million Vehicle Kilometers) 2005 7,664(+1%) Projected Figures (DfT Million Vehicle Kilometers) 2006 7,696(+1%) 2007 7,679(-1%)	LTP target to limit growth to 10% pa by 2011 and to reduce growth by 50% by 2016.	Actual Figures (DfT Million Vehicle Kilometers) 2000 7,276 2001 7,365 (+1%) 2002 7,415(+1%) 2003 7,523(+1%) 2004 7,645(+1%)	Forecast growth levels from 2000 levels, based on proposed development: 9% growth by 2006 16% growth by 2011	Plan should include policies that support sustainable modes of transport and reduce the need to travel especially by car. Site selection criteria should aim to locate waste sites close to waste arisings.	DfT Area-Wide County Traffic Mileage
Road traffic growth (for targeted areas of population)	2010/11 Bognor Regis - 97 Chichester - 98 Crawley - 98 Horsham - 97 Worthing - 99 Measured as an index from a base of 100 for the financial year 2009/10	Limit the growth in the number of vehicles entering Crawley, Horsham, Chichester and Worthing between 7am and 10am weekdays to 0.8% per annum (100.8), apart from Crawley which has a target of no growth per annum (100)	2007/08 Chichester -100.3 Worthing -98.3 Horsham - 101.3. Crawley - 100.3 Measured as an index from a base of 100 for the financial year 2006/07			WSCC 3 rd Local Transport Plan (2011-26)

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Chemical river water quality	West Sussex 2009/10 River and lake water body status Good – 12% Moderate – 69% Poor – 17% Bad – 2%	Southern region: 2003 89.9% Good or fair 2002 91.9% 2001 92%	West Sussex: 86% (1998) down to 76% (2001) of good quality West Sussex, 2004/06 Chemical - 67% of 'good quality' (includes very good, good and fairly good)	Target of 94% good or fair is on track to be achieved.	Site selection criteria should ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of surface and ground waters.	Environment Agency State of the Environment: water quality in your patch West Sussex County 2006
Biological river water quality		Southern region: 2003 99% Good or fair 2002 99%	West Sussex, 2004/06 Biological - 91% of 'good quality' (includes very good, good and fairly good)			

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Bathing water quality	<p>2012</p> <p>9 beaches rated Higher (75%)</p> <p>2 beaches rated Minimum (16%)</p> <p>1 beach - Felpham failed (8%)</p> <p>Felpham only one to fail – data collected June 2012 (storm/flooding)</p>	<p>Kent: 3 good (11%), 25 excellent (89%)</p> <p>East Sussex: 5 good (35%), 9 excellent (65%)</p>	<p>2006</p> <p>4 beaches (33.3%) rated good</p> <p>8 beaches (66.7%) rated excellent</p> <p>Sites attaining guideline compliance 9</p> <p>Sites attaining imperative compliance 2</p> <p>No sites failing compliance.</p> <p>2007</p> <p>2 beaches rated good (15%)</p> <p>11 beaches rated excellent (85%)</p> <p>Sites attaining guideline compliance 8</p> <p>Sites attaining imperative compliance 3</p> <p>No sites failing compliance.</p>	Bathing water quality has consistently risen or remained stable on all beaches from 2003/04 except at Felpham which has failed.	Site selection criteria should ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of bathing waters.	<p>Environment Agency, http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/default.aspx</p> <p>Water Information System for Europe (WISE) http://water.europa.eu/</p> <p>Info re guideline compliance/imperative compliance provided by EA in response to SA scoping report consultation.</p> <p>EA Bathing Water Data Explorer</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Estuarine water quality in the South East River Basin Management District	2009 Length of River classified by WFD – 538.3km of which: % Good ecological status = 19 % Moderate ecological status = 68 % Poor ecological status = 12 % Bad ecological status = 1	To achieve at least good status for all waters by 2015 where possible. By 2015, 35% of estuaries will be at good chemical status.	2008 Length of River classified by WFD – 538.3km of which: % Good ecological status = 4.66 % Moderate ecological status = 63.78 % Poor ecological status = 6.10 % Bad ecological status = 5.35 Remainder to be assessed.	Improvements in estuarine water quality.	Site selection criteria should ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of estuarine waters.	WFD (Water Framework Directive) and the South East River Basin Management Plan data. 2009 http://www.euwfd.com/ EA in response to SA scoping report consultation.
Groundwater condition in the South East River Basin Management District	There are 30 groundwater bodies in the district. 33% of groundwater bodies are classified as good overall	To achieve at least good status for all waters by 2027.	This is a new measure	It may not be possible to achieve objective of good status in all groundwater by 2027	Site selection criteria should ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of groundwater.	WFD (Water Framework Directive) and the South East River Basin Management Plan data. 2009 http://www.euwfd.com/
Abstraction rate of non-tidal water (national data)	UK (megalitres per day): 2010 = 34,000		UK (megalitres per day): 2004 = 38,000 2000= 41,200	Insufficient data	None applicable	Defra, Water Abstraction estimates http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/inland-water/iwfg12-abstrac/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Household water usage per person per day (national data)	<p>Litres per person per day 2008/09 = 146 Unmetered = 150 Metered = 127</p> <p>2010: 170 litres per person per day (EA Data);</p>	<p>EA target if is 130 litres per person per day by 2030.</p> <p>South East England: 156</p> <p>A house without a water meter in the UK: 170</p>	<p>Litres per person per day 2002/03: unmetered = 162 metered = 148</p> <p>2005/6 = 151</p> <p>2007/8 = 170.1</p>	Consumption is increasing.	Increasing pressure on water resources - ensure water quality is protected.	<p>Defra, Sustainable development indicators in your pocket, annually</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/progress/data-resources/documents/sdiyp2008_a6.pdf</p> <p>No longer updated new indicators being developed</p> <p>EA Fact Sheet for West Sussex</p> <p>http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Research/West_Sussex_Fact_Sheet_Apr_10.pdf</p>
Drinking water quality (national data)	2010: 99.94% of tests met required standards (Southern Water Region)	100% meeting Drinking Water Inspectorate tests	<p>2003 99.8% complied with relevant standards.</p> <p>2006: 99.96% of tests met required standards</p>	Quality steadily improving since 1995.	Site selection criteria should ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to the quality of drinking water sources.	<p>Defra, Sustainable development indicators in your pocket, annually</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/progress/data-resources/documents/sdiyp2008_a6.pdf</p> <p>Drinking Water 2010 (Southern Water Region) CIDW</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Source Protection Zones	Source Protection Zones Grade 1 – 126 Grade 2 – 89 Grade 3 – 47 Grade 4 – 5 Total for county – 265	Not applicable	Insufficient Data	Not applicable	Plan should include policies which aim to avoid harm to groundwater quality.	Environment Agency http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/default.aspx
Frequency of flood incidents	2009 75 significant flooding incidents (from 51 rainfall events) 12.6% of West Sussex is within a flood plain 28,232 properties are at risk of flooding		3 river; 1 coastal (1999)	Insufficient data	Plan should include policies to minimise the contribution of development to climate change and mitigate any negative impacts. Site selection criteria should seek to avoid areas at risk of floods	LA21 indicators review report (2000) West Sussex Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Local Climate Impact Profile 2009 WSCC EA Fact Sheet for West Sussex http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/static/documents/Research/West_Sussex_Fact_Sheet_Apr_10.pdf

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Water Leakage Rate	<u>Company estimate of total leakage (Ml/d) (Performance, 2010/11)</u> Southern Water – 92 Thames Water – 715 Portsmouth Water - Unknown National – 3,281	<u>Company estimates of total leakage (Ml/d) (Target 2007/08)</u> Southern Water – 92 Thames Water – 755 Portsmouth Water – 30 Whole industry – 3,410 <u>Company estimates of total leakage (Ml/d) (Target 2008/09)</u> Southern Water – 92 Thames Water – 715 Portsmouth Water – 30 Whole industry – 3,350 <u>Company estimates of total leakage (Ml/d) (Target 2009/10)</u> Southern Water – 92 Thames Water – 690 Portsmouth Water – 30 Whole industry – 3,320	<u>Company estimates of total leakage (Ml/d) (Performance 2005/06)</u> Southern Water – 93 Thames Water – 860 Portsmouth Water – 30 Whole industry – 3,575 <u>Company estimate of total leakage (Ml/d) (Performance, 2006/07)</u> Southern Water – 82 Thames Water – 790 Portsmouth Water – 29 Whole industry – 3,420	Insufficient data	Site selection criteria to include verifying location of and impact of development on water utility networks	Defra, Future Water: The Government's Water Strategy for England http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/water/strategy/pdf/future-water.pdf OFWAT Security of Supply 2006-07 report Environment Agency

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
River flood hazard - Area at flood risk.	73 flood watches + warnings in places October 2001-2002 10% of West Sussex is currently in flood zone 2.	No targets identified.	73 flood watches + warnings in places October 2001-2002	<p>Climate change is likely to increase flood risks because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) more intense rains, especially in winter, will increase peak river flows. b) of rising sea levels and a potentially greater risk of tidal surges during storms c) soils will tend to be wetter on average in winter. <p>Across the UK peak river flows could be 20% higher by 2080.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the Southeast is sinking. Estuaries and low coastal land will be inundated unless sea defences are raised. And eroding cliffs will retreat ever faster as rising tides and more vigorous waves and storms rip at their exposed faces.</p>	Site selection criteria should include the risk of flooding.	<p>Environment Agency http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/default.aspx</p> <p>Percentage of West Sussex within flood zone 2 provided by EA in response to SA scoping report consultation.</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Energy from low carbon resources	<p>March 2009: 72 operational and 6 planned installations in the East and West Sussex Sub-region sub-region.</p> <p>One AD Plant in West Sussex with capacity of 28,000tpa</p>	<p>National = 2.7% (2003)</p> <p>Regional target by:</p> <p>2010 to achieve 620MW</p> <p>2016 = 895</p> <p>2020 = 1130</p> <p>Prior to 2009: There were 6 operational renewable energy technologies identified in the East and West Sussex sub-region. This equates to 1.26 MWe (Renewable Electricity) and 3.19 MWth (Renewable Heat). 2 of the 6 installations are in West Sussex.</p>	Upward trend in provision of facilities generating energy from low carbon technologies.	Upward trend in provision of facilities generating energy from low carbon technologies.	Plan should support the development of renewable energy.	<p>DTI</p> <p>http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/inform/energy_trends/renewable_art_dec2001.pdf</p> <p>South East Plan policy EN3</p> <p>www.SEE-STATS.org</p> <p>www.biogas-info.co.uk</p>
Greenhouse gas emissions	2011 (provisional) 549.3mt	<p>Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012</p> <p>Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of greenhouse gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050</p> <p>UK target by 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from activities within SE region by 60%.</p>	2011 figure was 7.0 per cent lower than the 2010 figure of 590.4 million tonnes. There has been a general downward trend in greenhouse gas emissions since 1990.	Targets to decrease GHG emission and new technologies for alternative energy supplies means GHGs should decrease.	Plan should include policies to minimise the contribution of development to climate change and mitigate any negative impacts	<p>Climate Change: The UK Programme</p> <p>Http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/cm4913/pdf/section1.pdf</p> <p>Sustainable development indicators in your pocket 2008 – Defra</p> <p>UK Greenhouse Gas Emissions, DECC, 2012</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Greenhouse Gas Emissions from transport	2011 (provisional) HGVs – 22.9mt	<p>Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012</p> <p>Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of greenhouse gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050</p> <p>UK target by 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from activities within SE region by 60%.</p>	Emissions from the transport sector were down by 1.4 per cent (1.7 Mt) since 2010.	The advantages of increased fuel efficiency is likely to be outweighed if the use of the cars and the need to travel are not also addressed. In 2003, emissions from transport were 8% higher than 1990 levels.	<p>Plan should include policies that support sustainable modes of transport and reduce the need to transport waste especially by road.</p> <p>Site selection criteria should locate waste facilities close to waste arisings.</p>	<p>Climate Change: The UK Programme</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/cm4913/pdf/section1.pdf</p> <p>http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/performance/2.htm</p> <p>UK Greenhouse Gas Emissions, DECC, 2012 -</p> <p>http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/4856-2011-uk-greenhouse-gas-emissions-provisional-figur.pdf</p> <p>http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/climate-change/2351-uk-greenhouse-gas-emissions-performance.pdf</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Greenhouse Gas Emissions from other combustion sources	2011 (provisional) Waste Incineration CO2 emissions (tonnes) 0.3mt	Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012 Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of greenhouse gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050 UK target by 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from activities within SE region by 60%. Electricity suppliers will be obliged to increase the proportion of electricity provided by renewable sources to 10% by 2010.	Waste Incineration CO2 emissions 1990 – 1.2mt 2000 – 0.5mt	Insufficient data.	Plan policies should support sustainable energy generation and consumption. Plan policies should support recycling and reuse.	Defra, Climate Change: The UK Programme 2006 http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/uk/ukccp/pdf/ukccp06-all.pdf Indicators of Sustainable Development http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/sustainable/quality04/maind/04n.htm UK Greenhouse Gas Emissions, DECC, 2012 - http://www.decc.gov.uk/assets/decc/11/stats/4856-2011-uk-greenhouse-gas-emissions-provisional-figur.pdf
Greenhouse Gas Emissions from landfill	Methane from landfill 2010 estimate 701,100 tonnes for UK	Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012 Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of greenhouse gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050 UK target by 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from activities within SE region by 60%.		Long-term reduction from 2,050,400 tonnes in 1990 and 1,297,400 tonnes in 2000	Plan should support a reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases from landfill.	Defra, Biomass Strategy 2007

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
% of energy from renewable/low carbon sources	UK: 6.8% in 2010 to 25.7 TWh (Terawatt per hour), up 0.1% from 2009	UK target of 5% by 2003, 15% by 2020.	UK: 11.4 GWh (3%) in 2003.	Generally rising at national level, including rising use of landfill gas, municipal solid waste and waste	Plan should support the production of energy from renewable sources.	Department of Energy and Climate Change http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/statistics/publications/dukes/dukes.aspx
South Downs National Park	2011 South Downs National Park = 1,600km ² 807km is in West Sussex.	Not applicable	National Park came into force 2011	Not applicable	Plan to be prepared in conjunction with the SDNPA.	South Downs National Park Authority

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Landscape and Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness	Indicators of the health and robustness of regional landscape character areas are being measured through the <i>Countryside Quality Counts</i> initiative being pursued by the Natural England and the relevant local authorities in the South East. The recent West Sussex Landscape Character Assessment (November 2003) provides baseline data against which the success of landscape conservation and creation measures related to waste sites can be assessed.	<p>The characterisation programme and the policy and guidance arising from it will cover varying areas including the whole county (Historic Landscape Characterisation, landscape character assessments and guidance on local distinctiveness and land management); AONBs (ditto); and borough and district areas (mainly landscape character assessments).</p> <p>The <i>Character of West Sussex Partnership Programme</i> is led by WSCC in conjunction with the borough and district councils, AONB agencies and stakeholders. The main aims of the Partnership are to produce a range of interlocking characterisation studies; to produce planning and land management guidance; and to raise public and community awareness of character as a vital and attractive ingredient of the environment of the county. Various characterisation studies are mentioned below.</p>	Indicators of the health and robustness of regional landscape character areas are being measured through the <i>Countryside Quality Counts</i> initiative being pursued by Natural England and the relevant local authorities in the South East. The recent West Sussex Landscape Character Assessment (November 2003) provides baseline data against which the success of landscape conservation and creation measures related to waste sites can be assessed.	<p>The characterisation studies will be used to underpin policy and guidance documents being prepared by the Partnership members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies • LDF Core Strategies and Local Plan Policies • Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) • Land Management Guidelines • Local Distinctiveness Guidelines. 	Plan should aim to protect and where possible enhance the distinctive character of towns, villages and countryside.	<p>Sussex Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) Access database (2003-08) (contact Historic Environment Records Officer 01243 382230).</p> <p>Local Distinctiveness Study of West Sussex (2004-06) – unpublished (contact Historic Environment Records Officer 01243 382230).</p> <p>Sussex Extensive Urban Surveys (EUS) of 41 historic towns and Intensive Urban Survey (IUS) of Chichester/ Fishbourne (2004-08) (contact Historic Environment Records Officer 01243 382230).</p> <p><i>A Strategy for the West Sussex Landscape</i> (October 2005).</p> <p>A Landscape Character Assessment of West Sussex (November 2003) – preliminary consultant's report.</p> <p>South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment (2011)</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
						<p><i>Landscape Character Assessment for Horsham District</i> (Oct 2003).</p> <p>An <i>integrated Landscape Character Assessment of the South Downs</i> (January 2006) published by the South Downs Joint Committee.</p> <p>http://www.countryside.gov.uk/LAR/Landscape/CC/landscape_character_assessment.asp</p> <p><i>Landscape Character Assessment for Mid Sussex District</i> (November 2005).</p> <p><i>Landscape Character Assessment of Chichester Harbour AONB</i> (June 2005).</p>
Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	<p>2012</p> <p>Chichester Harbour = 74km²</p> <p>High Weald = 1460 km²</p> <p>(these designations are not wholly within West Sussex)</p>	There are 36 AONB in England, covering 15% of the landscape.	<p>2008</p> <p>Chichester Harbour = 74km²</p> <p>Sussex Downs = 983 km²</p> <p>High Weald = 1460 km²</p> <p>(these designations are not wholly within West Sussex)</p>	Sussex Downs AONB transferred to South Downs National Park following designation in 2011.	All public bodies now have a duty of regard for the purposes of AONB when undertaking their work and there is now an ability to set up special managing bodies known as Conservation Boards.	<p>Natural England</p> <p>http://www.natural-england.org.uk/</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Area of Green Belt land	None listed in Green Belt Statistics 2007	554,240 ha in London and wider South East (2007) 600,470 ha in South East (2003) 10 ha in West Sussex (2003)	10 ha (2003)	No change in area in West Sussex	Plan will aim to minimise the impact of waste development on Green Belt	CLG Local Planning Authority Green Belt Statistics, 2007 http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/679239.pdf
% of landscape classed as tranquil	West Sussex Early 1960s: 30.06% disturbed - 69.94% tranquil Early 1990s 54.99% disturbed – 45.01% tranquil 2007 65% disturbed – 35% tranquil CPRE local tranquillity score is: -6.18	No target identified	35% (2007)	Tranquillity reducing.	Site selection criteria should include public amenity.	http://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/countryside/tranquil-places Related Document - 'England's Fragmented Countryside South East and London'.

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Number and extent of statutory and non-statutory designated historic sites	<u>2012</u> Listed Buildings = 7585 Conservation Areas = 237 Scheduled Ancient Monuments = 346 Historic Parks and Gardens = 34 Reported archaeological sites and finds = 8937 Historic Parkscapes = 271		<u>2004:</u> Listed Buildings = 7515 Conservation Areas = 230 Scheduled Ancient Monuments = 351 (2005 figure) Historic Parks and Gardens = 34 (2005 figure) Reported archaeological sites and finds = 7825 Historic parkscapes = 271 <u>2008</u> Listed Buildings = 7941 Conservation Areas = 237 Scheduled Ancient Monuments = 408 Historic Parks and Gardens = 34 Reported archaeological sites and finds = 8300 (2007 figure) Historic Parkscapes = 271	Number of known sites likely to increase in future	Development should not be permitted unless designated historic sites will be protected and, where practicable, enhanced.	English Heritage http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/serve/show/nav.855 WSSC Sites and Monuments Record West Sussex Environment Strategy 2008

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Accessibility & condition of Public Rights of Way	<p>2012:</p> <p>4146km (Up from 4071km) of Public Rights of Way including footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways and byways open to all traffic.</p> <p>Waste site related</p> <p>No. of PROW diversions (2008): 1</p> <p>No. of PROW stopped up (2008): 1</p> <p>No. of new PROW opened (2008): 1</p>	All Public Rights of Way must remain open and available for public use at all times unless the Local Authority has undertaken the relevant legal procedure. Planning permission alone does not allow the right of way to be obstructed or moved in any way.	<p>2006</p> <p>4035km of Public Rights of Way including footpaths, bridleways, roads used as public paths and byways open to all traffic.</p> <p>2008</p> <p>4071km (Up from 4035km) of Public Rights of Way including footpaths, bridleways, roads used as public paths and byways open to all traffic.</p> <p>No. of PROW diversions (2008): 9</p> <p>No. of PROW stopped up (2008): 2</p> <p>No. of new PROW opened (2008): 6</p>	Insufficient data	Ensure, where possible, that Public Rights of Way are retained with maximum user safety and convenience where waste development impinges on existing Public Rights of Way.	<p>http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/leisure-and-tourism/public-rights-of-way/</p> <p>Rights of Way Officer, WSCC</p>

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Severance (habitats and/or communities)	<p>A23 Handcross-Warninglid</p> <p>Carriageway widening scheme under construction (October 2011-Autumn 2014). Widening of 3.8km of carriageway from 2-lanes to 3-lanes, revised junctions and footway/cycleway improvements.</p> <p>Other development related schemes under construction/about to start – 2012/13</p> <p>A259 Bognor Regis Relieft Road</p> <p>A272 Haywards Heath Relief Road</p> <p>A264/South Broadbridge Heath development link to A24</p>	Not applicable		<p>A27 Chichester improvements</p> <p>Scheme is shown on a list of 18 schemes for further development in future spending review periods</p> <p>A27 Worthing and Arundel</p> <p>Dialogue is ongoing with the Highways Agency to further develop improvement schemes</p> <p>Road links in Arun District</p> <p>Studies are underway (2012) to consider potential improvement works at the A284 Lyminster Bypass, A29 Woodgate and for the A259</p> <p>Other potential development related schemes</p> <p>A272 Billingshurst North-East Relieft road</p>	Development should not create a physical or psychological barrier between separate parts of a habitat or community.	Highways Agency http://www.highways.gov.uk/roads/

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Development pressure	1999-2000 3.5% of strategic gaps lost (431 ha)		1999-2000 3.5% of strategic gaps lost (431 ha)	Development pressures in the South East are likely to reduce or shift the location of strategic gaps.	Policy SP5 of the South East Plan - The existing broad extent of Green Belts in the region is appropriate and will be retained and supported and the opportunity should be taken to improve their land-use management and access as part of initiatives to improve the rural urban fringe.	Structure Plan background paper "Mind the Gap II" http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/yourcouncil/ppri/splan/backdocs/mindthegap.pdf
Household growth	2001/2-2009/10 = 24,295 gross dwelling completions (2,700 annual average) Net growth 2001/2-2009/12 = 21,843 (2,427 annual average)		1991/2-2000/1 = 28,418 gross dwelling completions (2842 annual average)	Population is likely to continue increasing in West Sussex.	Plan should enable provision of sufficient and timely waste management facilities to meet the needs of the community/apportionment	Housing and residential land in West Sussex http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/living/planning/the_county_plan/housing_and_residential_land.aspx
Population growth	Projections as at 2008: 1991-2001 = +6.3% 2001 = 755,000 2006 = 770,800 (2.2% increase on 2001) 2011 = 795,000 (3.1% increase on 2006) 2016 = 812,400 (2.2% increase on 2011) 2021 = 828,100 (1.9% increase on 2016) 2026 = 846,400 (2.2% increase on 2021)	SE Region: +5.7% (1991-2001) UK: +2.6% (1991-1998)	Projections as at 2006: 1991-2001 = +7.2% 2001 = 754,300 2006 = 770,300 (3% increase on 2001) 2011 = 787,400 (2% increase on 2006) 2016 = 803,300 (2% increase on 2011)	Population is likely to continue increasing in West Sussex.	Plan should enable provision of sufficient and timely waste management facilities to meet the needs of the community/apportionment	Census 2001 and WSCC forecasts http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/communityandliving/population/forecasts/2001CensusPopEstimates.pdf

Indicator & Relevant Data Set	Data most recently collected	Comparators/ Targets	Trends	Likely Future Position/Trend	Issues Identified for DPD	Source/Update Frequency
Access to recycling services	No local data.	Municipal Waste Strategy: 98% households to be served by a recycling service by 2009.		MSDC, Crawley Borough, Horsham District and Adur District already exceed this target.	Plan should encourage reduction, re-use and recycling of municipal waste.	West Sussex Municipal Waste Strategy http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=2473970
Proportion of household with no-one of working age in work	2011 Oct to Dec Region = 14.5% UK = 18.9%	No targets identified.	2004 Oct to Dec Region = 13.3% UK = 17.4%	There has been an increase in unemployment over recent months.	Plan should aim to enable employment through the waste industry	Labour Force Survey http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/lmac/working-and-workless-households/2011/index.html
Employment in waste	2010 1,600 (Waste collection, treatment and disposal activities; and materials recovery) Nearest 100 0.5% of West Sussex employed population	No targets identified.	2008 1,300	Insufficient data	Plan should aim to enable employment through the waste industry	Business Register and Employment Survey, Office for National Statistics (via NOMIS)

Appendix D: Targets and Indicators

D1. The Plan is based on the evidence available at the time of preparation. However, there is a need to monitor what is happening and to respond in the most appropriate way in order to deliver the vision, objectives, and strategies for waste. The following draft indicators have been developed that enable the Authorities to monitor the implementation of the Plan. Changes may be made prior to submission of the final draft Waste Local Plan to the Secretary of State. Further work will be undertaken as the Plan progresses to finalise the list of indicators.

Table D1: Targets and Indicators			
Objective	SA Objective	Draft Indicator(s)	Target (if applicable)
SO1: To facilitate the implementation of the JMRMS.	K	Amount of municipal waste arising, and managed by management type, and the percentage each management type represents of the waste managed (National Core Indicator W2)	<u>National Targets:</u> 2011 National Waste Policy Review Recycle 50% of waste from households by 2020 (from revised Waste Framework Directive). <u>JMRMS Targets:</u> 0% waste growth by 2015 57% recycling by 2015/16 67% recovered by 2015/16 80,000 tonnes of waste diverted from landfill through waste prevention per year by 2015.
SO2: To facilitate the implementation of the CIWS and to enable the progressive movement of non-municipal waste up the waste hierarchy away from landfill.	D, E, K, L	Amount of C&I waste arising, and managed by management type, and the percentage each management type represents of the waste managed.	<u>National Targets:</u> There are currently no targets for C&I waste. <u>Regional Targets (SEP):</u> 55% recycling and composting by 2015, 60% by 2020 and 65% by 2025. 75% diversion from landfill by 2015, 81% by 2020 and 84% by 2025. <u>Local Targets:</u> There are currently no local targets for C&I waste.
SO3: To maintain net self-sufficiency in managing the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste within West Sussex.	D, K, L	Total waste arisings versus total waste management capacity in West Sussex. Sewer capacity assessments.	None

Table D1: Targets and Indicators			
Objective	SA Objective	Draft Indicator(s)	Target (if applicable)
SO4: To protect the network of waste management sites.	D, K, L	Number of waste management sites closed due to non-waste uses granted on or nearby the site.	None
SO5: To make provision for new transfer, recycling and treatment facilities as close as possible to where the waste arises.	D, K	Capacity of new waste management facilities by type (National Core Indicator W1)	<p><u>National Targets:</u> 2011 National Waste Policy Review Recycle 50% of waste from households by 2020 (from revised Waste Framework Directive).</p> <p><u>JMRMS Targets:</u> 0% waste growth by 2015 57% recycling by 2015/16 67% recovered by 2015/16</p> <p><u>C&I (SEP Target):</u> composting by 2015, 60% by 2020 and 65% by 2025. 75% diversion from landfill by 2015, 81% by 2020 and 84% by 2025.</p> <p><u>C&D:</u> Waste Framework Directive target to recovery at least 70% of construction and demolition waste by 2020.</p>
SO6: To only make provision for a declining amount of landfill over the plan period with 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031.	D, K, L	Percentage of total waste (or by type) landfilled	<p><u>EU landfill diversion targets:</u> MSW: 75% of baseline (1995) levels by 2006 50% of baseline levels by 2009 35% of baseline levels by 2015</p> <p><u>JMRMS:</u> 80,000 tonnes of waste diverted from landfill through waste prevention per year by 2015.</p>

Table D1: Targets and Indicators			
Objective	SA Objective	Draft Indicator(s)	Target (if applicable)
SO7: To enable the use of rail and water transport for the movement of waste and to minimise the use of local roads for the movement of waste.	F	Number of permissions for waste uses utilising rail or water transport.	None
SO8: To protect and, where possible, enhance the special landscape and townscape character of West Sussex.	G	Number/extent (area) of planning consents issued on greenfield land outside defined urban areas by type Number of planning consents issued contrary to specialist landscape/townscape advice	None
SO9: To protect the SDNP and the two AONB from unnecessary and inappropriate development.	G	Number of planning consents issued contrary to specialist landscape/townscape advice Number of planning consents in AONB and SDNP by type.	None
SO10: To protect and, where possible, enhance the natural and historic environment and resources of the County.	H	Number of planning consents issued adversely affecting historic environment designations Number of planning consents issued adversely affecting nature conservation designations	None
SO11: To conserve and safeguard the County's important mineral resources.	I	Number of planning consents issued resulting in mineral sterilisation Production of secondary and recycled aggregates (National Core Indicator M2).	None
SO12: To minimise the risk to people and property from flooding.	C	Number of planning consents issued contrary to advice of Environment Agency on grounds of flood risk or water quality	Zero

Table D1: Targets and Indicators			
Objective	SA Objective	Draft Indicator(s)	Target (if applicable)
S013: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and amenity of residents, businesses, and visitors.	A, B, C, E, G, H, J, M, N, O, P	<p>Number of planning consents issued involving loss of public right of way without adequate replacement</p> <p>Number of planning consents issued without adequate restoration and aftercare schemes (if appropriate).</p> <p>Number of planning permissions securing community benefit</p> <p>Number/extent of planning consents issued contrary to advice of Environment Agency or local environmental health officers on air quality grounds</p>	None
SO14: To minimise carbon emissions and to adapt to, and to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of, climate change.	F, P, L, M	<p>Greenhouse Gas emissions (Mt)</p> <p>Number of new waste facilities in West Sussex generating energy from waste.</p>	<p>International:</p> <p>Kyoto protocol: cut greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels by 2008-2012</p> <p>National:</p> <p>Climate Change Act 2008: to cut emissions of green house gas emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050</p>

Appendix E: Testing the Strategic Objectives against the Framework

E1. In order to test whether the WLP is likely to contribute towards the achievement of 'sustainable development', it is necessary to assess whether each strategic (plan) objective is compatible with each sustainability objective. Table E1 identifies whether the respective objectives are compatible, incompatible, or where there is no direct link.

Strategic Objectives:

- Strategic Objective 1: To facilitate the implementation of the JMRMS.
- Strategic Objective 2: To facilitate the implementation of the CIWS and to enable the progressive movement of non-municipal waste up the waste hierarchy away from landfill.
- Strategic Objective 3: To maintain net self-sufficiency in managing the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste within West Sussex.
- Strategic Objective 4: To protect the network of waste management sites.
- Strategic Objective 5: To make provision for new transfer, recycling and treatment facilities as close as possible to where the waste arises.
- Strategic Objective 6: To only make provision for a declining amount of landfill over the plan period with 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031.
- Strategic Objective 7: To enable the use of rail and water transport for the movement of waste and to minimise the use of local roads for the movement of waste.
- Strategic Objective 8: To protect and, where possible, enhance the special landscape and townscape character of West Sussex.
- Strategic Objective 9: To protect the SDNP and the two AONB from unnecessary and inappropriate development.
- Strategic Objective 10: To protect and, where possible, enhance the natural and historic environment and resources of the County.
- Strategic Objective 11: To conserve and safeguard the County's important mineral resources.
- Strategic Objective 12: To minimise the risk to people and property from flooding.
- Strategic Objective 13: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and amenity of residents, businesses, and visitors.
- Strategic Objective 14: To minimise carbon emissions and to adapt to, and to mitigate the potential adverse impacts of, climate change.

Table E1: Testing the consistency of Strategic Objectives against the SA Objectives																
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
S01	x	x	x	✓	✓	⊙	x	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓
S02	x	x	x	✓	✓	⊙	x	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓
S03	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓
S04	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
S05	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	x	x	x	x	✓	✓	x	x	x	✓
S06	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
S07	✓	✓	⊙	⊙	⊙	✓	✓	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	✓	⊙	⊙	✓
S08	✓	✓	⊙	x	⊙	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
S09	✓	✓	⊙	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SO10	✓	✓	⊙	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SO11	⊙	⊙	⊙	x	✓	⊙	✓	⊙	✓	✓	✓	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
SO12	✓	✓	✓	x	✓	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	x	✓	✓	⊙	✓	✓
SO13	✓	✓	✓	x	⊙	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
SO14	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	⊙	⊙	✓	✓	✓	✓	⊙	✓	✓
Key: ✓ Compatible, ⊙ No direct link, x Incompatible																

Comments and Recommendations:

Strategic Objective SO1: Potential conflict in facilitating the JMRMS with a number of SA objectives including: amenity, flooding, PROW and users of the countryside, the built and natural environment, air, soil and water. Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO2: Potential conflict in facilitating the CIWS and enabling the progressive movement of waste up the hierarchy with a number of SA objectives including: amenity, flooding, PROW and users of the countryside, the built and natural environment, air, soil and water. Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO3: Potential conflict in maintaining net self-sufficiency in West Sussex with a number of SA objectives including: amenity, flooding, PROW and users of the countryside, the built and natural environment, air, soil and water. Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO5: Making provision for new waste management sites as close as possible to where the waste arises conflicts with a number of SA objectives including: amenity, flooding, PROW and users of the countryside, the built and natural environment, air, soil and water. Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO6: Potential conflict with SA F as waste may need to be transported outside of the County before alternative provision is made for

Strategic Objective SO8: Protecting and enhancing the special landscape and townscape character conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objectives D and K). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO9: Protecting the SDNP and AONB conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objectives D and K). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO10: Protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objectives D and K). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO11: Conserving and safeguarding the county's mineral resources conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objective D). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO12: Minimising the risk of people and property from flooding conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objectives D and K). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Strategic Objective SO13: Protecting and, where possible enhancing the health and well-being and amenity of residents, businesses and visitors conflicts with the provision of waste management facilities (SA Objectives D). Recommendation: No change as a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis whether need outweighs protection/adverse impacts.

Appendix F: Assessment of the Strategic Policy Options

F1 The assessment of the main strategic options against the sustainability objectives is shown in the following tables.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options for W1 (a) on non landfill capacity										
a) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex; b) making capacity available for net imports to the County; c) planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - a) - b)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	-	-	N	+	+	+	Option a) Effects may be negative in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational as part of the drive towards net self-sufficiency. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral. Option b) this involves provision of greatest quantity of capacity therefore the negative effects likely to be amplified. Still prospect in longer term of reaching acceptance. Option c) positive effect as bulk of waste managed outside county. Still requirement for some provision for bulking stations to transfer on but overall effect positive.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	--	--	N	+	+	+	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	++	++	++	--	--	--	Option a) Implementation of the policy will help to ensure an adequate supply of facilities as a supply of suitable waste facilities will be needed for the County to be self-sufficient in managing West Sussex waste. Option b) Same as a) but more. Option c) fails to make provision

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options for W1 (a) on non landfill capacity										
a) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex; b) making capacity available for net imports to the County; c) planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - a) - b)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	++	++	++	--	--	--	Option a) New facilities would create employment within the waste industry and support business through providing for management of wastes generated locally. New technologies and process will up-skill workforce. More recycling will increase the supply of secondary materials to the local economy. Option b) Same as a) but more if market leads to developments and investment. Option c) fails to make provision
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	Option a) Policy unlikely to change the 'shape' of the West Sussex waste management network. Option b) will attract more waste movements into the county. Option c) will encourage waste movements out of the county
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	N	-	-	-	+	+	+	Option a) Policy unlikely to change the overall 'shape' of the West Sussex waste management network. Option b) will require greater provision of facilities with some potentially adverse effect cumulatively or by exception as may go beyond allocated sites. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities and may see some existing facilities in less suitable locations close
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	-	-	-	+	+	+	Option a) Policy unlikely to change the overall 'shape' of the West Sussex waste management network. Option b) will require greater provision of facilities with some potentially adverse effect cumulatively or by exception as may go beyond allocated sites. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities and may see some existing facilities in less suitable locations close.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options for W1 (a) on non landfill capacity										
a) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex; b) making capacity available for net imports to the County; c) planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - a) - b)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	-	-	-	+	+	+	As above
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	-	-	-	+	+	+	As above
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	++	++	++	-	-	-	Option a) should result in provision of non landfill infrastructure encouraging development of alternative recycling routes Option b) should result in provision of more non landfill infrastructure encouraging development of alternative recycling routes with greater 'critical mass' of material on offer. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	++	++	++	-	-	-	Option a) should result in provision of non landfill infrastructure encouraging development of alternative recovery routes Option b) should result in provision of more non landfill infrastructure encouraging development of alternative recovery routes with greater 'critical mass' of material on offer. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options for W1 (a) on non landfill capacity										
a) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex; b) making capacity available for net imports to the County; c) planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - a) - b)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	+	+	+	N	N	N	++	++	++	Option a) Use of high quality and properly regulated/permitted built facilities to contain and manage waste will allow associated emissions to be effectively controlled. Replacing landfill with associated fugitive emissions. Option b) will require greater provision of facilities with some potentially adverse effect cumulatively or by exception as may go beyond allocated sites. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county and may see some existing facilities in less suitable locations close NB: quality of out of county destination facilities unaccounted for.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a) should result in diversion of organic waste from landfill to composting and anaerobic digestion producing material of beneficial value to the soil. Option b) should result in diversion of more organic waste from landfill to composting and anaerobic digestion producing more material of beneficial value to the soil. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county for diversion of organic waste and produce less compost.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	++	++	++	+	+	+	Option a) Use of high quality and properly regulated/permitted built facilities to contain and manage waste should prevent emissions to water environment. Replacing landfill with associated adverse emissions. Option b) will require greater provision of facilities replacing landfill with associated adverse emissions. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county and may see replacement of landfill. NB: quality of out of county destination facilities unaccounted for.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options for W1 (a) on non landfill capacity										
a) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex;										
b) making capacity available for net imports to the County;										
c) planning for reliance on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - a) - b)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a). Use of high quality built facilities replacing landfill with associated methane emissions. These facilities may be recovering value from residual waste as energy will contribute towards supply of renewable/lower carbon energy. Option b) As option a) but more. Potential benefits of enabling development of facilities proximate to users of outputs. Option c) will reduce provision of facilities in county with resultant limit on energy contribution gain to County.
Assessment Summary	The Policy seeks to provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to deal with waste generated in the County, which has beneficial impacts on waste management and the local economy.									

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	--	--	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	N	Option a) this involves provision of greatest quantity of landfill capacity therefore the negative effects likely to be amplified, and tailing off in long term as landfill sites are restored. Option b) Same as a) but less capacity provided hence lower overall negative impact. Still prospect in longer term of reaching acceptance with site restoration. Option c) similar to Option b) - same number of sites required Option d) lack of negative effects of landfill offset to some degree by effects of built capacity in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational as part of the drive towards net self-sufficiency. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	--	--	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	N	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible impact or difference. Possibility is that displacement of void might exacerbate local flooding, or creation of land raise might increase run off. These are assumed to be managed effectively.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) provides greatest supply of convenient and cost effective landfill. Option b) Same as a) but less capacity provided hence lower overall positive contribution. Option c) similar to b). Option d) This policy taken to promote the development of in county non landfill capacity in the longer term so would make a positive contribution overall. There may be short/medium term detriment as a result of waste being driven to landfill out of the county which may cause temporary disruption.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to 'stimulate' economy but support business as usual approach. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some encouragement of new technologies Option c) similar to b) Option d) If policy results in new facilities then this would create employment within the waste industry and support business through providing for management of wastes generated locally. New technologies and process will up-skill workforce. More recycling will increase the supply of secondary materials to the local economy.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to ALR. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some encouragement of new technologies Option c) similar to b) Option d) could lead to waste travelling outside the county for disposal in the short to medium term until alternative treatment technologies come on stream. Eventually facilities will be more optimally located in relation to sources and the ALR. Balance each other out hence neutral
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to protected landscapes. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) similar to b) Option d) effect unknown but assumed to be neutral as new sites will be properly assessed for this aspect.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to historic environment. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) similar to b) Option d) effect unknown but assumed to be neutral as new sites will be properly assessed for this aspect.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill more likely to result in some loss. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) effect unknown but assumed to be neutral as new sites will be properly assessed for this aspect.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill could result in neutral or positive effect if there are enhancement and restoration opportunities. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) similar to b) Option d) effect unknown but assumed to be neutral as new sites will be properly assessed for this aspect.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) The thrust of this policy is to encourage development of infrastructure that promotes recycling.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) The landfill provision restriction should drive waste from landfill and encourage development of alternative recovery routes
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) Reduction in landfilling with its fugitive emissions should result in improvement in local air quality. Use of high quality built facilities to contain and manage waste will allow associated emissions to be effectively controlled.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b):													
(a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision.													
(b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place.													
(d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) Diversion of organic waste from landfill to composting and anaerobic digestion would produce material of beneficial value to the soil.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in risk to aquifers and water bodies and hence likelihood of improvement in water quality. Use of high quality built facilities to contain and manage waste will allow associated run-off to be effectively controlled.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management													
Options for W1(b): (a) Provide sufficient landfill capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 3 (4.4mt) but phase the release of capacity or sites based on need to ensure that there is no over-provision. (b) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 4 (3.3mt) and limit the input to the site/to one of the sites to avoid over-provision if the need declines. This would ensure that a contingency is in place. (c) Provide sufficient capacity to meet the shortfall for Scenario 5 (3.1mt), but allocate a reserve site to ensure that an under-provision does not occur. This would ensure that a contingency is in place. (d) Planning to achieve 'zero waste to landfill' by 2031 assuming this drives construction of alternative capacity within the county.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Capacity gradient (least first) d) - c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) similar to b) Option d) Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in methane release – methane is a very powerful greenhouse gas. Use of high quality built facilities that may be recovering value from residual waste as energy will contribute towards supply of renewable/lower carbon energy.
Assessment Summary	The Policy seeks to drive waste from landfill by restricting supply within County, which has beneficial impacts on waste management and the local economy. Its contribution towards minimising the transport of waste is unknown as waste destined for landfill may travel further while waste destined for other management should be dealt with within the County and adjacent areas. Policy should encourage treatment facilities to come on stream to divert waste from landfill but the objective to achieve 'zero waste to landfill by 2031' could lead to a net export of residual waste for disposal to land in the short to medium term.												

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options relating to Policy W1 (c): a) making capacity available for net imports to the County for landfill, including non-inert waste from London; b) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency in landfill for West Sussex; c) Making no further provision for landfill capacity within the County;										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	--	--	-	-	-	N	++	++	++	Option a) involves provision of greatest quantity of landfill capacity therefore the negative effects likely to be amplified, and tailing off in long term as landfill sites are restored. Option b) less capacity provided hence lower overall negative impact. Still prospect in longer term of reaching acceptance with site restoration Option c) Fewer landfills in county
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	--	--	-	-	-	N	++	++	++	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible impact or difference. Possibility is that displacement of void might exacerbate local flooding, or creation of land raise might increase run off. These are assumed to be managed effectively.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	++	++	++	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) provides greatest supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option b) less capacity provided hence lower overall positive contribution Option c) This policy may result in capacity shortfall bringing risk to local businesses.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	+	+	+	--	--	--	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to 'stimulate' economy but support business as usual approach. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some encouragement of new technologies Option c) landfill prohibition in isolation could put economy at risk.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options relating to Policy W1 (c): a) making capacity available for net imports to the County for landfill, including non-inert waste from London; b) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency in landfill for West Sussex; c) Making no further provision for landfill capacity within the County;										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to ALR. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some encouragement of new technologies Option c) waste travels out of county for disposal but uses ALR.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	--	--	--	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to protected landscapes. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) no landfills or new facilities.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	--	--	--	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill likely to anchor disposal network around fixed points that are geologically dependant and may not be ideally related to historic environment. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) no landfills or new facilities.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	--	--	--	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill more likely to result in some loss. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) no landfills or new facilities
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill could result in neutral or positive effect if there are enhancement and restoration opportunities. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) no landfills or new facilities

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options relating to Policy W1 (c): a) making capacity available for net imports to the County for landfill, including non-inert waste from London; b) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency in landfill for West Sussex; c) Making no further provision for landfill capacity within the County;										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	--	--	--	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) no landfills or new facilities promoted in county. No active diversion policy in county.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	--	--	--	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) no landfills or new facilities promoted in county. No active diversion policy in county.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	--	--	--	-	-	-	+	+	+	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) Reduction in landfilling with its fugitive emissions should result in improvement in local air quality.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	--	--	--	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) no promoting policy for composting but no landfill either.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	--	--	--	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in risk to aquifers and water bodies and hence likelihood of improvement in water quality.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management										
Options relating to Policy W1 (c): a) making capacity available for net imports to the County for landfill, including non-inert waste from London; b) planning for the achievement of net self-sufficiency in landfill for West Sussex; c) Making no further provision for landfill capacity within the County;										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	--	--	--	-	-	-	++	++	++	Option a) continuation of landfill won't drive improvement on this aspect. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites Option c) Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in methane release – methane is a very powerful greenhouse gas.
Assessment Summary	The Policy seeks to restrict supply of landfill without explicitly promoting alternatives. Its contribution towards minimising the transport of waste is unknown as waste destined for landfill may travel further while waste destined for other management should be dealt with within the County and adjacent areas. Policy should encourage treatment facilities to come on stream to divert waste from landfill.									

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
<p>(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.</p> <p>(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and</p> <p>(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on amenity, this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of amenity i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.</p> <p>Redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall.</p> <p>Option b) offers similar benefits as a) but to a lesser degree</p> <p>Option c) neutral as maintaining status quo which could include some unsuitable sites - could be negative</p>
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	See above re replacement of existing stock
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in capacity although replacement may be more 'suitable'. Loss prevention of sites could be seen as a positive but definition of 'important contribution' unclear.</p> <p>Option b) offers similar benefits as a) but to a lesser degree</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
<p>(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.</p> <p>(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and</p> <p>(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in employment although replacement may be more 'efficient' and safeguarding protects existing business.</p> <p>Option b) offers similar benefits as a) but to a lesser degree</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be located in areas that are less than ideal from a transport point of view this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have evolved historically but that have unacceptable impact in terms of traffic - disruption, emissions and accident risk. Therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of transport i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.</p> <p>Replacement of historic facilities with sites that are better related to the ALR and have greater regard to transport issues in accordance with the development management policy and current statutory controls e.g. Highways would result in net improvement</p> <p>Option b) offers similar benefits as a) but to a lesser degree</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) As above - policy provides possibility of improvement on baseline and no deterioration.</p> <p>Policy could potentially enhance objective by providing sensitively located well designed replacement facilities</p> <p>Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
<p>(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.</p> <p>(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and</p> <p>(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Thrust of policy is to retain and make best use of existing sites where appropriate so inherently supportive of previously developed land although the possibility that some existing sites may prove to be unsuitable may open up possibility of seeking new locations not on previously developed land. Providing these new locations are identified in accordance with development management policies then this policy should result in positive contribution.</p> <p>Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) policy provides possibility of improvement on baseline and no deterioration.</p> <p>Policy could potentially enhance objective by providing sensitively located well designed replacement facilities.</p> <p>Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent with some uptake of allocated sites</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<p>No real basis to discern between the options as actual contribution unknown. Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion.</p> <p>Option a) supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in recycling capacity although replacement may be more 'efficient' due to configuration flexibility and provide opportunity to utilise secondary materials in construction (short term gain).</p>

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
<p>(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.</p> <p>(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and</p> <p>(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	<p>No real basis to discern between the options as actual contribution unknown. Option a) continuation of landfill unlikely to drive diversion.</p> <p>Option a) Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in diversion potential although replacement may open up prospect of more advanced technology being deployed.</p>
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	<p>Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.</p> <p>Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the development management policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement.</p> <p>Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent</p> <p>Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.</p>

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.										
(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and										
(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions. Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the development management policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions. Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the development management policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement. Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites										
(a) Only safeguarding the waste management sites that make an important contribution based on policy criteria that determine suitability.										
(b) Only safeguarding existing waste sites based on policy criteria that determine suitability; and										
(c) Safeguarding all waste management sites.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) a) - b) - c)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	++	++	++	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) Accepting that existing sites may be located in suboptimal positions in relation to access to energy outlets this policy presents the opportunity to identify sites best located for energy supply. Therefore the policy should be beneficial i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions. Replacement of historic facilities with sites located with closer regard of objective in accordance with the development management policy would result in net improvement Option b) as a) but to a lesser extent Option c) This policy retains existing network which may or may not be adequate. Hence neutral given.
Assessment Summary	The Policy supports retention of existing sites at minimum and at best replacement of undesirable sites so should result in overall improvement on waste management facility 'stock' over time. Loss prevention of sites could be seen as a positive but how far that will extend will depend in large part with how 'important contribution' is actually defined.									

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities										
<p>a) a limited number of medium/large sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, giving priority to sites close to the Strategic Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>b) distribution of a larger number of smaller sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, and the larger settlements in the rural areas, giving priority to sites close to Advisory Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>c) wider distribution of sites of varying sizes across the County, including the predominantly rural areas, close to the Advisory Lorry Route (with a preference for large scale sites to be close to the Strategic Lorry Route) and with a preference for previously developed sites and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient - no difference
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. Likely to attract waste from further afield so not compliant with proximity principle. Option b) policy disperses sites around county but still accounting for suitability. Option c) as b but even more dispersed potentially into rural areas likely to have superior background context etc.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	N	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible difference. Relies on site specifics.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible difference. Relies on site specifics.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) Concentration of capacity makes less proximal Option b) distribution to more local level may offer business benefits Option c) wider distribution brings possible benefits closer still

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities										
<p>a) a limited number of medium/large sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, giving priority to sites close to the Strategic Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>b) distribution of a larger number of smaller sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, and the larger settlements in the rural areas, giving priority to sites close to Advisory Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>c) wider distribution of sites of varying sizes across the County, including the predominantly rural areas, close to the Advisory Lorry Route (with a preference for large scale sites to be close to the Strategic Lorry Route) and with a preference for previously developed sites and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient - no difference
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Option a) likely to result in more vehicle movements to central facilities but would use SLR Option b) more local facilities less movements but using ALR Option c) as b) but more dispersed. In all cases short term constructive traffic movements may be adverse, sites will have had to meet acceptable Highway standards
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. Option b) policy disperses sites around county but still accounting for suitability. Option c) as b but even more dispersed potentially into rural areas with adverse impacts
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas where previously developed land most likely to be found Option b) policy disperses sites around county where previously developed land may not always be available. Option c) as b but even more dispersed potentially into rural areas with adverse impacts
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible difference.

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities										
<p>a) a limited number of medium/large sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, giving priority to sites close to the Strategic Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>b) distribution of a larger number of smaller sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, and the larger settlements in the rural areas, giving priority to sites close to Advisory Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>c) wider distribution of sites of varying sizes across the County, including the predominantly rural areas, close to the Advisory Lorry Route (with a preference for large scale sites to be close to the Strategic Lorry Route) and with a preference for previously developed sites and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient - no difference
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible difference.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No discernible difference.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. May result in exceedance of local air quality standards Option b) policy disperses sites around county. Option c) as b but even more dispersed potentially into rural areas with reduced impact risk
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. May result in exceedance of local air quality standards Option b) policy disperses sites around county. Option c) as b but even more dispersed potentially into rural areas with greater adverse impact risk
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	N	N	N	-	-	-	As above
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference.

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities										
<p>a) a limited number of medium/large sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, giving priority to sites close to the Strategic Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>b) distribution of a larger number of smaller sites within or close to the main urban areas along the coast and in the north-east of the County, and the larger settlements in the rural areas, giving priority to sites close to Advisory Lorry Route, previously developed land and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives;</p> <p>c) wider distribution of sites of varying sizes across the County, including the predominantly rural areas, close to the Advisory Lorry Route (with a preference for large scale sites to be close to the Strategic Lorry Route) and with a preference for previously developed sites and on Greenfield sites if there are no suitable alternatives.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient - no difference
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
Assessment Summary	The Policy seeks to minimise the impacts through distribution of sites in accordance with the proximity principle.									

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling										
<u>One permanent large site</u>										
(b) Identify one site suitable for a large inert waste recycling facility (capacity of approximately 0.2mtpa) in a centralised location in relation to where waste arises, with good access to the ALR. The site will not be located within the AONB or National Park, unless a suitable previously-developed site is available. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Four small sites</u>										
(b) Identify four sites suitable for small recycling facilities (capacity of up to 50,000tpa) to serve the north east, south east, south west of the County. Sites will have good access to the ALR. Sites may be located within the AONB or National Park, although preference will be given to sites outside these areas. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Facilities only linked to existing sites and mineral workings</u>										
(c) Develop a policy to guide the location of inert waste recycling sites and mobile facilities linked to existing sites and mineral workings that are well-related to the ALR.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. Likely to attract waste from further afield so not compliant with proximity principle. Option b) policy disperses sites around county to be more local to sources with slight policy permission for siting in AONB or National Park. Option c) as b but anchored to selected existing sites or temporary uses. Possibility of adverse impacts on new communities minimised.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for inert waste. Option b) as a) above but just in different configuration Option c) limited approach may result in underprovision.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for inert waste. Option b) as a) above but just in different configuration Option c) limited approach may result in underprovision.

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling										
<u>One permanent large site</u>										
(b) Identify one site suitable for a large inert waste recycling facility (capacity of approximately 0.2mtpa) in a centralised location in relation to where waste arises, with good access to the ALR. The site will not be located within the AONB or National Park, unless a suitable previously-developed site is available. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Four small sites</u>										
(b) Identify four sites suitable for small recycling facilities (capacity of up to 50,000tpa) to serve the north east, south east, south west of the County. Sites will have good access to the ALR. Sites may be located within the AONB or National Park, although preference will be given to sites outside these areas. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Facilities only linked to existing sites and mineral workings</u>										
(c) Develop a policy to guide the location of inert waste recycling sites and mobile facilities linked to existing sites and mineral workings that are well-related to the ALR.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) policy concentrates impacts of smaller number of larger facilities in urban areas. Likely to attract waste from further afield. Option b) policy disperses sites around county to be more local to sources. Option c) as b but anchored to selected existing sites or temporary uses. Possibility of adverse impacts on new communities minimised.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+		+	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards urban areas Option b) policy disperses sites around county with slight policy permission for siting in AONB or National Park Option c) as b but anchored to selected existing sites or temporary uses.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	-	-	-	N	N	N	Option a) This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards previously developed land if located in AONB or SDNP and away from greenfield and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement. Option b) This policy does not seek to direct proposed facilities away from greenfield and slight policy permission for siting in AONB or National Park. Option c) as b but anchored to selected existing sites or temporary uses.

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling										
<u>One permanent large site</u>										
(b) Identify one site suitable for a large inert waste recycling facility (capacity of approximately 0.2mtpa) in a centralised location in relation to where waste arises, with good access to the ALR. The site will not be located within the AONB or National Park, unless a suitable previously-developed site is available. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Four small sites</u>										
(b) Identify four sites suitable for small recycling facilities (capacity of up to 50,000tpa) to serve the north east, south east, south west of the County. Sites will have good access to the ALR. Sites may be located within the AONB or National Park, although preference will be given to sites outside these areas. Also, allow for extending existing sites and the potential for new sites to be linked to existing mineral workings.										
<u>Facilities only linked to existing sites and mineral workings</u>										
(c) Develop a policy to guide the location of inert waste recycling sites and mobile facilities linked to existing sites and mineral workings that are well-related to the ALR.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Capacity gradient (least first) c) - b) - a)
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) policy specifies capacity target Option b) as a) Option c) no target set- left more to market to deliver. This may not be sufficient.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference. All operations to LAAPC controls on dust.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference. Site specific.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference. Site specific.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern difference. Site specific.
Assessment Summary	Policy supports an adequate supply of suitable inert recycling sites promoting a supply of recycled aggregates to replace primary aggregates and thereby diverting inert waste from landfill helps									

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																			
a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
e) A combination of options a and c.																			
f) A combination of options b and d																			
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	As option supports additional facilities then effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short term as facilities are established and become operational. However locational criteria specified and encouragement of community based schemes should mean acceptability improved so neutral effect in medium term. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect remains neutral. Larger schemes (options c, d, e and f) more likely to be visible and have a greater impact.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																				
a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
e) A combination of options a and c.																				
f) A combination of options b and d																				
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy	
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary	
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	The nature of composting means the sites are more likely to be found in rural areas, but open air composting could be considered as compatible with agricultural uses that would be found in the countryside. Some initial negative perception initially until activity becomes accepted part of working of countryside. Larger schemes (options c, d, e and f) more likely to be visible and have a greater impact.	
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern as specific site characteristics unknown	
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No basis to discern between options - all should offer benefits	

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																				
a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
e) A combination of options a and c.																				
f) A combination of options b and d																				
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy	
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary	
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	No basis to discern between options - By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new composting facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. More composting will increase the supply of compost to the local economy and displace imports of non compost based soil conditioners bringing longer term price stability and security of supply.	
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Smaller sites would place compost near to user and allows for movement using traditional tractor trailer. Larger sites (options c, d, e and f) would be located close to the ALR. Short term construction traffic movements likely to be negligible for this type of facility.	

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																			
a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																			
e) A combination of options a and c.																			
f) A combination of options b and d																			
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option b, d and f exclude reference to National Park and AONB therefore potential negative effects if no discrimination between protected landscapes and the rest of the countryside. Smaller scale facilities (options a, c, e and f) are compatible with agricultural uses which are found in the countryside.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	All options include a preference for PDL and avoidance of BMV which is positive for all options therefore no discernable difference between the options.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																			
<p>a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.</p> <p>b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.</p> <p>c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.</p> <p>d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.</p> <p>e) A combination of options a and c.</p> <p>f) A combination of options b and d</p>																			
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting																				
a) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
b) Develop a policy to enable small-scale, on-farm or community based open-windrow facilities to come forward in rural areas. Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
c) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Sites should not be located in the AONB/National Park unless a suitable previously developed site is available. Sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
d) Develop a policy to allow larger scale open-windrow facilities in rural areas with good access to the ALR (with a preference for sites close to the SLR). Preference should be given to previously developed land and sites on agricultural land should avoid the best and most versatile land.																				
e) A combination of options a and c.																				
f) A combination of options b and d																				
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Assume that 250m exclusion zone applied under EA policy	
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary	
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options	
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options	
Assessment Summary	Policy supports an adequate supply of suitable composting sites and therefore diverts green waste from landfill. Consider including reference to 250 metre buffer zone in policy. Policy that does not make reference to National Park and AONB might result in potential negative effects if no distinction between protected landscapes and the rest of the countryside. Smaller and larger scale facilities provides more flexibility to enable smaller on-farm/community based schemes and larger facilities for the industry.																			

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge										
(a) Develop a policy to only allow the expansion of existing sites; (b) Develop a policy to allow only new sites to be developed; (c) Develop a policy to allow for the expansion of existing sites and new sites to be developed										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	Option a) Policy limited to existing sites - additional impacts minimised but could be cumulative in longer term. Option b) As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral. Option c) As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	N	N	-	-	-	N	-	-	N	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) limitation may risk provision Option b) more flexibility Option c) This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for wastewater.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) limitation may risk provision Option b) more flexibility Option c) Providing wastewater treatment facilities increases the capacity to accommodate development including economic development.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge										
(a) Develop a policy to only allow the expansion of existing sites; (b) Develop a policy to allow only new sites to be developed; (c) Develop a policy to allow for the expansion of existing sites and new sites to be developed										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) limitation may risk provision Option b) more flexibility Option c) By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new wastewater facilities built to modern standards more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy and include anaerobic digestion and supply of quality sludge into design.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge										
<p>(a) Develop a policy to only allow the expansion of existing sites;</p> <p>(b) Develop a policy to allow only new sites to be developed;</p> <p>(c) Develop a policy to allow for the expansion of existing sites and new sites to be developed</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) limitation may risk provision Option b) more flexibility Option c) By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new modern wastewater facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that produce quality output suited to land application rather than landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
Assessment Summary	Broader implications of the Policy are likely to be negligible and/or mitigated as the policy aims to concentrate development at existing wastewater treatment works and/or within industrial areas, and development elsewhere has to be acceptable in environmental terms.									

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																		
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. c) Combination of a) and b) d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex. e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex. f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																		
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Option a) As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral. Sites have been pre screened. Option b) As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral. sites have not been pre screened Option c) Some sites have been pre screened but more flexibility Option d) More of a) Option e) More of b) Option f) More of c)																		

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																		
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. c) Combination of a) and b) d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex. e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex. f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																		
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
																		Baseline indicates not self sufficient currently - reliant on exports
																		Commentary
																		As above
																		No basis to discern between options
																		All policies are likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for hazardous and llr waste.
																		All options should make new facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. Local provision of facility to meet industry needs should offer more cost effective management route.

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																			
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex.																			
b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex.																			
c) Combination of a) and b)																			
d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex.																			
e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex.																			
f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																			
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Baseline indicates not self sufficient currently - reliant on exports
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	All present short term construction traffic movements likely to be significant for this type of facility. Option a) b) c) As policy does not specify ALR proximity establishment of new facility away from ALR may cause some adverse impact although sites would still need to meet Highway standards. Overall neutral in lifetime as without this policy waste would move out of county but that waste likely to move via ALR. Option d) e) f) greater movements due to imports
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																				
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex.																				
b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex.																				
c) Combination of a) and b)																				
d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex.																				
e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex.																				
f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																				
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)			Baseline indicates not self sufficient currently - reliant on exports	
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary	
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options	
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options	
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	All policy options should make new built facilities more deliverable. However most treatment facilities unlikely to promote recycling except soil hospital type which would contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. Contribution of contaminated soil no more than 10% hazardous waste arisings so overall neutral.	

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																		
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. c) Combination of a) and b) d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex. e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex. f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																		
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
																	Baseline indicates not self sufficient currently - reliant on exports	
																	Commentary	
																	By providing guidelines for new facilities all policy options should make new built facilities more deliverable. However much hazardous waste excluded from landfill so overall impact marginal. Soil hospital type would contribute positively to encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill. Contribution of contaminated soil no more than 10% haz waste arisings so overall neutral.	
																	Option a) b) c) As these policy options seeks to provide for waste that might otherwise continue to be dealt with out of County this policy could have adverse effect. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective. Option d) e) f) exacerbates adverse effects potentially	
																	No basis to discern between options	

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste																		
a) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. b) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals based on the achievement of net self-sufficiency for West Sussex. c) Combination of a) and b) d) Allocate specific sites for hazardous waste facilities to allow for net imports into West Sussex. e) Do not allocate sites but identify criteria to guide proposals to allow for net imports into West Sussex. f) f) Combination of options d) and e)																		
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			Option f)		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Assessment Summary	<p>The Policy supports development of adequate arrangements for these waste streams, however, no reference is made to how the waste will be managed.</p> <p>What would be defined as a 'substantial contribution' could be more clearly defined to understand how policy might work in practice i.e. what threshold might apply to actually promote provision of capacity within the County..</p> <p>There is likely to be concern & anxiety about hazardous waste being dealt with anywhere in the County, due to negative perceptions about that type of waste. There may be concern caused by the uncertainty of not knowing where sites may be located.</p> <p>Another possible negative impact is that management of hazardous waste may not support movement up the waste hierarchy. However, this kind of facility is currently necessary for specific types of waste & the relevant treatments are not known at this stage.</p> <p>Other impacts will depend on the location, scale & design of facilities.</p>																	

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land

Policy W8 has been split up and assessed according to its component parts. W8 (a) (i) essentially duplicates W1 (b) so has been appraised under self-sufficiency in waste management. W8 (a) (ii) to (v) are essentially detailed Development Management policies that do not define the strategy of the Plan and so separate SA is not necessary.

Policy W(8) (b) (i) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex's waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) Limited promotion of landfill still secures longer term future and associated effects. Option b) as a) but more extreme Option c) As policy restricts development of new landfill facilities then perceived effects would be positive on baseline of status quo of market operation. In the long term the phasing out of landfill likely to produce a positive legacy providing alternative means of restoring mineral sites are deployed Option d) As c) but more with treatment outside County too.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	++	++	++	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options

Policy W(8)(b)(i): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex's waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	++	++	++	-	-	-	--	--	--	Option a) provides supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option b) promotes greatest supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option c) By restricting supply of landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities. Option d) As c) but benefits associated with treatment going outside County too.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	++	++	++	-	-	-	--	--	--	Option a) provides supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option b) promotes greatest supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option c) By restricting supply of landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities. Option d) As c) but benefits associated with treatment going outside County too.

Policy W(8)(b)(i) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex's waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	-	-	-	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to transport routes. . This is offset to some degree by the limited lifespan of landfills. Option b) As a) but more so Option c) Displacement of waste from landfill by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits - although the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies Option d) Positive effect could be offset if landfill in the County is not replaced by in county recovery and results in long distance movement to out of County landfill.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to valued landscape. They also represent large facilities that can negatively impact on landscape if not well screened albeit over a limited life. Option b) As a) but more so Option c) Displacement of waste from landfill by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits but the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies. Option d) Lack of facilities in County beneficial for this aspect.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	+	+	+	As above

Policy W(8) (b) (i) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex’s waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be rural and associated with mineral workings they may compromise elements of this objective. Option b) As a) but more so Option c) Displacement of waste from landfill by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits but the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies. Option d) Lack f facilities in County beneficial for this aspect.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Option a) Landfill does offer longer term restoration opportunity but not an end itself. Option b) Landfill does offer longer term restoration opportunity but not an end itself. Option c) Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect. Option d) eliminates local issues and losses opportunities.

Policy W(8)(b)(i): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex's waste; b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste; c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) Landfill drives out recycling Option b) As a) but more so Option c) By restricting landfill supply this policy indirectly promotes this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. However some loss of capacity to take outputs from recycling processes such as non-inert trommelled fines that may prove problematic to find alternative disposal routes. Option d) As c) but problem residue disposal exacerbated
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	N	N	N	Option a) Landfill restrict recovery Option b) As a) but more so Option c) By restricting landfill supply this policy directly promotes this objective. Do need capacity to deal with residues. Option d) As c) but problem residue disposal exacerbated
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) Landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. Option b) As a) but more so. Option c) By restricting supply fugitive emission minimised. Therefore overall positive compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply. Option d) As c) but better still
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	++	++	++	As above

Policy W(8) (b) (i) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex’s waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) Landfill will give rise to some emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. Potential long term failure of liner systems presents longer term risk of adverse legacy in aquifers too. Option b) As a) but more so. Option c) By restricting supply this effect is minimised. Therefore overall positive compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply. Option d) As c) but better still
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	N	N	N	Option a) landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions of methane regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. Option b) As a) but more so. Option c) Restriction on supply of landfill will reduce methane production and potential for capture and utilisation of landfill gas to produce renewable energy. By restricting supply fugitive emissions are minimised and opportunity created for alternative energy from waste technologies to be deployed that is more efficient converter of energy value of residual waste although this is not guaranteed by this policy. Therefore overall neutral effect compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply. i.e. elimination of fugitive methane vs. possible loss of energy value Option d) As c) but lose potential thermal treatment benefit

Policy W(8) (b) (i) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land													
a) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net self-sufficiency for landfill of West Sussex’s waste;													
b) Develop a policy to allow non-inert landfill sites to come forward to provide for net imports of waste;													
c) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill sites to come forward only for disposal of waste arising in West Sussex													
d) Develop a policy that relies on net exports of waste, with the majority of treatment taking place outside the County.													
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
Assessment Summary	The Policy restricts to some degree an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill is still needed to enable disposal of residues from other waste treatment processes that are higher up the waste hierarchy. Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites. Policy duplicates part of policy W1.												

Policy W(8)(b)(ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land

(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.

(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.

(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land

(d) Combination of a, b and c

(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county

	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	++	++	++	Option a) Landfill limited by anchoring around existing sites. Locals adjusted to impacts. Ultimately temporary. Option b) as a) but landfill in different place. Option c) as a) but landraise in different place with more flexible location. Option d) More flexibility and choice should lead to best available option coming forward. Option e) Preferring landfill outside county displacing negative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	++	++	++	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options

Policy W(8) (b) (ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	--	--	--	Option a) Landfill limited by anchoring around existing sites. Locals adjusted to impacts. Ultimately temporary. Option b) as a) but landfill in different place. Option c) as a) but landraise in different place with more flexible location. Option d) More flexibility and choice should lead to best available option coming forward. Option e) Preferring landfill outside county displacing negative effects.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) provides limited supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option b) provides limited supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option c) provides limited supply of convenient and cost effective landfill Option d) More flexibility and choice should lead to best available option coming forward. Option e) Preferring landfill outside county displacing negative effects.

Policy W(8) (b) (ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	-	-	-	±	±	±	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to transport routes. Existing sites established. This is offset to some degree by the limited lifespan of landfills. Option b) As a) Option c) As b) but more flexible on siting Option d) As above Option e) Positive effect offset if landfill in the County is replaced by long distance movement to out of County landfill.

Policy W(8) (b) (ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	--	--	--	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to valued landscape. They also represent large facilities that can negatively impact on landscape if not well screened albeit over a limited life. Option b) As a) but new Option c) As b) but more flexible Option d) As c) but more flexible still Option e) Lack of facilities in County beneficial for this aspect.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	--	--	--	-	-	-	N	N	N	+	+	+	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	--	--	--	N	N	N	+	+	+	++	++	++	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be rural and associated with mineral workings they may compromise elements of this objective. Option b) As a) Option c) As b) but more explicit protection. Option d) As c) but more flexible still Option f) Lack of facilities in County beneficial for this aspect.

Policy W(8) (b) (ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	Option a) Landfill does offer longer term restoration opportunity but not an end itself. Option b) Landfill does offer longer term restoration opportunity but not an end itself. Option c) Landraise doesn't offer longer term restoration opportunity. Option d) As c) but more flexible still Option e) eliminates local issues and loses opportunities.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	Option a) Landfill drives out recycling Option b) As a) Option c) As b) Option d) As c) but worse as likelihood of site increased by flexibility. Option e) By restricting landfill supply this policy indirectly promotes this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. However some loss of capacity to take outputs from recycling processes such as non-inert trommelled fines that may prove problematic to find alternative disposal routes.

Policy W(8) (b) (ii) : Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	+	+	+	Option a) Landfill restrict recovery Option b) As a) Option c) As b) Option d) As c) but worse as likelihood of site increased by flexibility. Option e) By restricting landfill supply this policy indirectly promotes this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	++	++	++	Option a) Landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. Option b) As a) Option c) As b) Option d) As c) but worse as likelihood of site increased with flexibility Option e) By restricting supply fugitive emission minimised.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	++	++	++	As above

Policy W(8) (b) (ii): Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land																
(a) Consider potential for extending existing sites, taking into account cumulative impact.																
(b) Identify new landfill void capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park, unless no suitable alternative sites are available.																
(c) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land-raise sites will not be located on Grade 1 and 2 Agricultural Land																
(d) Combination of a, b and c																
(e) Develop a policy to allow for non-inert landfill to come forward only if there are no opportunities to expand existing sites and no suitable alternative sites outside of the county																
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			Option d)			Option e)			
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	++	++	++	As above
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	--	++	++	++	As above
Assessment Summary	The Policy restricts to some degree an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill is still needed to enable disposal of residues from other waste treatment processes that are higher up the waste hierarchy. Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites. Policy duplicates part of policy W1.															

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land

W9 (a) (i) essentially duplicates W1 (b) which has been appraised under self sufficiency in waste management. W9(b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) are essentially detailed Development management policies that do not define the strategy of the Plan and so separate SA is not necessary.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land										
a) Identify new landfill void capacity, well related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park unless no suitable alternative sites are available. b) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land raise will not be located on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. c) Not allocating sites but identifying criteria to guide proposals to restoration of mineral sites, non-inert waste sites, and suitable engineering projects.										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			All options make provision for inert landfill
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	+	-	N	+	-	N	+	No basis to discern between options. Negative in short term turning to positive with restoration opportunities in long term
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	+	-	N	+	-	N	+	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	-	N	+	-	N	+	-	N	+	No basis to discern between options. Negative in short term turning to positive with restoration opportunities in long term
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	No basis to discern between options. Provision of reliable management routes for inert waste important to sustaining construction activity.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to transport routes. Option b) As a) Option c) More flexible policy allows for more optimal location although anchored round sub-optimal; mineral sites

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land										
<p>a) Identify new landfill void capacity, well related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park unless no suitable alternative sites are available.</p> <p>b) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land raise will not be located on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>c) Not allocating sites but identifying criteria to guide proposals to restoration of mineral sites, non-inert waste sites, and suitable engineering projects.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			All options make provision for inert landfill
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	Option a) As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to valued landscape. They also represent large facilities that can be a blight on landscape if not exceptionally well screened albeit over a limited life. Option b) Flexibility offered by this policy for land raise could reduce disadvantages of a) Option c) As b)
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	+	+	+	-	-	-	Option a) Doesn't explicitly address concern. Option b) explicitly protects best and most versatile Option c) Could be aggravated by sites being potentially located in mineral voids that may not be fully exhausted.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	No basis to discern between options.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Inert landfill does not generally give rise to fugitive emissions Therefore overall neutral effect compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply. No basis to discern between options.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	As above. No basis to discern between options.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land										
<p>a) Identify new landfill void capacity, well related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park unless no suitable alternative sites are available.</p> <p>b) Identify new land raise capacity, well-related to the ALR and with a preference for sites outside the AONB or National Park. Land raise will not be located on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>c) Not allocating sites but identifying criteria to guide proposals to restoration of mineral sites, non-inert waste sites, and suitable engineering projects.</p>										
	Option a)			Option b)			Option c)			All options make provision for inert landfill
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6- 25yrs	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e. legacy	Commentary
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	As above. No basis to discern between options.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Inert waste does not produce greenhouse gases. No basis to discern between options.
Assessment Summary	<p>Landfill may be essential to enable disposal of waste from construction development. While recovery operations can accommodate, Environment Agency restrictions (as reflected in the proposed policy criteria) are constraining this outlet increasingly forcing such operations to be dealt with as landfill. Reflection of the criteria in this policy relating to landfill rather than recovery may prove to be overly restrictive if alternative options are not available forcing waste to travel to out of county landfill (as current).</p> <p>Necessity of policy to apply to residual waste for inert material is questionable. Landfill Directive treatment requirement allows for no treatment where not beneficial and freshly dug fill would be a case in point.</p> <p>In terms of public health and amenity, the policy would give rise to overall neutral effects in the short and medium term as the positive effects of restricting landfilling in the county are off-set by the negative effects of having to find/develop alternative facilities. In the long term the phasing out of inert landfill may produce a negative legacy as alternative means of restoring mineral sites may be limited.</p> <p>Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites.</p>									

Appendix G: Assessment of the Strategic Policies

G1 The assessment of the strategic policies against the sustainability objectives is shown in the following tables.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
<p>(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.</p> <p>(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W1			Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs		
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	Facility design and management, including transport. Public engagement and awareness raising to minimise negative effects.	Perceived effects may be negative in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational as part of the drive towards net self-sufficiency. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	See above	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	+	+	+	Sites would need to comply with policies on flooding, including NPPF Technical Guidance. Facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Allocated sites have been explicitly assessed against this aspect. Additional sites would need to comply with Plan and NPPF policies on flood risk and mitigation so the effect would be neutral or positive. Waste treatment (except haz waste and landfill) is classified as 'less vulnerable' and so is compatible in Flood Zone 1,2 and 3a
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Implementation of the policy will help to ensure an adequate supply of facilities as a supply of suitable waste facilities will be needed for the County to be self-sufficient in managing West Sussex waste.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.					
(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.					
(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.					
	Policy W1				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5 yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	New facilities would create employment within the waste industry and support business through providing for management of wastes generated locally. New technologies and process will up-skill workforce. More recycling will increase the supply of secondary materials to the local economy.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	N	N	N	NA	Policy unlikely to change the 'shape' of the West Sussex waste management network because the sites are in relative proximity to existing sites and limited opportunities to make use of rail or water. Uncertainty around whether increasing capacity in these areas will actually reduce movement out of the county. Objective to achieve 'Zero Waste to Landfill' could lead to waste travelling outside the county for disposal. In the short to medium term until alternative treatment technologies come on stream.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	N	Sites would be assessed against DM policies promoting PDL and high quality design.	The allocated sites comprise Greenfield and PDL development which could give rise to positive and negative effects on landscape and townscape. There is also uncertainty about the effect development at non-allocated sites would have but it would be judged against policies in the plan designed to protect this objective, promote the use of PDL and encourage good quality design.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.					
(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.					
(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.					
	Policy W1				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5 yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	Sites would be assessed against DM policies protecting the historic environment	Development at allocated sites could give rise to positive and negative effects on heritage assets. There is also uncertainty about the effect of development at non-allocated sites would have but they would be judged against other policies in the plan designed to protect this objective.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	Sites would be assessed against DM policies promoting PDL. DM policies would ensure that effective use is made of the site.	The allocated sites comprise Greenfield and PDL development which could give rise to positive and negative effects. There is also uncertainty about the effect of development at non-allocated sites would have but they would be judged against other policies in the plan which promote the use of PDL. Allocated sites located on, or in proximity to, best and most versatile land and development could give rise to loss. There is also uncertainty about the effect non-allocated sites would have but they would be judged against other policies in the plan. Most of the allocated sites in the WLP are not allocated in other Local Plans and therefore the pdl sites allocated are not seen as high priority land by the Districts therefore allocation for waste use is making best use of pdl.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.					
(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.					
(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.					
	Policy W1				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	Sites would need to comply with policies on biodiversity and geodiversity facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Allocated sites have been explicitly assessed against this aspect. Any further sites would need to comply with policies on this aspect. The effect would be neutral or positive if there are enhancement and restoration opportunities.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	High quality recycling should be encouraged via site specific DM policies	The thrust of this policy is to encourage development of infrastructure that promotes recycling.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	The provision of non landfill infrastructure combined with the landfill provision restriction should drive waste from landfill and encourage development of alternative recovery routes
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	+	+	+	high quality built facilities should be encouraged via site specific DM policies	Reduction in landfilling with its fugitive emissions should result in improvement in local air quality. Use of high quality built facilities to contain and manage waste will allow associated emissions to be effectively controlled. Allocated sites have been explicitly assessed against this aspect. Any further sites would need to comply with policies on AQ assessment, the effect would be positive.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.					
(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.					
(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W1			Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs		
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	NA	Diversion of organic waste from landfill to composting and anaerobic digestion would produce material of beneficial value to the soil. Allocated sites have been explicitly assessed against this aspect. Any further sites would need to comply with policies on soil assessment, the effect would be positive.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	DM policies should encourage use of Suds inc rainwater harvesting and grey water reuse where process water is required	Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in risk to aquifers and water bodies and hence likelihood of improvement in water quality. Use of high quality built facilities to contain and manage waste will allow associated run-off to be effectively controlled. Allocated sites have been explicitly assessed against this aspect. Additional sites would need to comply with policies on water assessment, the effect would be positive.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	DM policies to encourage most efficient energy form waste technologies and supply of lower carbon energy to locality	Reduction in landfilling should result in reduction in methane release – methane is a very powerful greenhouse gas. Use of high quality built facilities that may be recovering value from residual waste as energy will contribute towards supply of renewable/lower carbon energy. Some allocated sites offer specific opportunities of supply of lower carbon energy to locality.

Policy W1: Self-Sufficiency in Waste Management					
<p>(a) Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where they are consistent with the objective of net self-sufficiency for the transfer, recycling, and treatment of the waste arising in West Sussex.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising in West Sussex will not be permitted unless they are consistent with the objective of 'zero waste to landfill' in West Sussex by 2031.</p> <p>(c) Proposals for the disposal to land of waste arising from outside West Sussex will not be permitted.</p>					
	Policy W1				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<p>The Policy seeks to provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to deal with waste generated in the County, which has beneficial impacts on waste management and the local economy.</p> <p>Its contribution towards minimising the transport of waste is unknown as waste destined for landfill may travel further while waste destined for other management should be dealt with within the County and adjacent areas.</p> <p>Policy should encourage treatment facilities to come on stream to divert waste from landfill but the objective to achieve 'zero waste to landfill by 2031' could lead to a net export of residual waste for disposal to land in the short to medium term.</p> <p>Policy duplicates part of policy W8.</p>				

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites					
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:					
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use; (b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment; (c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or (d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W2			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on amenity, this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of amenity i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions. Redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the DM policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting likely to result in net improvement.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	+	+	+	See above	See above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W17 Flooding.	See above
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	N	N	N	NA	Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in capacity although replacement may be more 'suitable'. Loss prevention of sites could be seen as a positive but definition of 'important contribution' unclear.

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites					
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:					
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use; (b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment; (c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or (d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W2			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	NA	Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in employment although replacement may be more 'efficient' and safeguarding protects existing business.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport.	Accepting that existing sites may be located in areas that are less than ideal from a transport point of view this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have evolved historically but that have unacceptable impact in terms of traffic - disruption, emissions and accident risk. Therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of transport i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions. Replacement of historic facilities with sites that are better related to the ALR and have greater regard to transport issues in accordance with the DM policy and current statutory controls e.g. Highways would result in net improvement.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policies W11: Character and W13: Protected Landscapes and the HQWF SPD	As above - policy provides possibility of improvement on baseline and no deterioration. Policy could potentially enhance objective by providing sensitively located well designed replacement facilities.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment, & the HQWF SPD	As above

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites					
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:					
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use; (b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment; (c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or (d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W2			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside other relevant policies.	Thrust of policy is to retain and make best use of existing sites where appropriate so inherently supportive of pdl although the possibility that some existing sites may prove to be unsuitable may open up possibility of seeking new locations not on pdl. However providing these new locations are identified in accordance with DM policies then this policy should result in positive contribution.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W14: biodiversity & geodiversity.	As above - policy provides possibility of improvement on baseline and no deterioration. <i>Policy could potentially enhance objective by providing sensitively located well designed replacement facilities.</i>
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	N	N	NA	Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in recycling capacity although replacement may be more 'efficient' due to configuration flexibility and provide opportunity to utilise secondary materials in construction (short term gain).
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	NA	Policy supports either retention of acceptable existing sites or replacement on like for like basis so no overall change in diversion potential although replacement may open up prospect of more advanced technology being deployed.

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites					
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:					
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use; (b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment; (c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or (d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W2			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water.	Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.. Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the DM policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water.	Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.. Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the DM policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement.

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites					
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:					
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use; (b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment; (c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or (d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W2			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water.	Accepting that existing sites may be adversely impacting on this objective this policy presents the opportunity to screen out sites that have had historical use but that have unacceptable impact therefore the policy should be beneficial in terms of this objective i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.. Also to ensure that redevelopment as part of a scheme that brings wider benefits could see actual enhancement overall. Replacement of historic facilities with sites built to modern standards and located in accordance with the DM policy and current statutory controls e.g. EA permitting would result in net improvement.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	NA	Accepting that existing sites may be located in suboptimal positions in relation to access to energy outlets this policy presents the opportunity to identify sites best located for energy supply. Therefore the policy should be beneficial i.e. result in a net improvement on the current baseline conditions.. Replacement of historic facilities with sites located with closer regard of objective in accordance with the DM policy would result in net improvement

Policy W2: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites						
Development that would prevent or prejudice the use of existing sites that make an important contribution to the management of waste in West Sussex will not be permitted unless:						
(a) the current use is temporary and the site is unsuitable for continued waste use;						
(b) continued use of the site for waste management purposes would be unacceptable in terms of impact on the community and risk to the environment;						
(c) redevelopment of the site would form part of a scheme accepted by the County Council as being of wider benefit than the retention of the site for waste use; or						
(d) a suitable replacement site has been identified and permitted.						
		Policy W2				
Appraisal Objective		Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary		The Policy supports retention of existing sites at minimum and at best replacement of undesirable sites so should result in overall improvement on waste management facility 'stock' over time. Loss prevention of sites could be seen as a positive but how far that will extend will depend in large part with how 'important contribution' is actually defined.				

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities

- (a) Proposals for built waste management facilities (including associated development) to enable the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste will be permitted provided that they are either:
 - (i) located within or close to the main urban areas in the Areas of Search along the coast and in the north and east of the County as identified on the Key Diagram; or
 - (ii) outside the Areas of Search identified on the Key Diagram, they are only small-scale facilities to serve a local need.
- (b) Proposals for waste management facilities that accord with part (a) must:
 - (i) be located on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management uses; or
 - (ii) be located within built-up areas, or on suitable previously-developed land outside built-up areas; or
 - (iii) on a greenfield site, only if it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available; and
- (iii) be well-related to the Lorry Route Network; large-scale facilities must have good access to the Strategic Lorry Route.

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities					
<p>(a) Proposals for built waste management facilities (including associated development) to enable the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste will be permitted provided that they are either:</p> <p>(i) located within or close to the main urban areas in the Areas of Search along the coast and in the north and east of the County as identified on the Key Diagram; or</p> <p>(ii) outside the Areas of Search identified on the Key Diagram, they are only small-scale facilities to serve a local need.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for waste management facilities that accord with part (a) must:</p> <p>(i) be located on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management uses; or</p> <p>(ii) be located within built-up areas, or on suitable previously-developed land outside built-up areas; or</p> <p>(iii) on a greenfield site, only if it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available; and</p> <p>(iii) be well-related to the Lorry Route Network; large-scale facilities must have good access to the Strategic Lorry Route.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W3			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. New technologies and process will up-skill workforce. More recycling will increase the supply of secondary materials to the local economy..
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	This policy makes proximity of proposed facilities to the ALR a policy objective and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement. However, clarity over definition of 'well-related' required. Although in short term constructive traffic movements may be adverse, sites will have had to meet acceptable Highway standards.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Policy should be applied alongside Policies W11: Character and W13: Protected Landscapes and the HQWF SPD	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities away from areas this objective seeks to protect and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement.

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities					
<p>(a) Proposals for built waste management facilities (including associated development) to enable the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste will be permitted provided that they are either:</p> <p>(i) located within or close to the main urban areas in the Areas of Search along the coast and in the north and east of the County as identified on the Key Diagram; or</p> <p>(ii) outside the Areas of Search identified on the Key Diagram, they are only small-scale facilities to serve a local need.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for waste management facilities that accord with part (a) must:</p> <p>(i) be located on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management uses; or</p> <p>(ii) be located within built-up areas, or on suitable previously-developed land outside built-up areas; or</p> <p>(iii) on a greenfield site, only if it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available; and</p> <p>(iii) be well-related to the Lorry Route Network; large-scale facilities must have good access to the Strategic Lorry Route.</p>					
Policy W3					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, Soil and Water	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards pdl and away from greenfield and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective..
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy.

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities					
<p>(a) Proposals for built waste management facilities (including associated development) to enable the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste will be permitted provided that they are either:</p> <p>(i) located within or close to the main urban areas in the Areas of Search along the coast and in the north and east of the County as identified on the Key Diagram; or</p> <p>(ii) outside the Areas of Search identified on the Key Diagram, they are only small-scale facilities to serve a local need.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for waste management facilities that accord with part (a) must:</p> <p>(i) be located on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management uses; or</p> <p>(ii) be located within built-up areas, or on suitable previously-developed land outside built-up areas; or</p> <p>(iii) on a greenfield site, only if it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available; and</p> <p>(iii) be well-related to the Lorry Route Network; large-scale facilities must have good access to the Strategic Lorry Route.</p>					
Policy W3					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, Soil and Water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, Soil and Water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective..
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, Soil and Water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective..

Policy W3: Location of Built Waste Management Facilities					
<p>(a) Proposals for built waste management facilities (including associated development) to enable the transfer, recycling, and treatment of waste will be permitted provided that they are either:</p> <p>(i) located within or close to the main urban areas in the Areas of Search along the coast and in the north and east of the County as identified on the Key Diagram; or</p> <p>(ii) outside the Areas of Search identified on the Key Diagram, they are only small-scale facilities to serve a local need.</p> <p>(b) Proposals for waste management facilities that accord with part (a) must:</p> <p>(i) be located on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management uses; or</p> <p>(ii) be located within built-up areas, or on suitable previously-developed land outside built-up areas; or</p> <p>(iii) on a greenfield site, only if it can be demonstrated that no suitable alternative sites are available; and</p> <p>(iii) be well-related to the Lorry Route Network; large-scale facilities must have good access to the Strategic Lorry Route.</p>					
Policy W3					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities proximate to main sources of waste the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill and associated reduction in methane release.
Assessment Summary	<p>Policy supports an adequate supply of suitable built waste facilities for the re-use, recycling and treatment of materials, driving waste up the hierarchy.</p> <p>Definition of 'well-related' and 'small-scale' could be scoped out to provide clarity over how policy should be applied.</p>				

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling					
Proposals for the processing and recycling of inert waste will be permitted provided that:					
(a) they are located in accordance with Policy W3; or					
(b) they can be accommodated at existing mineral workings where:					
(i) the duration of operations is tied to that of the mineral workings; and					
(ii) they are well-related to the Lorry Route Network.					
	Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects may be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral. If on mineral sites then on completion the operation will cease.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	As above	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Sites would need to comply with policy W17: Flooding, facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect. Less vulnerable uses compatible in FZ 1,2,3a
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for inert waste.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new inert waste facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. More recycling will increase the supply of secondary materials to the local economy.

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling					
<p>Proposals for the processing and recycling of inert waste will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(a) they are located in accordance with Policy W3; or</p> <p>(b) they can be accommodated at existing mineral workings where:</p> <p>(i) the duration of operations is tied to that of the mineral workings; and</p> <p>(ii) they are well-related to the Lorry Route Network.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W4			Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	This policy makes proximity of proposed facilities to the ALR a policy objective and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement. Short term construction traffic movements likely to be negligible for this type of facility...
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities away from areas this objective seeks to protect or towards existing sites and therefore this should result in a no worsening of current and possible net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	NA	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites and away from greenfield and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective. Use of mineral sites presents opportunity for biodiversity gains but these are more properly attributed to the mineral workings themselves rather than the coincidentally located recycling facility.

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling					
<p>Proposals for the processing and recycling of inert waste will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(a) they are located in accordance with Policy W3; or</p> <p>(b) they can be accommodated at existing mineral workings where:</p> <p>(i) the duration of operations is tied to that of the mineral workings; and</p> <p>(ii) they are well-related to the Lorry Route Network.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W4			Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	NA	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown and inert waste to landfill does not create methane.

Policy W4: Inert Waste Recycling					
<p>Proposals for the processing and recycling of inert waste will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(a) they are located in accordance with Policy W3; or</p> <p>(b) they can be accommodated at existing mineral workings where:</p> <p>(i) the duration of operations is tied to that of the mineral workings; and</p> <p>(ii) they are well-related to the Lorry Route Network.</p>					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective			Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Assessment Summary					
			<p>Policy supports an adequate supply of suitable inert recycling sites promoting a supply of recycled aggregates to replace primary aggregates and thereby diverting inert waste from landfill helps Definition of 'well-related' could be defined to provide clarity over how policy should be applied.</p> <p>Policy is similar to W3: Built Waste Facilities and therefore could be incorporated into it.</p>		

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting					
Proposals for open windrow composting and associated facilities will be permitted provided that they are located on suitable:					
(a) existing, permitted, or allocated sites for waste management; (b) previously-developed land outside the built-up area; (c) agricultural land, where the impact on any best and most versatile land would be acceptable in accordance with Policy W16; or (d) sites to enable small-scale local community or agriculturally-based schemes in close proximity to the source of the waste.					
	Policy W5				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	N	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short term as facilities are established and become operational. However locational criteria specified and encouragement of community based schemes should mean acceptability improved so neutral effect in medium term. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect remains neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	N	As above	The nature of composting means the sites are more likely to be found in rural areas, but open air composting could be considered as compatible with agricultural uses that would be found in the countryside. Some initial negative perception initially until activity becomes accepted part of working of countryside.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Sites would need to comply with policy W17: Flooding. Facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective..
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for compostable waste.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting					
Proposals for open windrow composting and associated facilities will be permitted provided that they are located on suitable:					
(a) existing, permitted, or allocated sites for waste management; (b) previously-developed land outside the built-up area; (c) agricultural land, where the impact on any best and most versatile land would be acceptable in accordance with Policy W16; or (d) sites to enable small-scale local community or agriculturally-based schemes in close proximity to the source of the waste.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W5			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new composting facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. More composting will increase the supply of compost to the local economy and displace imports of non compost based soil conditioners bringing longer term price stability and security of supply.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	Short term construction traffic movements likely to be negligible for this type of facility. Establishment of new facility away from ALR may cause some adverse impact although this is likely to be limited and sites would still need to meet Highway standards. Some risk of adverse effect on rural locations although this may be similar to other agricultural uses. Encouragement for use of existing sites should mitigate providing these sites are acceptable. Overall neutral rather than positive.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character and W13: Protected Landscapes	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites in first instance and then pdl and therefore this should result in a no worsening of current and possible net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement. Policy does not make specific reference to National Park and AONB therefore potential negative effects if no discrimination between protected landscapes and the rest of the countryside.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting					
Proposals for open windrow composting and associated facilities will be permitted provided that they are located on suitable:					
(a) existing, permitted, or allocated sites for waste management; (b) previously-developed land outside the built-up area; (c) agricultural land, where the impact on any best and most versatile land would be acceptable in accordance with Policy W16; or (d) sites to enable small-scale local community or agriculturally-based schemes in close proximity to the source of the waste.					
Policy W5					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	NA	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites and towards pdl. However it does accept that some loss of best and versatile land may occur so beneficial impact offset to some degree. However without this policy new facilities may not be directed towards existing sites or pdl so net overall effect still beneficial.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new composting facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy and produce compost for supply back into local economy.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new composting facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting					
Proposals for open windrow composting and associated facilities will be permitted provided that they are located on suitable:					
(a) existing, permitted, or allocated sites for waste management; (b) previously-developed land outside the built-up area; (c) agricultural land, where the impact on any best and most versatile land would be acceptable in accordance with Policy W16; or (d) sites to enable small-scale local community or agriculturally-based schemes in close proximity to the source of the waste.					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W5			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Potential impacts on air quality from bioaerosols released from the composting process, but such operations would be regulated by the DM process & statutory bodies such as the EA. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective including 250m exclusion zone for bioaerosol protection. Some overall detriment in air quality might be experienced in short term while processes get established.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective. Provision of more compost will improve soil quality.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Potential negative impacts of liquor but actual impacts should be minimal, as they would be regulated by the DM process & statutory bodies such as the EA..
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+		Provision of more compost will aid carbon retention and should displace imports of non compost based soil conditioners and fertilisers (avoiding relatively high carbon burden) so overall beneficial effect. Assumed that process controls effective to prevent anaerobic conditions developing and methane production.

Policy W5: Open Windrow Composting					
<p>Proposals for open windrow composting and associated facilities will be permitted provided that they are located on suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) existing, permitted, or allocated sites for waste management; (b) previously-developed land outside the built-up area; (c) agricultural land, where the impact on any best and most versatile land would be acceptable in accordance with Policy W16; or (d) sites to enable small-scale local community or agriculturally-based schemes in close proximity to the source of the waste. 					
			Policy W5		
Appraisal Objective			Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Assessment Summary			<p>Policy supports an adequate supply of suitable composting sites and therefore diverts green waste from landfill.</p> <p>Consider including reference to 250 metre buffer zone in policy.</p> <p>Policy does not make reference to National Park and AONB therefore potential negative effects if no distinction between protected landscapes and the rest of the countryside.</p>		

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge					
<p>(a) Proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) where possible, new facilities are accommodated within existing waste water treatment sites; or</p> <p>(ii) where new facilities cannot be accommodated within existing sites, they are located on suitable previously-developed land or on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management facilities or general industrial uses.</p> <p>(b) Where location of the proposal in accordance with part (a) of this policy is not feasible in operational terms or is inappropriate for other reasons, proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) the proposal is necessary to support new development; or</p> <p>(ii) it is required to meet environmental standards or regulatory provisions.</p>					
Appraisal Objective	Policy W6			Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	As above	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Sites would need to comply with policy W17: Flooding. Facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for wastewater.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge					
<p>(a) Proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) where possible, new facilities are accommodated within existing waste water treatment sites; or</p> <p>(ii) where new facilities cannot be accommodated within existing sites, they are located on suitable previously-developed land or on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management facilities or general industrial uses.</p> <p>(b) Where location of the proposal in accordance with part (a) of this policy is not feasible in operational terms or is inappropriate for other reasons, proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) the proposal is necessary to support new development; or</p> <p>(ii) it is required to meet environmental standards or regulatory provisions.</p>					
Policy W6					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new wastewater facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment. Providing wastewater treatment facilities increases the capacity to accommodate development including economic development.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	Short term construction traffic movements likely to be significant for this type of facility. Establishment of new facility may cause some adverse impact although this is likely to be limited as inputs do not involve vehicle movements. Overall neutral rather than positive.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites in first instance and then pdl Where development cannot be accommodated in such areas, development elsewhere has to be acceptable in environmental terms. Therefore this should result in a no worsening of current and possible net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge					
<p>(a) Proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) where possible, new facilities are accommodated within existing waste water treatment sites; or</p> <p>(ii) where new facilities cannot be accommodated within existing sites, they are located on suitable previously-developed land or on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management facilities or general industrial uses.</p> <p>(b) Where location of the proposal in accordance with part (a) of this policy is not feasible in operational terms or is inappropriate for other reasons, proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) the proposal is necessary to support new development; or</p> <p>(ii) it is required to meet environmental standards or regulatory provisions.</p>					
Policy W6					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	NA	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites and towards pdl and away from greenfield and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new wastewater facilities built to modern standards more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy and include anaerobic digestion and supply of quality sludge into design.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge					
<p>(a) Proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) where possible, new facilities are accommodated within existing waste water treatment sites; or</p> <p>(ii) where new facilities cannot be accommodated within existing sites, they are located on suitable previously-developed land or on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management facilities or general industrial uses.</p> <p>(b) Where location of the proposal in accordance with part (a) of this policy is not feasible in operational terms or is inappropriate for other reasons, proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) the proposal is necessary to support new development; or</p> <p>(ii) it is required to meet environmental standards or regulatory provisions.</p>					
Policy W6					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new modern wastewater facilities more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that produce quality output suited to land application rather than landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Potential impacts on air quality from bioaerosols released from the composting process, but such operations would be regulated by the DM process & statutory bodies such as the EA. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective including 250m exclusion zone for bioaerosol protection. Some overall detriment in air quality might be experienced in short term while processes get established.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective. Provision of high quality sludge will improve soil quality.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Potential negative impacts of liquor but actual impacts DM process & statutory bodies such as the EA.

Policy W6: Management of Wastewater and Sewage Sludge					
<p>(a) Proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) where possible, new facilities are accommodated within existing waste water treatment sites; or</p> <p>(ii) where new facilities cannot be accommodated within existing sites, they are located on suitable previously-developed land or on existing, permitted, or allocated sites for built waste management facilities or general industrial uses.</p> <p>(b) Where location of the proposal in accordance with part (a) of this policy is not feasible in operational terms or is inappropriate for other reasons, proposals for the management of wastewater and sewage sludge will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>(i) the proposal is necessary to support new development; or</p> <p>(ii) it is required to meet environmental standards or regulatory provisions.</p>					
Policy W6					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new wastewater facilities built to modern standards more deliverable and therefore should contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that include anaerobic digestion into design with associated renewable energy production and offset of high carbon energy demand to meet parasitic load.
Assessment Summary	<p>The Policy prioritises development at existing facilities, on PDL, sites allocated for waste management facilities, or on general industrial sites.</p> <p>Broader implications of the Policy are likely to be negligible and/or mitigated as the policy aims to concentrate development at existing wastewater treatment works and/or within industrial areas, and development elsewhere has to be acceptable in environmental terms.</p>				

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste					
Proposals for the management of hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that they make a substantial contribution to meeting the needs of West Sussex for the treatment of the relevant waste stream(s).					
	Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	N	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	As policy supports additional facilities then perceived effects would be negative on baseline of status quo in the short to medium term as facilities are built and become operational. In the long term, as the facilities become more established and accepted, the effect is neutral.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	-	N	As above	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Sites would need to comply with policy W17: flooding, facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	This policy is likely to directly contribute to ensuring adequate provision of suitable waste facilities for hazardous and llr waste.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new facilities more deliverable. New facilities would create employment within the waste industry. Local provision of facility to meet industry needs should offer more cost effective management route.

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste					
Proposals for the management of hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that they make a substantial contribution to meeting the needs of West Sussex for the treatment of the relevant waste stream(s).					
	Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR. Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	Short term construction traffic movements likely to be significant for this type of facility. As policy does not specify ALR proximity establishment of new facility away from ALR may cause some adverse impact although sites would still need to meet Highway standards. Overall neutral in lifetime as without this policy waste would move out of county but that waste likely to move via ALR.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character. Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	This policy does not seek to direct proposed facilities away from areas that this objective seeks to protect therefore could have adverse impacts. Therefore this could result in a worsening of current as without this policy waste may continue to move out of County via ALR.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	This policy does not seek to direct proposed facilities away from areas that this objective seeks to protect therefore could have adverse impacts. Therefore this could result in a worsening of current as without this policy waste may continue to move out of County via ALR.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	As this policy seeks to provide for waste that might otherwise continue to be dealt with out of County this policy could have adverse effect. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective.

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste					
Proposals for the management of hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that they make a substantial contribution to meeting the needs of West Sussex for the treatment of the relevant waste stream(s).					
	Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	N	N	N	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable. However most treatment facilities unlikely to promote recycling except soil hospital type which would contribute positively to achieving this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. Contribution of contaminated soil no more than 10% haz waste arising so overall neutral.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N	NA	By providing guidelines for new facilities the policy should make new built facilities more deliverable. However much hazardous waste excluded from landfill so overall impact marginal. Soil hospital type would contribute positively to encouraging facilities that enable diversion from landfill. Contribution of contaminated soil no more than 10% haz waste arising so overall neutral.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	As this policy seeks to provide for waste that might otherwise continue to be dealt with out of County this policy could have adverse effect. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	As this policy seeks to provide for waste that might otherwise continue to be dealt with out of County this policy could have adverse effect. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	As this policy seeks to provide for waste that might otherwise continue to be dealt with out of County this policy could have adverse effect. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective.

Policy W7: Hazardous and Low Level Radioactive Waste					
Proposals for the management of hazardous waste and/or low level radioactive waste will be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that they make a substantial contribution to meeting the needs of West Sussex for the treatment of the relevant waste stream(s).					
	Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	NA	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as waste likely to be managed to appropriate standards via hazardous waste controls and PPC permits requiring encouragement of application of waste hierarchy on major industrial producers.
Assessment Summary	<p>The Policy supports development of an adequate arrangements for these waste streams, however, no reference is made to how the waste will be managed..</p> <p>What would be defined as a 'substantial contribution' could be more clearly defined to understand how policy might work in practice i.e. what threshold might apply to actually promote provision of capacity within the County..</p> <p>There is likely to be concern & anxiety about hazardous waste being dealt with anywhere in the County, due to negative perceptions about that type of waste. There may be concern caused by the uncertainty of not knowing where sites may be located.</p> <p>Another possible negative impact is that management of hazardous waste may not support movement up the waste hierarchy. However, this kind of facility is currently necessary for specific types of waste & the relevant treatments are not known at this stage.</p> <p>Other impacts will depend on the location, scale & design of facilities.</p>				

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land					
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites; (iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; (iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and (v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment; (ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere. 					
Policy W4					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	+	Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity	As policy restricts development of new landfill facilities then perceived effects would be positive on baseline of status quo of market operation. However this would be offset by the indirect effect of alternative facilities having to be provided (potentially including landfill capacity outside of the County). While the principal impacts of these are assessed under other policies their influence offsets the full positive effect to give overall neutral benefit in short and medium term. In the long term the phasing out of landfill likely to produce a positive legacy providing alternative means of restoring mineral sites are deployed
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	N	N	+	As above	As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Sites would need to comply with policies on flooding. facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land					
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites; (iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; (iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and (v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment; (ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere. 					
Policy W4					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	-	N	N	NA	By restricting supply of landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities in the short term. Over time this should be offset by provision of alternative management facilities. The full effect of these are assessed under other policies.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	-	N	N	NA	By restricting supply of landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities in the short term. Over time this should be offset by provision of alternative management facilities. The full effect of these are assessed under other policies.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to transport routes. Displacement of waste from these by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits - although the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies. This is offset to some degree by the limited lifespan of landfills. Positive effect could be offset if landfill in the County is not replaced by in county recovery and results in long distance movement to out of County landfill.

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land					
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites; (iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; (iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and (v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment; (ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective				Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character. Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to valued landscape. Only extension to existing site at Brookhurst Wood is proposed. They also represent large facilities that can negatively impact on landscape if not well screened albeit over a limited life. Displacement of waste from these by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits - although the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	N	N	N	NA	This policy seeks to direct proposed facilities towards existing sites and therefore this should result in a net overall benefit. i.e. without this policy new facilities may not have to meet this requirement However this benefit is offset by sites being potentially located in agricultural areas or in mineral voids that may not be fully exhausted.

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land					
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites; (iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; (iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and (v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment; (ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere. 					
Policy W4					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity & Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect. Landfill does offer longer term restoration opportunity but not an end itself.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By restricting landfill supply this policy indirectly promotes this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. However some loss of capacity to take outputs from recycling processes such as non-inert trommelled fines that may prove problematic to find alternative disposal routes.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	By restricting landfill supply this policy directly promotes this objective.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. By restricting supply this effect is minimised. Therefore overall positive compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply.

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land					
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites; (iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; (iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and (v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment; (ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective				Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. By restricting supply this effect is minimised. Therefore overall positive compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Landfill will give rise to some emissions regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. Potential long term failure of liner systems presents longer term risk of adverse legacy in aquifers too. By restricting supply this effect is minimised. Therefore overall positive compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N	NA	While restriction on supply of landfill will reduce methane production and potential for capture and utilisation of landfill gas to produce renewable energy landfill will generally give rise to fugitive emissions of methane regardless of how well it is controlled so negative effect where provided. By restricting supply this effect is minimised and opportunity created for alternative energy from waste technologies to be deployed that is more efficient converter of energy value of residual waste although this is not guaranteed by this policy. Therefore overall neutral effect compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply. i.e. elimination of fugitive methane vs. possible loss of energy value

Policy W8: Disposal of Non-Inert Waste to Land							
<p>(a) Proposals for the disposal of non-inert waste to land (including the extension of existing operations) will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b);(ii) the waste to be disposed of cannot be managed at existing and/or permitted recycling and treatment sites;(iii) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised;(iv) appropriate measures are included to recover energy from landfill gas; and(v) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. <p>(b) Any proposals for new non-inert landfill or landraise sites must accord with (a) and will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) they are only required for the disposal of residual waste arising in West Sussex following recycling and treatment;(ii) there are no opportunities to extend the operation of existing sites either within West Sussex or elsewhere.							
			Policy W4				
Appraisal Objective			Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary			<p>The Policy restricts to some degree an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill is essential in order to enable disposal of residues from other waste treatment processes that are higher up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>There is a possible risk of sterilising mineral resources. This is unlikely, as it might be possible to extract prior to development and stockpile resources if appropriate.</p> <p>The Policy seeks to promote the recovery of energy from landfill gas.</p> <p>There may be indirect negative impacts on health due to the public perception about the health risks of landfill sites, especially for non-inert waste. This could cause stress and anxiety. In long term, restoration would minimise impacts.</p> <p>Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites.</p> <p>Policy duplicates part of policy W1.</p>				

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
<p>The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:</p> <p>(a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b);</p> <p>(b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment;</p> <p>(c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material;</p> <p>(d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use;</p> <p>(e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c);</p> <p>(f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area;</p> <p>(g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and</p> <p>(h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20.</p>					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective			Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
					Mitigation/Enhancement
					Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses			N	N	-
					Policy should be applied alongside W19: Public Health and Amenity
					As policy restricts development of inert landfill facilities then perceived effects would be positive on baseline of status quo of market operation. However this would be offset by the indirect effect of alternative facilities having to be provided. While the principal impacts of these are assessed under other policies their influence offsets the full positive effect to give overall neutral benefit in short and medium term. In the long term the phasing out of inert landfill likely to produce a negative legacy as alternative means of restoring mineral sites may be limited.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks			N	N	+
					As above
					As above
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased			N	N	N
					Sites would need to comply with policy W17:Flooding. Facility design would need to incorporate SUDs.
					Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
<p>The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment; (c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material; (d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use; (e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c); (f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area; (g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and (h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective				Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	-	N	N	NA	By restricting supply of inert landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities in the short term. Over time this should be offset by provision of alternative management facilities. The full effect of these are assessed under other policies.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	-	N	N	NA	By restricting supply of inert landfill this policy may create problems for the supply of cost effective waste facilities in the short term. Over time this should be offset by provision of alternative management facilities encouraging recycling and reuse and supplying material back to the local economy. The full effect of these are assessed under other policies..
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W18: Transport, in order to minimise transport of waste & maximise use of ALR.	As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to transport routes. Displacement of waste from these by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits - although the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
<p>The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment; (c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material; (d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use; (e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c); (f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area; (g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and (h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Should be applied alongside Policy W11: Character. Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	As landfill locations tend to be dictated by geology they may not be optimally located with respect to valued landscape. They also represent large facilities that can be a blight on landscape if not exceptionally well screened albeit over a limited life. Displacement of waste from these by restricting supply towards new built facilities that can be located more flexibly brings a positive benefits - although the full effect of the alternatives are assessed under other policies.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	Should be applied alongside Policy W15: Historic Environment	As above
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	Add locational criteria as per other facility specific policies	This policy does not seek to direct proposed facilities away from areas that this objective seeks to protect therefore could have adverse impacts. This could be aggravated by sites being potentially located in agricultural areas or in mineral voids that may not be fully exhausted.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
<p>The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment; (c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material; (d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use; (e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c); (f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area; (g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and (h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W14: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy has no discernible effect on this aspect as specific site characteristics unknown. However reasonable to assume that any site provided will need to meet appropriate standards to safeguard this objective as would any proposal coming forward so neutral effect.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	By restricting landfill supply this policy indirectly promotes this objective by encouraging facilities that enable movement up the waste hierarchy. However some loss of capacity to take outputs from recycling processes that may prove problematic to find alternative disposal routes.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	N	N	N		By restricting landfill supply this policy directly promotes this objective although this does not relate directly to residual waste so neutral effect.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	Inert landfill does not generally give rise to fugitive emissions Therefore overall neutral effect compared with status quo of uncontrolled supply.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
<p>The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b); (b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment; (c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material; (d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use; (e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c); (f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area; (g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and (h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20. 					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	As above
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Should be applied alongside Policy W16: Air, soil & water	As above
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	N		Inert waste does not produce greenhouse gases.

Policy W9: Depositing of Inert Waste to Land					
The depositing of inert waste to land will not be permitted unless:					
(a) there is a need for the development in accordance with Policy W1(b);					
(b) the material to be used is only residual waste following recycling and treatment;					
(c) there is a genuine need to use the waste material as a substitute for a non-waste material;					
(d) the material to be reused is suitable for its intended use;					
(e) the amount of waste material to be used is no more than is necessary to meet the need identified under (c);					
(f) the proposal results in clear benefits for the site and, where possible, the wider area;					
(g) any important mineral reserves would not be sterilised; and					
(h) restoration to a high quality standard would take place in accordance with Policy W20.					
			Policy W4		
Appraisal Objective			Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term
			Mitigation/Enhancement		Commentary
Assessment Summary			The Policy restricts to some degree an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities in the short term. Landfill may be essential to enable disposal of waste from construction development. While recovery operations can accommodate, Environment Agency restrictions (as reflected in the proposed policy criteria) are constraining this outlet increasingly forcing such operations to be dealt with as landfill. Reflection of the criteria in this policy relating to landfill rather than recovery may prove to be overly restrictive if alternative options are not available forcing waste to travel to out of county landfill (as current)..		
			Necessity of policy to apply to residual waste for inert material is questionable. Landfill Directive treatment requirement allows for no treatment where not beneficial and freshly dug fill would be a case in point.		
			In terms of public health and amenity, the policy would give rise to overall neutral effects in the short and medium term as the positive effects of restricting landfilling in the county are off-set by the negative effects of having to find/develop alternative facilities. In the long term the phasing out of inert landfill may produce a negative legacy as alternative means of restoring mineral sites may be limited.		
			Other impacts depend on the location and previous or existing use of sites.		

Appendix H: Assessment of the Site Options

H1 The assessment of the main site options against the sustainability objectives is shown in the following tables.

Arun District waste sites

Shoreham Harbour, Shoreham (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal likely to form part of a wider, mixed-use redevelopment, which would need to be considered to ensure that the siting of the proposal was suitable for the proposed surrounding uses, not negatively affecting it.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	N	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise the site is low risk individually and in terms of safety, however medium risk cumulatively with other sites accessing the A27 via the A283, due to highway capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Some flexibility about the exact location of this proposal should mean that any effect on PROW can be avoided or mitigated. Potential to enhance PROW through regeneration of the area.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Flood Zone 3b, high risk area. Med-high risk of flooding from land, high risk from groundwater and sewers. However, flood risk to be addressed through the JAAP process once a specific site is identified.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help to meet social need for waste infrastructure and would support economic growth by providing employment opportunities in a regeneration area. Built waste facility could also supply heat and/or energy to buildings within the area.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Development would create employment for the local community. High quality development in this area would enhance vitality and viability by contributing to the regeneration of the wider area.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	+	N	N	N	+	NA	Proposal unlikely to affect tourism directly as the area is already quite industrial. Regeneration of the wider area may encourage investment in leisure facilities.

Shoreham Harbour, Shoreham (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal is located close to the Advisory Lorry Route and close to waste arisings from the south coast, Shoreham-by-Sea and Brighton and Hove; however, there are congestion problems locally. Regeneration of the area may lead to improvements of the transport network.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	+	+	+	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	The proposal, along with the associated surrounding regeneration is expected to enhance the townscape character and quality.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Mitigation of impacts on Conservation Areas, SAM, Listed Buildings and Archaeological Remains.	Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and SAM. Archaeological, geo-archaeological, historic building visual and conservation area visual impact assessments may be required at planning application stage to ensure no impact on the historic environment. The size of the regeneration area should mean that impacts can be avoided.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Unknown at this stage as exact siting not yet decided, however, location is likely to be on previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	SNCI on west side of Harbour, adjacent to River Adur SSSI. Impact assessments may be required at planning application stage (when a specific site is identified) to ensure no detrimental impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity. The size of the regeneration area should mean that impacts can be avoided.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is within chalk MSA but chalk resources are extensive and the site is within the built up area therefore no significant issues.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	-	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Proposal could affect AQMA in the area unless mitigation or improvements are provided through the regeneration of the area.

Shoreham Harbour, Shoreham (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/ waste regulation processes.	Site is within a built up area and land does not constitute the best and most versatile land. Development could help to remediate contaminated land, depending on where the site is located.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes. 30m buffer from rivers required.	SPZ3 and major aquifer. Controls and mitigation through the DM and waste regulation processes may be necessary to protect the water environment once an exact location is decided.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site part of mixed-use redevelopment therefore compatible uses can be located together and possible negative impacts could be avoided. Site could supply heat/energy to buildings in the surrounding area. Site may improve local economy by providing employment and contributing to other development/regeneration in the area. Local congestion problems but redevelopment of the area could lead to road improvements. Mitigation of impacts on SAM, Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and archaeological remains. Sites likely to be located on previously developed land. Impact assessment of SCNI and SSSI required to ensure there is no effect on biodiversity. Flood Zone 3b. Site may improve townscape character and quality through high quality design. Air quality mitigation measures required. Assessment of impact on water environment required. 							

Slindon Bottom (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are some isolated properties in the area, and a cluster of residential properties to the south and east. The amenity of the nearby residents could be affected by associated traffic or noise, although this can be controlled through the planning application process and is not considered to be significant. Site is a former gravel pit, but has had no workings recently. There are no other workings in the immediate area. Site could be restored to the benefit of residential amenity in the long term.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	-	-	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advises site is medium risk due to access route.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW runs along the north of the site. There maybe some impact, which can be controlled and mitigated through the DM process. In the long term there is opportunity for improvement as the site will be restored.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore development is appropriate. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	+	NA	Site would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create some employment in the short to medium term during landfilling. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. The site could be restored to beneficial afteruse for the local economy.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Fontwell racecourse and hotel nearby, but site would have no significant effect on these uses. However, site is located within South Downs National Park, and whilst there may be some effect in the short to medium term during operation there may be potential improvements in the long term through site restoration.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is 1.1km from the ALR (A27), but Slindon Bottom Road, Dukes Road and junction likely to require improvement.

Slindon Bottom (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal is likely to enhance landscape character in the long term due to restoration.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	N	-	-	N	N	Mitigation of archaeological remains. Geo-archaeological Impact Assessment required.	Possible significant impact on archaeological remains immediately adjacent to the site (prehistoric remains). No significant impact on the historic built environment.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is Greenfield but opportunities for inert landfill on PDL are unlikely as it usually occurs in former mineral workings which are not classified as PDL. Site can be restored to beneficial after use.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Adjacent to Ancient Woodland and SNCI which should be mitigated. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is close to waste arisings therefore potentially fewer vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	HRA, FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	SPZ 2/3 and major aquifer therefore hydro-geological risk assessment required to assess impact on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Possible restoration to beneficial after use that has positive impact on climate change.

Slindon Bottom (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to protect amenity of residents, particularly from HGV movements. ▪ Protection/mitigation of users of the PROW required. ▪ Possible impact on tourism as site is within the South Downs National Park but potential long term improvements to landscape through restoration of the site. ▪ Flood zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. ▪ Site would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth. ▪ Adjacent SSSI and ancient woodland will need to be protected and mitigated. ▪ Improvements to roads and access may be required. ▪ Geoarchaeological assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains. ▪ Hydrogeological Risk Assessment required. ▪ Mitigation of impacts on air quality. 							

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process.	Site contains existing industrial uses, and is adjacent to wastewater treatment works and Ford MRF. Amenity of dwellings beyond, to the north east and south west, could be affected by traffic movement or noise. Possible negative effects from the cumulative impact of other waste uses in the area.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	N	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site would be low risk individually, however medium risk when considered alongside Ford Airfield and Hobbs Barn due to access to the A27 via the Ford Road roundabout.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process.	There is a PROW to the north of the site which could be protected or mitigated. There may be opportunities to enhance amenity through additional landscaping.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore development is appropriate. Med-high risk of flooding from land. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	As the site is currently operating, there could there be a net loss or gain of employment. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Transport Assessment may be required.	Site is located approximately 2.2km from the A259, which is part of the Strategic Lorry Route. No access concerns subject to a routing agreement preventing access via Rollerston Park/B2233. Cumulative effect, when considered alongside Ford Airfield, would require a transport assessment to ensure no unacceptable impact.

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	+	N	+	+	+	N	Opportunities for enhancement through a landscaping scheme to reduce visual impact will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process.	Site is currently used as a concrete block manufacturing yard with minimal screening. Proposal would provide an opportunity to improve the landscape character and quality through high quality design and appropriate landscaping.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Opportunities for enhancement through a landscaping scheme to reduce visual impact will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process. Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains.	Site lies in the archaeologically rich coastal plain and there may be buried archaeological remains. Listed buildings to the north of the site need to be taken into account. However, setting may already be affected by industrial uses so there may be potential to improve landscaping to mitigate impacts.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is in use as a concrete block manufacturing site and would therefore make best use of previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	The site is an existing industrial estate and there are no significant effects on biodiversity and geodiversity.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	+	NA	Site is not within a MSA therefore no mineral safeguarding issues.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	The site is previously developed land therefore unlikely to comprise the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is located on a major aquifer.

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity of dwellings to the north east and south west, could be affected by traffic movement or noise. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Mitigation/protection of PRoW and possible enhancements to visual amenity and setting of listed building through landscaping. Flood Zone 1 therefore the sequential test is passed. No significant effect on the local tourism economy. Potential access issues, routing agreement likely to be required. Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains. Site would make best use of previously developed land. No significant effects on biodiversity. Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste being sent to landfill. Potential controls to protect the water environment (major aquifer). Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Ford Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process.	Site is adjacent to wastewater treatment works, Ford MRF and Ford prison. Amenity of dwellings beyond, to the north east and south west, could be affected by traffic movement or noise. Possible negative effects from the cumulative impact of other waste uses in the area.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health; however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site would be low risk individually, however medium risk when considered alongside Land adj Ford Sewage works and Hobbs Barn due to access to the A27 via Ford Road roundabout.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No PROWs directly affected and no significant effect on countryside users. The appearance and impact would be similar to existing uses.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is within Flood Zone 1 therefore development is appropriate. Med-high risk of flooding from land, high risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth. Potential for co-location of waste facilities therefore positive cumulative effect.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site would provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located close to the centres of population on the south coast and is 1.9km from the ALR (A259). No access problems anticipated subject to a routing agreement requiring access only via A259. When considered alongside Land adj Sewage Works, Ford, transport assessment required to ensure no unacceptable cumulative impact.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation (additional peripheral planting) and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is of little landscape character importance but area is generally flat and exposed.

Ford Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigate impact on buried archaeological remains. Archaeological impact assessment required.	Archaeological remains may be present on the site but could be mitigated through the planning application process.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	N	NA	Site is currently unused land which was part of Ford Airfield, adjacent to a business/industrial estate. It is technically greenfield but permission was previously granted for commercial development.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Ditches nearby which will need to be assessed but any impact could be mitigated. Potential to improve biodiversity through landscaping.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not within a MSA therefore no mineral safeguarding issues.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Site is grade 1 soil quality but is unlikely to be used for agricultural purposes as a commercial planning permission has been granted for the site and there are commercial uses surrounding the site.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is located on a major aquifer therefore appropriate controls may be necessary to ensure the protection of the water environment and wetland ecology.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Ford Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible impact on residential properties to the north east and south west as a result of traffic movements. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No PROW to be affected. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. No significant effect on tourism. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Close to the ALR. No significant impact on landscape but peripheral planting may be required. Mitigation of archaeological remains required. Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Loss of grade 1 agricultural soil but the site is a former airfield and an existing industrial area therefore unlikely to be used for agriculture. Site is located on a major aquifer therefore appropriate controls may be necessary to ensure the protection of the water environment. Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Hobbs Barn, Littlehampton (Built Waste Facility or Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Nearest residential properties are to the east of the site which could be affected by the proposal, although effects are not considered to be significant as effects may be controlled through the planning application process.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process	Possible indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Site is over 250m from the nearest residential property but the impact of bio-aerosols from any composting facility would need to be assessed. Highways Agency advise site would be low risk individually, however medium risk when considered alongside Land adj Ford Sewage works and Ford Airfield due to access to the A27 via Ford Road roundabout.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No PROWs would be likely to be affected by the proposal. Site not considered to have a significant effect on users of the countryside as the site is well screened.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. 30m buffer zone from rife required.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 3a. Preference should be given to lower risk sites, however 'less vulnerable' development such as open-air composting may be appropriate. Exception test required for 'more vulnerable' development such as built waste facilities.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site would provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including routing agreement and access improvements may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is adjacent to the ALR therefore minimising the need to use rural roads. No highways concerns, however, routing agreement and highway improvements (provision of right hand turn) may be required.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Existing site has good screening which could be retained or enhanced. Opportunity to improve landscape quality through high quality design.

Hobbs Barn, Littlehampton (Built Waste Facility or Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological mitigation required.	Possibility of buried archaeological remains. Listed buildings to the east of the site but as the site is well screened, there is not considered to be any significant impact.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Site is located on an existing industrial site.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Protection of hedgerows required. Other appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	No significant effect on biodiversity subject to protection of existing hedgerows.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not within a MSA therefore no mineral safeguarding issues.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Development may have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. Site is over 250m from the nearest residential property but the impact of bio-aerosols from any composting facility would need to be assessed. There may be some effect on air quality at the construction phase. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Site is grade 1 soil quality but is unlikely to be used for agricultural purposes as the site is an existing industrial area.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process. 30m buffer from rife required.	Site is situated on a major aquifer.

Hobbs Barn, Littlehampton (Built Waste Facility or Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant effect on properties to the east due to distance and the existing site screening. Site is over 250m from the nearest residential property but the impact of bio-aerosols from any composting facility would need to be assessed. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No PROW to be affected and the screening around the site mean that countryside users will not be significantly affected. Flood Zone 3a therefore sequential test and exception test required depending upon the flood risk vulnerability category of the use. No significant effect on tourism. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Close to the ALR but improvement to access and routing agreement may be required. No significant impact on landscape as the site is already well screened. Mitigation of archaeological remains required. No significant effect on biodiversity subject to protection of existing hedgerows. Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Loss of grade 1 agricultural soil but the site is an existing industrial area. Site is located on a major aquifer therefore appropriate controls may be necessary to ensure the protection of the water environment. Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Blue Prince Mushroom Site, Poling (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties to the east and west of the site which could be affected by the proposal, although effects are not considered to be significant as effects may be controlled through the planning application process and the site is an existing industrial estate. Potential impacts in the short term during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities. Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process	Modern built waste facility will have little or no impact on health; however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site would be high risk for highways safety due to direct access onto A27.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	-	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Protection/mitigation of PROW.	PROW runs around the south eastern corner of the site but impact not considered to be significant if there is protection/mitigation. There maybe some impact on countryside users in the short term due to construction. In the medium-longer term, although the site is in a sensitive landscape area, good design and further planting could ensure any impact was minimal and may improve the current appearance of the site.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site would provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is adjacent to the ALR (A27) therefore minimising the need to use rural roads.

Blue Prince Mushroom Site, Poling (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation will be necessary through the DM process. Additional planting required.	Proposal is for a similar use to existing industrial use, but the site is in a sensitive landscape area. Impact not considered to be significant subject to additional landscape planting.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological mitigation required and additional planting would help to screen any impact on the nearby listed building.	Possibility of buried archaeological remains. Listed buildings to the west of the site but additional planting could help screen any impact.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	The site is previously developed land and planning permission has been granted for in-vessel composting and commercial uses.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation necessary through the DM process. Northern boundary feature requires protection. If EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on the nearby SPA.	SNCI nearby, and protected plants have previously been recorded in the area, protection of the northern boundary feature required. Site is 8km from Arun Valley SPA/Ramsar and 10km from Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. HRA advises certain EfW types, alone or considered cumulatively with increased house building in the area could affect these sites, therefore if EfW is proposed, detailed analysis of proposals would be required to ensure no unacceptable impacts,
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	+	NA	Site is not within a MSA therefore no mineral safeguarding issues.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Whilst much of the site is Grade 1, the site has already been developed and is no longer the best and most versatile land. There may also be contamination on the site.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Ecology Assessment and appropriate mitigation and controls necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	The site on SPZ1. Site has already got planning permission for an in-vessel composting facility.

Blue Prince Mushroom Site, Poling (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential properties to the east and west of the site could be affected by the proposal, although effects are not considered to be significant as effects may be controlled through the planning application process and the site is an existing industrial estate. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PROW runs around the south eastern corner of the site but impact not considered to be significant if there is protection/mitigation. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. No significant effect on tourism. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Close to the ALR but direct access onto the A27 may not be acceptable in terms of highway safety. Additional planting required to improve landscape impact. Mitigation of archaeological remains required. No significant effect on biodiversity subject to protection of northern boundary feature. Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Loss of grade 1 agricultural soil but the site is an existing industrial area. Site is located on SPZ1 therefore appropriate controls may be necessary to ensure the protection of the water environment. Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Chichester District waste sites

Land south of Strettington flyover, (Church Farm) Tangmere (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	The nearest residential properties are some distance away and site is surrounded by agricultural land and the A27. No significant impact on residential properties or other uses.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	-	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be set out in the plan and implemented through the DM process	Site is over 250m from the nearest residential property but the impact of bio-aerosols from any composting facility would need to be assessed. HA advise site is high risk in terms of highway safety and capacity due to direct access onto the A27.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process	No PROWs would be affected by the proposal. The area is agricultural and a composting use is compatible with rural uses therefore no significant effect on other countryside users.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore the sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Facility would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site would provide some employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is adjacent to the ALR (A27) therefore minimising the need to use rural roads.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Screening required.	Site is located within an area of very open farmland and development may therefore affect landscape character as it would be difficult to screen.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological mitigation required.	Proposal is unlikely to affect the historic built environment but archaeological mitigation required.

Land south of Strettington flyover, (Church Farm) Tangmere (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	No specific ecological concerns at this site.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal may have both positive and negative effects. Facilities may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected by processes or transport of waste. More facilities closer to waste sources would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing transport distances. A built waste or composting facility could reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the amount of waste landfilled.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Site is grade 1 and 2 soil quality therefore site would lead to loss of good agricultural soil quality.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	No significant constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land south of Strettington flyover, (Church Farm) Tangmere (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant impact on residential properties or other uses. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Site is over 250m from the nearest residential property but the impact of bio-aerosols from any composting facility would need to be assessed. No PROW affected and no significant effect on countryside users as composting is appropriate use in a rural environment. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. No significant effect on tourism. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Close to the ALR but direct access onto the A27 may not be acceptable in terms of highway safety. Potential impact on landscape character due to openness of the site. Screening required. Mitigation of archaeological remains required. No significant effect on biodiversity. Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. Loss of grade 1 and 2 agricultural land. No significant impact on the water environment. Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Portfield, Chichester (Built Waste Facility, Inert Landfill, Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	-	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are residential properties and retail units to the west (across the A27) and residential and commercial uses to the south of the site. Although the site is well screened, there could be potential effects, particularly as the site has been used for mineral extraction and processing in the past.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	-	-	-	-	-	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health. Highways Agency advise site is high risk in terms of highway safety and capacity due to location of access and proximity to Portfield roundabout and Bognor Road roundabout.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	There is a PROW to the north of the site which would not be affected.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	FRA required for built waste element, focus on surface water drainage. Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Zone 2/3 with high groundwater. Development of site may lead to loss of flood storage provided by the existing mineral voids.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal is would provide a waste facility which would support social need and economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Concrete batching at the site has recently ceased. Development may create additional employment for the local community or replace that recently lost. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No significant direct effect on tourism, although a chimney stack could be visible from the main tourist route along the A27 towards Chichester.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Improved access would be required.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. It is also adjacent to the ALR (A27) therefore the use of rural roads would be minimised. Access to Shopwhyke Road may be required to be restricted by condition or routing agreement.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	-	N	N	N	N	Additional screening may be required for new facilities. Height restrictions may be required to protect views of Chichester Cathedral and SDNP.	Built waste facilities may be a visual improvement to the existing site, although existing (and any new) screening will minimise any effect on landscape and townscape character, however a chimney stack may have an impact on views to Chichester Cathedral and views upon the South Downs.

Portfield, Chichester (Built Waste Facility, Inert Landfill, Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Desk based archaeological and geo-archaeological assessment and archaeological mitigation required.	There are listed buildings to the east and south of the site but existing and any additional screening would minimise any impact. Possible impact on buried archaeological remains therefore mitigation required.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Part of the site has mineral voids and would therefore be regarded as Greenfield, however other parts of the site are used for aggregate processing and other industrial uses.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls through the DM process. Ecological survey required. If EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the SAC.	May be opportunities for enhancement, much of the site is covered by a hard surface or industrial buildings. HRA identifies a potential effect on Kingsley Vale SAC if EfW is proposed. Detailed assessment of any such proposal would therefore be required to ensure no unacceptable impact.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	A built waste facility or inert recycling on the site will help to move treatment of waste in the area up the waste hierarchy. Using the site for inert landfill would not move waste up the waste hierarchy, however, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development may have a limited effect on the existing air quality as existing crushing facilities would be replaced with other waste facilities. Using the site for a built waste facility or inert recycling could result in reduced vehicle emissions by reducing the need for landfill, and by reducing the distance waste is transported.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	The site is in an area of high groundwater levels and provides flood storage, therefore possible significant effects on groundwater.

Portfield, Chichester (Built Waste Facility, Inert Landfill, Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the site is well screened, there could be potential effects, particularly as the site has been used for mineral extraction and processing in the past (cumulative effects). Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No significant effect on users of PRoW or countryside. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed however the site would lead to a loss of flood storage. Possible indirect effects on tourism if a chimney stack is proposed. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Close to the ALR but access changes and improvements required. Height restrictions may be necessary to protect views of Chichester Cathedral spire and to South Downs National Park. Mitigation of archaeological remains required. Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC if EfW proposed. Ecological survey and mitigation required. Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. No loss of soil quality because site is a former mineral working. Potential significant effects due to high groundwater. HRA required. Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There is a car breakdown recovery centre and caravan park to the east of the site therefore possible impacts on these uses. To the west of the site, on the opposite side of the road are retail units.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise the site is acceptable and is classed as medium risk.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is well screened from the countryside. No PROWS are directly affected.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal is for built waste facilities for the recycling or treatment of waste, supporting social need and economic growth and encouraging waste up the waste hierarchy.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment opportunities. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	-	-	-	-	-	N	NA	Caravan sites to the east which is likely to be affected by the introduction of a waste use nearby. A chimney stack could be visible from the main tourist route along the A27 towards Chichester.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. Site has direct access to the ALR (A259) although there are existing congestion problems on the A27 which the site could contribute to when considered cumulatively. Access would be required to be a left in, left out arrangement only.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	-	N	N	N	N	Height restrictions may be necessary to protect views of Chichester Cathedral spire and to South Downs National Park.	A chimney stack may have an impact on views to Chichester Cathedral and views upon the South Downs.

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	N	-	-	-	N	A full record should be made of the wartime fuel depot structures. Archaeological and geo-archaeological assessments required.	Possible impact on wartime fuel depot structures on site.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is PDL and was previously used as a fuel depot.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological assessment and mitigation. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SAC.	There are no designations on the site but there may be issues with breeding common terns and other wildlife on nearby water bodies. HRA identifies a potential effect on Kingsley Vale SAC if EfW is proposed. Detailed assessment of any such proposal would therefore be required to ensure no unacceptable impact.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes. Desk top study to consider contamination required.	The soil quality is grade 4 and 5 and is not therefore the best and most versatile land. The site is also contaminated so there could be negative effects in the short term, however redevelopment of the site could provide an opportunity to remediate the site.

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Desktop study to consider contamination of site. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	No significant constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible impacts on uses to the east. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ No significant effect on users of PRoW or countryside. ▪ Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. ▪ Possible indirect effects on tourism if a chimney stack is proposed and on nearby caravan park. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. ▪ Close to the ALR but A27 is congested. Access would be required to be left in. left out only. ▪ Height restrictions may be necessary to protect views of Chichester Cathedral spire and to South Downs National Park. ▪ Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains required. ▪ Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC if EfW proposed. ▪ Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. ▪ No loss of soil quality because grades 4 and 5, although site is contaminated. ▪ No significant groundwater effects. ▪ Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Woodhorn Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties to south west but amenity could be protected through the planning application process. Villages in the surrounding area could be affected by traffic but if the facility is small (e.g. on-farm facility only), any effect is not considered to be significant.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	No PROWS are directly affected.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide some employment for the local community depending on the size of the facility. Impact on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located close to the ALR (3.4km from the A27, and 3.3km from the A29). No specific access concerns. Routing agreement may be required, however if the site is used as a local 'on farm' facility, the traffic impacts are not considered to be significant.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Screening required.	Development could affect landscape character through encroachment into Greenfield areas. Screening required to minimise landscape impact.

Woodhorn Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigation of archaeological remains. Archaeological and geo-archaeological assessment required.	Proposal unlikely to affect the built historic environment but possible impact on buried archaeological remains.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	N	NA	Proposal would involve development of Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SACs.	Existing hedges require protection or mitigation. HRA identifies possible effects on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC if EfW is proposed, particularly when considered cumulatively with other plans such as increased house building development. Therefore any proposal for EfW would require detailed assessment to ensure no negative impacts.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site would lead to loss of grade 1 agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes. 30m buffer from watercourse required.	There is watercourse near the site but not considered to be a significant constraint.

Woodhorn Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential properties to south west could be affected. Villages in the surrounding area could be affected by traffic but if the facility is small (e.g. on-farm facility only), any effect is not considered to be significant. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ No significant effect on users of PRoW or countryside. ▪ Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. ▪ No significant effect on tourism. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. ▪ Site is located within 3.3km from the ALR, however if the site is used as a local 'on farm' facility, the traffic impacts are not considered to be significant. ▪ Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains required. ▪ Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. ▪ Retention of hedgerows required. ▪ Site would help to move waste up the hierarchy leading to a reduction in waste to landfill and a reduction in greenhouse gases. ▪ Loss of grade 1 soil quality. ▪ No significant groundwater effects. ▪ Potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by diverting waste from landfill and generating energy, although the site would still generate traffic movements which produce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Pendean Sandpit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties around the site could be affected, particularly as there has been previous mineral working, however any effects should be controlled through the DM process.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. HA advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to west and south of the site may be affected. Appropriate protection and mitigation would be required through the DM process. Opportunity for improvement in the long-term as site will be restored.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	-	-	-	N	-	FRA, HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Major aquifer, part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b. Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to show development would be appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which may be affected in the short term during landfilling. There may be improvements in the long term as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There is an existing access to the road network, may require improvement. Site is located 309m from ALR. The site is not close to large urban areas, therefore waste may need to travel further. Consideration could be given to providing a single access serving both this site and Hawkhurst Farm, which would reduce traffic.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal would use inert material to restore pit to an agreed landform, opportunity for improvement to landscape in the long term.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigation of archaeological remains.	Isolated listed buildings surrounding the site but site is well screened therefore no significant effects on the historic built environment. Potential impact on buried archaeological remains.

Pendean Sandpit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield, as it is a former mineral working. Site would be restored following completion of inert landfilling.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological assessment may be required	Site may contain sensitive habitats and inert landfill may compromise restoration to heathland. Restoration of the site may improve biodiversity. There could be potential effects on the SSSI nearby.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	N	-	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is situated on a major aquifer and SPZ 2/3, therefore HRA required to assess groundwater impact.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is not close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore HGVs will have to travel further.

Pendean Sandpit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential properties around the site could be affected, particularly as there has been previous mineral working, however any effects should be controlled through the DM process. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Protection/mitigation of PROW to west and south required. Opportunity for improvement in the long-term as site will be restored. ▪ Part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b. ▪ Restoration of the site could provide opportunities for tourism. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. ▪ The site is not close to large urban areas, therefore waste may need to travel further. ▪ Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains required. ▪ Ecological assessment required as site may contain sensitive habitats. ▪ Site is a former mineral working and land is therefore it is not the best and most versatile land. ▪ Site is situated on a major aquifer therefore HRA required. ▪ The site is not close to large urban areas, therefore waste may need to travel further giving rise to increased greenhouse gases.

Boxgrove Gravel Pit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are some isolated residential properties around the site which might be affected but the effects could be controlled through the planning application process. The nearby village of Halnaker may be affected by lorry movements. There has been quarrying in the area in the past and inert landfill at a nearby site in Eartham therefore possible cumulative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	N	N	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste disposal techniques pose no risk to health. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the south of the site, controls and mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Opportunity for enhancement through additional planting and in the long term as part of restoration.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA, HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is in Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment for the local community. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. The site could be restored to beneficial afteruse for the local economy.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which may be affected in the short term during landfilling. There may be improvements in the long term as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is 1.6km from the ALR (A27) but highway improvements may be required. Routing and access will need to be considered as surrounding road network is rural. Consideration to be given to restricting the number of HGV movements to protect residential amenity.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Opportunity to improve the quality of the landscape in the long term as part of the restoration of the site.

Boxgrove Gravel Pit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Devil's Ditch earthworks to the immediate north. Mitigation may be required to ensure no harm to the setting of this Scheduled Ancient Monument. Setting may be enhanced in the long term.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield as a former mineral working site. Site could be restored to through inert landfill.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological survey and restoration to heathland required.	Some species of interest on the site which may require protection through the DM process. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is close to waste arisings therefore potentially fewer vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is situated on a major aquifer and SPZ 2/3, therefore HRA required to assess groundwater impact.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population). More sites close to sources of waste would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Boxgrove Gravel Pit (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Isolated residential properties around the site might be affected and the nearby village of Halnaker may be affected by lorry movements. Possible cumulative effects. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Protection/mitigation of PROW required. Opportunity for improvement in the long-term as site will be restored. Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Restoration of the site could provide benefits given the location of the site in the South Downs National Park. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. The site is close to large urban areas therefore minimising the distance waste may need to travel. Mitigation of Scheduled Ancient Monument. Setting may be enhanced in the long term. Ecological survey and restoration to heathland required. Site is a former mineral working and land is therefore it is not the best and most versatile land. Site is situated on a major aquifer and SPZ3 therefore HRA required. Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. 							

Land East of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are clusters of residential properties around the site, horticultural buildings to the west, a composting site to the south and wastewater treatment works to the north. Any waste use would need to be situated away from residential properties to minimise any impact but would be compatible with the nearby waste uses. Potential short term impacts during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency class the site as low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	-	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW runs to the east and south of the site and has the potential to be affected by the development, particularly during construction. Appropriate controls and mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. An energy from waste use could provide energy to the nearby horticultural development area (HDA) therefore providing benefits.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Tangmere Aviation Museum to the west but not considered to be significantly affected.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located 407m from the ALR (A27). No specific concerns subject to access being via City Fields Way.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site contains an area of open agricultural landscape, the character of which could be affected by the development, although there are existing industrial buildings on the site.

Land East of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	-	N	N	N	-	Geo-archaeological and archaeological assessment required.	Site could affect nearby listed buildings and Aldingbourne conservation area. Possibility of buried archaeological remains which would need assessment and mitigation.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	N	NA	Proposal would involve development on Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SACs.	Ecological survey required at DM stage to ensure any important species are protected. Hedgerows and existing wooded features should be retained. Protected species to the north of the site. HRA identifies possible effects on Kingsley Vale SAC and Dunton to Bignor Escarpment SAC if EfW is proposed, particularly when considered cumulatively with other plans such as increased house building development. Therefore any proposal for EfW would require detailed assessment to ensure no negative impacts.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is on grade 4 agricultural quality and therefore does not constitute best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is in SPZ2/3.

Land East of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cluster of residential properties around the site might be affected. Waste use compatible with composting and wastewater treatment works. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Protection/mitigation of PROW required. Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. The site is close to large urban areas therefore minimising the distance waste may need to travel. Protection/Mitigation of impact on listed buildings, conservation area and archaeological remains. Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. Protection of hedgerows, woody features and protected species required. Site is low grade agricultural land. Site is situated on SPZ3 therefore potential impacts on the water environment need to be explored. Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Potential for the waste use to produce energy from waste for surrounding uses. 							

South East Corner of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Aldingbourne village to the east, a composting site to the north and horticultural development area (HDA) to the north west. Potential impact on residents nearby, particularly the cumulative effect of nearby composting uses.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency class the site as low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	PROW or countryside users not significantly affected by the site.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. An energy from waste use could provide energy to the nearby horticultural development area (HDA) or farms therefore providing benefits.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Tangmere Aviation Museum to the west but not considered to be significantly affected.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is 1.7km from the ALR (A27). If site is small scale in conjunction with the farm, vehicle movements would not be significant. No specific concerns subject to access being via City Fields Way.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site would be situated on existing hard standing therefore no significant effect on landscape.

South East Corner of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	-	N	N	N	-	Geo-archaeological and archaeological assessment required.	Aldingbourne conservation area and listed buildings to the east therefore possible impact on their setting. Possibility of buried archaeological remains which would need assessment and mitigation.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Proposal would involve previously development land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SACs.	Ecological survey may be required to ensure any important species are protected. HRA identifies possible effects on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC if EfW is proposed, particularly when considered cumulatively with other plans such as increased house building development. Therefore any proposal for EfW would require detailed assessment to ensure no negative impacts.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is on grade 4 agricultural quality and therefore does not constitute best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

South East Corner of Tangmere Airfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aldingbourne village to the east may be affected but site compatible with adjacent composting uses. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ No significant impact on PROW or countryside users. ▪ Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ The site is close to large urban areas therefore minimising the distance waste may need to travel. ▪ If site is small scale in conjunction with the farm, vehicle movements would not be significant. ▪ Protection/Mitigation of impact on listed buildings, conservation area and archaeological remains. ▪ Ecological survey may be required. ▪ Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. ▪ Site is low grade agricultural land. ▪ No significant constraints on the water environment. ▪ Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions. ▪ Potential for the waste use to produce energy from waste for surrounding uses. 							

Bognor Common Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Some isolated residential properties in the surrounding area and Little Bognor village to the south which might be affected by lorry movements. Appropriate controls and mitigation may be required through the DM/waste regulation processes to ensure amenity is protected. Sandstone quarrying currently takes place at the site therefore possible cumulative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste disposal techniques pose no risk to health. Highways Agency advise the site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	-	-	-	+	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process e.g. improved landscaping/screening.	PROW surrounding and within the site therefore potential for significant effects. Potential for improvement in the long term due to restoration.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which may be affected in the short term during landfilling. There may be improvements in the long term as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located 1.2km from the ALR, however access is via narrow rural roads unsuitable for large numbers of HGVs. Site is not close to where waste arises therefore potential for waste to have to travel further.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Opportunity to improve the quality of the landscape in the long term as part of the restoration of the site.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological and geo-archaeological assessments and mitigation required.	Historic built environment (conservation area and listed buildings) will not be significantly affected. Mitigation of buried archaeological remains at the edges of the pits should be assessed and mitigated.

Bognor Common Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield as a former mineral working site, proposal would mean that site would be restored.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation necessary through the DM process. Ecological survey required. AA required at planning application stage to assess impact of noise on the Mens SAC bat population.	Development could affect SSSI, RIGSs and nearby Ancient Woodland. Potential for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration. HRA states that although site is within 10km of 4 SAC/SPA sites, negative impacts are unlikely. However, the Mens SAC is 500m away, therefore potentially noise could affect protected species. Further info required by Natural England as part of the DM process, to establish no adverse affect.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is located on a major aquifer therefore HRA required to assess impacts on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is not close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore HGVs will have to travel further.

Bognor Common Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some isolated residential properties in the surrounding area and Little Bognor village to the south which might be affected by lorry movements. Possible cumulative effects due to existing quarrying operations at the site. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Potentially significant effects on PROW or countryside users. Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. Site is not close to large urban areas therefore waste may need to travel further. Site is close to ALR but access is poor, via narrow rural roads. No significant impact on listed buildings and conservation area. Protection/mitigation of buried archaeological remains. Ecological survey may be required. Assessment required to ensure noise would not affect protected species within the Mens SAC Site is a quarry so no high grade agricultural land to be affected. Site is on major aquifer therefore possible impacts on the water environment. 							

Duncton Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No residential properties immediately adjoining the site and neighbouring land uses are countryside therefore no significant effect.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	-	-	-	+	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process e.g. improved landscaping/screening.	PROW surrounding and within the site therefore potential for significant effects. Potential for improvement in the long term due to restoration.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA, HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which may be affected in the short term during landfilling. There may be improvements in the long term as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	The site is 7km from the ALR (A283). Access is poor with little potential for improvement. Limit to the number of HGV movements would be required. Site is not close to main sources of waste therefore waste may have to travel further.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	The site is enclosed and there is unlikely to be a significant impact on landscape character provided landfill is limited. Potential for landscape improvements through restoration.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigation of buried archaeological remains.	Potential impact on buried archaeological remains therefore mitigation required.

Duncton Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield as a former mineral working site, proposal would mean that site would be restored.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	+	-	Appropriate mitigation necessary through the DM process. Applicant will be required to show no adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC through traffic or other operations.	Development could affect RIGS and Ancient Woodland. Appropriate controls/mitigation may be required through the DM process. Potential for enhancement in the long term. Site is close to Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. HRA identifies possible effect on air quality through traffic movement when considered cumulatively with other traffic increases on the A285. If 200 or more HGV movements per day are proposed, details of nitrogen deposition at the roadside would be required to ensure no unacceptable effect.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a quarry therefore would not constitute best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is located on a major aquifer, SPZ2/3 with high groundwater. HRA required to assess impact on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is not close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore HGVs will have to travel further.

Duncton Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No residential properties immediately adjoining the site and neighbouring land uses are countryside therefore no significant effect. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Potentially significant effects on PROW or countryside users. ▪ Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is not close to large urban areas therefore waste may need to travel further. ▪ Site is 7km from ALR and access is poor with little potential for improvement. ▪ Protection/mitigation of buried archaeological remains. ▪ Ecological survey may be required. ▪ Assessment required of any impacts on Kingsley Vale SAC and Duncton to Bignor Escarpment SAC. ▪ Site is a quarry so no high grade agricultural land to be affected. ▪ Site is on major aquifer, SPZ2 and 3 and high groundwater therefore possible impacts on the water environment. 							

Old Lime Kiln Works, Cocking (Built Waste Facility or Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties to the north, farm to the south which might be affected by lorry movements. Appropriate controls and mitigation may be required through the DM/waste regulation processes to ensure amenity is protected. Site was former lime works and there was chalk extraction nearby therefore possible cumulative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. HA advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Development of site and cumulative impact of development at nearby Cocking Quarry could affect the PROW which runs to east of site and across the route that links the old lime works and Cocking Chalk pit.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	-	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which could be affected by a waste facility on the site.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	-	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site has potential to directly access the A286, however, the ALR is 5km away to the north. Access would require significant improvements. The site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further. Allocation of both this site and Cocking Quarry, and provision of a single access, may reduce traffic.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is well screened therefore landscape impact is not likely to be significant.

Old Lime Kiln Works, Cocking (Built Waste Facility or Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigation of archaeological remains.	Conservation area and listed buildings to the north but site is well screened therefore unlikely to be affected. Possible impact on buried archaeological remains therefore mitigation required.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Site is on previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	No significant effect on biodiversity but ecological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	An inert recycling facility would provide secondary materials, which may help preserve primary mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former lime kiln works and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is located on a major aquifer and SPZ 3.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Old Lime Kiln Works, Cocking (Built Waste Facility or Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential properties to the north, farm to the south which might be affected by lorry movements. Possible cumulative effects due to past chalk extraction nearby. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Potentially significant effects on PROW or countryside users. ▪ Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is not close to large urban areas therefore waste may need to travel further. ▪ Site is located close to the ALR but access to it may require improvements and other controls through the DM process. ▪ Ecological survey required. ▪ Site is previously development land so no high grade agricultural land to be affected. ▪ Site is on major aquifer and SPZ 3 therefore possible impacts on the water environment. 							

Cocking Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties to the north, farm to the west which might be affected by lorry movements. Appropriate controls and mitigation may be required through the DM/waste regulation processes to ensure amenity is protected. Site is a former quarry and there is a lime works nearby therefore possible cumulative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW runs to the east and west of the site which could be affected by proposals, particularly if the old kiln works is operated in conjunction with the site.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA, HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which could lead to short term negative impacts during landfilling but long term improvements as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site has potential to directly access the A286 through the Old Lime Kiln Works site. ALR is 5km away. Access would require significant improvements. The site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further. Allocation of both this site and Old Lime Kiln Works, and provision of a single access, may reduce traffic.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is well screened therefore landscape impact is not likely to be significant. Potential for landscape enhancements following restoration.

Cocking Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Conservation area and listed buildings to the northwest but unlikely to be significantly affected.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield as a former mineral working site, proposal would mean that site would be restored.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is RIGs, adjacent to SNCI and Ancient Woodland. Ecological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is located on a major aquifer and SPZ 3. HRA required to assess impact on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is not close to likely sources of waste (centres of population) therefore HGVs will have to travel further.

Cocking Quarry (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential properties to the north, farm to the west which might be affected by lorry movements. Possible cumulative effects due to past chalk extraction and old lime kiln works. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Potentially significant effects on PROW or countryside users. ▪ Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is not close to large urban areas therefore waste may need to travel further. ▪ Site is located close to the ALR but access to it may require improvements and other controls through the DM process. ▪ Ecological survey and mitigation required. ▪ Site is a former mineral extraction site, land would not constitute best and most versatile land. ▪ Site is on major aquifer and SPZ 3 therefore possible impacts on the water environment. 							

Horsham District waste sites

Shoreham Cement Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties to the north, which might be affected. Site is a former quarry and cement works with existing inert recycling operations, therefore possible cumulative effects.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise the site is low risk individually and in terms of safety, however medium risk cumulatively with other sites accessing the A27 via the A283, due to highway capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There is a PROW to the east of the site but this is unlikely to be further affected by development on the site. The site is also within the South Downs National Park and would be highly visible to countryside users but there is potential for visual enhancement through development.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Flood zone 1. Development to be directed away from western edge of the site which is flood Zone 2. Med-high risk of flooding from land. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities within the county, thereby helping to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions near the site to be affected. Although the site is situated within the South Downs National Park, development of a waste facility may not have a more detrimental impact than the existing buildings. There could be long term improvements if the site is remediated and restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. Site is located on the ALR and is supported by good access.

Shoreham Cement Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	The site is within the South Downs National Park and a waste proposal on the site could involve the re-development of the site, or refurbishment of existing buildings which could contribute to the enhancement of landscape character although the site would not be restored fully.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	-	-	-	+	N	Assessment and mitigation of nearby SAM.	Restoration of the existing buildings could contribute to industrial heritage. Possible impact on the setting of the SAM at the top of the quarry but if the site is restored, possible improvements in the long term.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	The site is a disused chalk quarry and has not been restored. There are existing buildings on the site therefore the site would be making best use of previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	+	N	Potential to preserve part of the site in its current state and to create new habitats and introduce new species into the area. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Potential negative effects on SNCI to the west, SSSI on the site and protected species nesting within the existing quarry. Potential for long term ecological enhancement.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	+	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the need for landfill. Existing inert recycling facility on the site which may be lost if the site is redeveloped for alternative recycling facilities.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	+	N	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development may have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality at the construction phase. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	+	NA	Site occupied by disused cement works and may be contaminated. It does not constitute best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is situated on a major aquifer.

Shoreham Cement Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Residential properties to the north, possible cumulative effects due to past chalk extraction, cement manufacture and inert recycling. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ PRoW unlikely to be affected. The site may also be highly visible to countryside users but there is potential for visual enhancement through development. ▪ Development to be directed away from western edge of site, which is Flood Zone 2. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is located close to ALR and close to large urban areas therefore waste may not need to travel as far. ▪ Possible impact on SAM therefore assessment and mitigation required. Potential for restoration of existing buildings as industrial heritage. ▪ Potential negative effects on SNCI to the west, SSSI on the site and protected species nesting within the existing quarry. Potential for long term ecological enhancement. ▪ Site is a former mineral extraction site and cement works therefore land would not constitute best and most versatile land. Site would make best use of previously developed land. ▪ Site is on major aquifer therefore possible impacts on the water environment. ▪ Potential for the waste use to produce energy from waste for surrounding uses. 							

Nowhurst Business Centre, Strood Green (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Isolated residential properties in the area, farms and school nearby but not considered to be significantly affected. Existing industrial use on the site (civil engineering depot).
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity, however medium risk cumulatively if Brookhurst Wood and Langhurstwood are also allocated due to capacity of M23 Junction 11.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Mitigation/protection of PROW required.	Nearby PROW to the south but unlikely to be significantly affected. Redevelopment of an existing commercial site with opportunity for enhancement.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Flood zone 1. Development to be directed away from western edge of the site which is flood Zone 2 and 3b. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would move waste up the waste hierarchy and will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site located 347m from the ALR, with good access. It is close to a large centre of population to the north of the county meaning waste is transported shorter distances.

Nowhurst Business Centre, Strood Green (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Redevelopment of an existing commercial site which is well screened. No significant impact on landscape.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Assessment and mitigation of archaeological remains.	Listed buildings nearby but unlikely to be affected. Buried archaeological remains require mitigation.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is currently occupied and is considered previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Suitable landscaping conditions could enhance the existing biodiversity/geodiversity.	There are no designations but boundary hedges and tree line should be avoided.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.

Nowhurst Business Centre, Strood Green (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development may affect the amenity of the nearby residents and school therefore mitigation required. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Protection/mitigation of PRoW required. ▪ Development to be directed away from western edge of site which is Flood Zone 2 and 3b. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is located close to ALR and close to large urban areas therefore waste may not need to travel as far. ▪ No significant impact on listed buildings but mitigation of buried archaeological remains required. ▪ There are no designations but boundary hedges and tree line should be avoided. ▪ Site would make best use of previously developed land. ▪ No significant impact on best and most versatile land. ▪ No major constraints on water environment. ▪ Site may produce some greenhouse gas emissions, particularly through HGV movements but also potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through diverting waste from landfill. ▪ Potential for the waste use to produce energy from waste for surrounding uses. 							

Brookhurst Wood (Built Waste Facility, Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Some residential properties in wider area, clay pit to the east, brickworks on the site, industrial units to the north. No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses on site and surrounding area. In the long term, part of the site will be restored.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity, however medium risk cumulatively if Langhurstwood and Nowhurst are also allocated due to capacity of M23 Junction 11.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Protection/mitigation of PROW.	There is a PROW to the north and east of the site but unlikely to be significantly affected.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is in Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Positive effects as proposal is for suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is relatively close to a large centre of population, meaning waste is transported shorter distances. There is also potential for co-location of waste uses. The site benefits from being located 798m from the ALR (A264).
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Site currently has adequate screening, however new facilities may require additional landscaping/screening.	Site is likely to enhance landscape character in the long term due to restoration.

Brookhurst Wood (Built Waste Facility, Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Mitigation of archaeological remains.	Listed buildings nearby but unlikely to be affected as the site is well screened. Buried archaeological remains require mitigation.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Part of the site is brownfield and part is has a restoration scheme, which makes it technically greenfield.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary though the DM process. Assessment/mitigation of rare species required at planning application stage.	There are no designations but potentially protected species which would required survey and mitigation. Boundary hedges and tree line should be avoided. Opportunities for enhancement in long-term.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is a brickworks therefore mineral resources should have been excavated.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site incorporates both treatment, which will encourage waste up the waste hierarchy, and landfill which does not. However there will be a need for some landfill whatever recycling/treatment process is used.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	-	+	-	N	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development, specifically the landfill, is likely to have an adverse impact on existing air quality without appropriate controls. This can be controlled and mitigated through the planning and waste regulation processes to minimise impacts. The built waste facility would reduce the amount of waste being landfilled, contributing to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land, although the site is occupied by buildings.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is likely to have both positive and negative effects as treatment will reduce the need for landfill, but landfill will produce some greenhouse gases. There is potential for the use of landfill gas for energy.

Brookhurst Wood (Built Waste Facility, Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses on site and surrounding area and in the long term, the site will be restored. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Protection/mitigation of PRoW required. ▪ Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. ▪ Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is located close to ALR and close to large urban areas therefore waste may not need to travel as far. ▪ No significant impact on listed buildings but mitigation of buried archaeological remains required. ▪ Assessment/mitigation of rare species required at planning application stage. ▪ Site would make best use of previously developed land and part of the site would be restored after landfill. ▪ Site is not the best and most versatile land. ▪ No major constraints on water environment. ▪ Some greenhouse gases produced from non-inert landfill and HGV movements but there is potential for the use of energy from landfill gas or from the built waste facility. 							

Langhurstwood Quarry (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Some residential properties in wider area, landfill to the west, brickworks to the south west, business units to the north. No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses on site and surrounding area. In the long term, the site will be restored.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity, however medium risk cumulatively if Brookhurst Wood and Nowhurst are also allocated due to capacity of M23 Junction 11.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	-	-	-	+	N	Protection/mitigation of PROW.	There is a PROW to the south and east of the site which could be affected, therefore appropriate protection/mitigation required. Potential improvements in the long term.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is in Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Positive effects as proposal is for suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is relatively close to a large centre of population, meaning waste is transported shorter distances. There is also potential for co-location of waste uses. Site located 1.4km from the ALR (A264). Access may require improvement if increased numbers of HGV movements are proposed.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Site currently has adequate screening, however new facilities may require additional landscaping/screening.	Site is likely to enhance landscape character in the long term due to restoration.

Langhurstwood Quarry (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	There are no designations on the site and no significant effects on archaeological remains due to previous works.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	The site is a clay pit and is therefore a Greenfield site, although mineral voids are suitable locations for non-inert landfill.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary though the DM process. Assessment/mitigation required.	Potentially significant effect on the SSSI, SNCI and ancient woodland. Opportunities for enhancement in long-term.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is a brickworks therefore mineral resources should have been excavated.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is for landfill which does not encourage waste up the hierarchy. However there will be a need for some landfill whatever recycling/treatment process is used.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	-	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	The landfill is likely to have an adverse impact on existing air quality without appropriate controls. This can be controlled and mitigated through the planning and waste regulation processes to minimise impacts.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints therefore impact on water environment not considered to be significant.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Landfill will produce some greenhouse gases, however, there is potential for the use of landfill gas for energy.

Langhurstwood Quarry (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses on site and surrounding area. In the long term, the site will be restored. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Protection/mitigation of PRoW required. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test passed. Potential for creation of employment opportunities. Other possible impacts on local businesses are not considered to be significant. Site is located close to ALR and close to large urban areas therefore waste may not need to travel as far. No significant impact the historic environment. Assessment/mitigation of impact on SSSI and SNCI required. Site does not make best use of previously developed land but mineral voids are suitable locations for non-inert landfill. Site is not the best and most versatile land. No major constraints on water environment. Greenhouse gases produced from non-inert landfill but potential for use of landfill gas for energy. 							

Laybrook Brickworks (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	-	-	-	+	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential properties and farms in the wider area and villages nearby therefore possible direct and indirect negative effects due to landfilling and HGV movements. Site is an existing brickworks. In the long term the site will be restored.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the north, south east and west but would not be directly affected. Potential impacts on users of the countryside. Site is likely to have a positive effect in the long term due to restoration providing the opportunity to enhance the surrounding environment.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Part of the site is categorised Flood Zones 2 and 3b, however, detailed modelling for the site (completed in 2009) shows the site to be in flood zones 1 and 2. Detailed FRA required at planning application stage to show development would be appropriate,
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Development of the site helps to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities, and should not interfere with the existing mineral working, therefore may have a positive effect on social need and economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Development of the site is likely to have a positive effect as any existing employment on the site could be augmented by employment in a parallel waste operation. Positive effect in the medium term as the landfill will continue to provide employment after the claypit workings have ceased.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located 3.3km from the ALR (A24). Waste may have to be transported long distances to the site. Access improvements and a routing agreement would be required, alongside widening of the B2133

Laybrook Brickworks (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is enclosed and landscape is unlikely to be affected. Positive effect in the long term due to restoration.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Assessment/mitigation of archaeological remains. Visual impact assessment/mitigation of nearby listed buildings.	Listed building nearby and buried archaeological remains may be affected.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	The site is a clay pit and is therefore a Greenfield site, although mineral voids are suitable locations for non-inert landfill.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There may be some negative effects on the RIGS. Potential impact on boundary hedgerows unless they can be omitted from the site. Opportunities for enhancement in the long-term.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is a brickworks therefore mineral resources should have been excavated.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	-	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	The landfill is likely to have an adverse impact on existing air quality without appropriate controls. This can be controlled and mitigated through the planning and waste regulation processes to minimise impacts.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints therefore impact on water environment not considered to be significant.

Laybrook Brickworks (Non-Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Landfill will produce some greenhouse gases, however, there is potential for the use of landfill gas for energy.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible direct and indirect negative effects due to landfilling and HGV movements. In the long term the site will be restored. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ No significant effect on PRoW. ▪ Detailed modelling (in 2009) has shown the site to be in Flood zones 1 and 2. ▪ Existing employment on the site could be augmented by employment in a parallel waste operation. Landfill will continue to provide employment after the claypit workings have ceased. ▪ Site is 3.3km to the ALR but access may be a problem. ▪ No significant impact the historic environment. ▪ Potential impact on boundary hedgerows unless they can be omitted from the site. Opportunities for ecological enhancement in the long-term. ▪ Site does not make best use of previously developed land but mineral voids are suitable locations for non-inert landfill. ▪ Site is not the best and most versatile land. ▪ No major constraints on water environment. ▪ Greenhouse gases produced from non-inert landfill but potential for use of landfill gas for energy. 							

Chantry Lane (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located close to Storrington with residential properties to the north and west of the site. Amenity may require protection through the DM process.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	-	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise the site is low risk individually and in terms of safety, however medium risk cumulatively with other sites accessing the A27 via the A283, due to highway capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the south of the site could be affected by development. Site is also adjacent to the South Downs National Park therefore potential impact on countryside users. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration and landscaping.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Flood zone 1. Development to be directed away from western tip of site which is flood Zone 3b. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	+	N	NA	There are no tourist attractions nearby but the site is situated within the South Downs National Park which could lead to short term negative impacts during landfilling but long term improvements as the site is restored.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM.	Site is well related to the ALR, located approximately 2.3km from the Strategic Lorry Route. A new access and other DM controls such as a routing agreement may be required.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is enclosed with few views from outside. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration.

Chantry Lane (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological assessment and mitigation.	Listed building adjacent to the site. Area is of possible archaeological interest. Archaeological survey, mitigation and controls may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	Site is technically Greenfield as a former mineral extraction site although former mineral voids are suitable locations for landfill and the site would be restored.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological survey and mitigation required. Boundary hedgerows should be retained.	Proposal could affect RIGS and SSSI, but opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration. Site is 5km from Arun Valley SPA/Ramsar and adjacent to watercourse that drains into the river Stor, however, HRA concludes that inert landfill would have no likely significant effects on the SPA/Ramsar site.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal may require a routing agreement to avoid HGVs contributing to congestion and pollution in Storrington which has an AQMA. More facilities closer to waste sources would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing transport distances.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	N	N	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is on a major aquifer, HRA required to assess potential impact on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Possible restoration to beneficial after use that has positive impact on climate change.

Chantry Lane (Inert landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amenity of nearby houses may require protection through the DM process. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ PRoW requires protection/mitigation. ▪ Development to be directed away from western tip of site which is flood Zone 3b. ▪ Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is close to the ALR but new access may be required. ▪ Assessment/Mitigation of archaeological remains. ▪ Site does not make best use of previously developed land but mineral voids are suitable locations for landfill. ▪ Ecological survey and mitigation required. Boundary hedgerows should be retained. ▪ Site is not the best and most versatile land. ▪ Potential impact on the environment therefore HRA required. ▪ Potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. 							

Star Road Trading Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is within an industrial area with residential properties beyond and waste use considered compatible with industrial uses.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM.	PROW to the south east of the site but unlikely to be affected provided there is protection/mitigation.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including routing agreement and access improvements may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located 4.4km from the A24. Routing agreement should be considered and improvements to access and B2135 junction may be required.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal would be adjacent to an industrial area and there is not considered to be a significant impact on landscape.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological and industrial archaeological impact assessment required. Mitigation required.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.

Star Road Trading Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is classed as previously developed land, and is located within an industrial area.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological survey and mitigation.	No ecological designations but ecological survey and mitigation may be required protection for important species may be required, particularly during construction.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the brick clay MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints therefore impact on water environment not considered to be significant.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Star Road Trading Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surrounding uses (industrial) considered compatible with waste uses. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PRoW requires protection/mitigation. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site is not close to the ALR therefore waste may need to travel further and on rural roads. Assessment/Mitigation of archaeological remains required. Site would make best use of previously developed land. Ecological survey and mitigation may be required protection for important species. Site is not the best and most versatile land. No significant effect on the water environment. Potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements but potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through diverting waste from landfill and energy from waste. 							

Golding Barn (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM.	Some properties in the surrounding area and industrial uses adjacent to the site but not considered to be significantly affected.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the north east of the site. Potential for amenity to be affected although this can be minimised and mitigated through the DM process. Potential for enhancement in the long term due to restoration.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Medium risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated..
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Routing agreement and other appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	The site is 2.3km from the ALR to the south, and is close to where the waste arises on the south coast. Appropriate DM controls may be required including a routing agreement to avoid villages to the north. Access improvements may also be required.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is well screened with few views from outside. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term due to restoration.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Proposal is unlikely to affect the historic environment.

Golding Barn (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	As a former mineral extraction site, site is technically Greenfield. Site will be restored.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	N	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Development could affect RIGS and SSSI. Mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	NA	No mineral sterilisation issues as the site is a former quarry. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is close to waste arisings therefore potentially fewer vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	HRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is on a major aquifer and SPZ2/3. HRA required to assess impact on groundwater.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population). More sites close to sources of waste would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Golding Barn (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site not considered to have a significant effect on surrounding uses although HGV routing required to avoid traffic movements through villages to the north. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PRoW requires protection/mitigation. Flood Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site 2.3km from the ALR and is close to where the waste arises. No significant effect on the historic environment. Site is a former quarry which is Greenfield but inert landfill is suitable in mineral voids. Development could affect SSSI therefore mitigation required. Opportunity for enhancement in the long term as part of restoration. Site is a former quarry therefore not the best and most versatile land. Potential impact on the water environment. Potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. 							

Broadbridge Farm (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located to the east of Ashington, across the A24. There are existing wastewater treatment works and farm to the west of the site. Some mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to protect amenity. Nearest residential properties are over 250m away.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	There could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No PROW likely to be affected and no significant effect on users of the countryside.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. Direct development away from Southern edge.	The southern edge of the site is in flood zone 3b; sequential test concludes development is appropriate if development is directed away from this area. Med-high risk of flooding from land. History of sewer and fluvial flooding in the surrounding area but not on the site.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development will create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located adjacent to the ALR. Site would not have a significant impact on local road network. Some improvements may be required to the access and to A24 slip road/Hole Street junction.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Potential for proposal to affect the character of the landscape as the site is open greenfield, although impacts may be mitigated through additional planting.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological assessment and mitigation.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required to ensure no impact on the historic environment.

Broadbridge Farm (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	N	NA	Site is Greenfield land and does not make best use of previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Protection of boundary hedgerows.	Badger sett on the western boundary and great crested newts found in fishing lakes to the south. Potential for dust plumes from a wood breaker would have a negative impact upon ponds.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the brick clay MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal may have both positive and negative effects. Facilities may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected by processes or transport of waste. More facilities closer to waste sources would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing transport distances.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No significant constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	A composting facility would help to reduce the need for landfill and could thereby contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

Broadbridge Farm (Composting)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to protect amenity. Nearest residential properties are over 250m away. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No significant impact on PROW or countryside users. The southern edge of the site is in flood zone 3b, however, provided this area can be avoided, no significant effect. Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR. Archaeological assessment and mitigation. Site is Greenfield land. Impact on ecology needs assessment. Site grade 3 soil quality. No significant impact on the water environment. Composting would help to reduce the need for landfill but there is potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. 							

Land at North Farm, A24 (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM.	Site would be within or adjacent to an existing industrial area. Few residential properties nearby, amenity may require some protection through the DM process, particularly during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Bridleway runs to the south of the site. Protection/mitigation may be required through the DM process to protect amenity, there is an opportunity for enhancement due to good design and landscaping.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Zone 1. Med-high risk of flooding from land. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Development will create further employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are no tourist attractions in the area however, the site is situated within the South Downs National Park therefore potential to affect tourism.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including access improvements may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is adjacent to the ALR. Improvements to access/egress onto A24 desirable. This could be secured through the DM process.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Development may affect the character of the landscape, however, development may improve landscape quality through good design and landscaping, and may encourage renovation of the existing industrial buildings which are in a poor state of repair.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological and geo-archaeological survey	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.

Land at North Farm, A24 (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	N	NA	Proposal is likely to involve development of Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SPA.	No specific ecological concerns on this site. Site is 8km from Arun Valley SPA/Ramsar. HRA identifies a possibility of a negative effect if an EfW facility is proposed, when considered with other plans affecting air quality, such as increased housing development.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the chalk MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources, however due to the extent of the chalk resources, the impact is not significant.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	Site is grade 1 and 2 soil quality therefore site would lead to loss of good agricultural soil quality.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	SPZ 2. No major constraints therefore impact on water environment not considered to be significant.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land at North Farm, A24 (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site would be within or adjacent to an existing industrial area with few residential properties nearby, amenity may require some protection through the DM process, particularly during construction. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PROW would require protection/mitigation. Site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR but access improvements may be required. Archaeological assessment and mitigation required. Ecological assessment required if EfW is proposed, to ensure no impact on SPA. Site is Greenfield land. Site is high quality agricultural land. No significant impact on the water environment. Potential to reduce the need for landfill but there is potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. 							

Hampers Lane Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	N	N	N	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Kennels to the south of the site, disused pit to the north and existing quarry to the west. Amenity unlikely to be impacted from activities on site, however, controls and mitigation through the DM process may be necessary to ensure this. There is a history of mineral working in the area therefore cumulative effects are negative.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the west of the site and South Downs National Park to the south. Protection/mitigation of PROW may be required through the DM process to protect amenity, there is an opportunity for enhancement due to good design and landscaping.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1. Med-high risk of flooding from land. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Development will create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are no tourist attractions in the immediate vicinity but the South Downs National Park is situated to the south of the site therefore potential to affect tourism.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including routing agreement and access improvements may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is close to the ALR but access may need to be improved or moved, right turn lane would be required. Routing agreement may be required to ensure access is from the east/A24 only.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is well screened therefore no significant effect on landscape character.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological and Industrial Archaeological Impact Assessment Required.	Listed building nearby but site is well screened and considered unlikely to affect its setting. Buried archaeological remains.

Hampers Lane Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is previously developed land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological survey required. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SPA.	Ecological survey and mitigation may be required. Great crested newts on site. Site is 6km from Arun Valley SPA/Ramsar. HRA identifies a possibility of a negative effect if an EfW facility is proposed, especially when considered with other plans affecting air quality, such as increased housing development. Therefore detailed assessment would be required of any such proposal to ensure no unacceptable impact.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	N	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the unconsolidated sand MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development may have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality at the construction phase. Proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions by helping to reduce landfill. Traffic would need to be diverted away from Storrington to avoid further impact on the AQMA.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is grade 1 agricultural land but has been previously developed and may be contaminated.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is on a major aquifer.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Hampers Lane Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amenity of surrounding uses unlikely to be impacted from activities on site. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ PROW would require protection/mitigation and appropriate controls may be necessary to protect amenity of countryside users. ▪ Site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. ▪ Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is close to the ALR but access improvements may be required. ▪ Archaeological assessment and mitigation required. ▪ Ecological survey and mitigation required. Detailed assessment required if EfW is proposed to ensure no unacceptable effect on SPA. ▪ Site is previously developed land. ▪ Soil is not high agricultural quality. ▪ Potential impacts on the water environment. ▪ Potential to reduce the need for landfill but there is potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. Potential for site to produce energy from waste. 							

Mid Sussex District waste sites

Burleigh Oaks Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Some isolated properties in the surrounding area. Site is already an existing waste site. Some mitigation or controls may be necessary through the DM process to protect amenity. Potential short term impacts during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW to the south of the site which would require protection/mitigation.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore the sequential test is passed. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create further employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located 5km from the ALR. Detailed Traffic Assessment would be required at development management stage; appropriate mitigation and controls may be required, depending on traffic volumes.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation will be necessary through the DM process.	Site is enclosed and well screened therefore no significant effect on landscape character.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Proposal is unlikely to affect the historic environment.

Burleigh Oaks Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	+	N	+	+	+	N	NA	Site is previously developed land with an existing waste use.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SPA/SAC.	Impacts on the Ancient Woodland will need to be avoided. Site is 6km from Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC. HRA identifies a possibility of a negative effect if an EfW facility is proposed, especially when considered with other plans affecting air quality. Therefore detailed assessment would be required of any such proposal to ensure no unacceptable impact.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	There are no mineral safeguarding issues as the site is not within a MSA.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is on grade 2 agricultural land but is an existing waste site and would not constitute best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	30m buffer from culvert required. Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	There is a drain/culvert near the site.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Burleigh Oaks Farm (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of amenity of surrounding properties required if further waste uses proposed. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PROW would require protection/mitigation. Site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Development may create employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR but potential cumulative effect of HGVs passing through Turners Hill. No impact on the historic environment. Impacts on ancient woodland need protection. Ecological assessment required if EfW is proposed to ensure no unacceptable effect on SPA/SAC. Site is previously developed land. Potential impacts on the water environment. Potential to reduce the need for landfill but there is potential for greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. Potential for site to produce energy from waste. 							

Freshfield Lane Brickworks (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Potential impact on residential properties near the site and villages in the surrounding area as a result of vehicle movements. In the long term the site will be restored.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	N	N	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	-	-	-	+	N	Landscaping/screening may be necessary to mitigate the effects to PROW.	PROW and users of the countryside would be affected by landfill operation. Site is likely to have a positive effect in the long term due to restoration providing the opportunity to enhance the surrounding environment.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	+	N	N	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Zone 1 therefore the sequential test is passed. High risk of flooding from groundwater. Cumulative effect of sites within flood zone 1 is positive as this reduces the need for sites with greater flood risk to be allocated
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	N	N	NA	Proposal would help maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and should not interfere with the existing mineral working, therefore likely to have a positive effect on social need and economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development of the site is likely to have a positive effect as any existing employment on the site could be augmented by employment in a parallel waste operation. Positive effect in the medium term as the landfill will continue to provide employment after the claypit workings have ceased.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	The site is within the High Weald AONB therefore potential to affect users of this area.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is relatively close to large centres of waste production. Any increase in HGV movements would require a Traffic Assessment and appropriate mitigation and controls.

Freshfield Lane Brickworks (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process .i.e. landscaping and screening.	May extend the restoration period with associated activities. Site is located within an AONB therefore possible negative effects. There will be positive effects in the long term due to the restoration of the site.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	-	-	-	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Archaeological assessment and mitigation.	Highway improvements could adversely impact the historic environment of Danehill. Potential impact on buried archaeological remains in previously un-worked areas of the clay pit.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	N	N	N	N	+	N	NA	The site has a restoration scheme, which makes it technically Greenfield but former mineral voids are suitable for landfill.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	-	-	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site may have a negative impact on the nearby Ancient Woodland, Rare Species, RIGS and SSSI. Opportunities for enhancement in long-term as part of restoration. Site is 4km from Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC, significant impacts are unlikely however precautionary safeguards may be required. Possible effect on air quality through traffic movement, if 200 or more HGV movements per day are proposed, details of nitrogen deposition at the roadside would be required to ensure no unacceptable effect.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	N	-	N	N	N	N	Conditions safeguarding minerals extraction alongside or before waste development may be necessary.	Need for clay extraction before/alongside landfill developments. Inert landfill could discourage recycling of inert materials, necessitating more extraction of primary minerals. This risk could be minimised by avoiding over-provision and encouraging landfill of only residual inert waste.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	-	N	-	-	N	N	NA	Site is likely to have a negative effect as the proposal is for landfill, which does not move waste up the waste hierarchy. However, there will be a need for landfill to take residual wastes from recycling and treatment processes.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a former mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.

Freshfield Lane Brickworks (Inert Landfill)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is close to SPZ1 and 3.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Proposal is for inert waste only. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. Site is relatively close to likely sources of waste (centres of population). More sites close to sources of waste would reduce transport distances and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impact on residential properties near the site and villages in the surrounding area as a result of vehicle movements. Mitigation required. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PROW would require protection/mitigation. Site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Site could augment employment opportunities on the site after the claypit workings have ceased. Traffic Assessment and assessment of impact of traffic on SPA/SAC may be required, depending on number of proposed HGV movements. Site is within the High Weald AONB therefore potential impact on landscape character but the site would be restored over time. Highway improvements could adversely impact the historic environment of Danehill and mitigation of archaeological remains required. Site is technically Greenfield but mineral voids are suitable locations for inert landfill for restoration purposes. Potential impacts on the water environment. Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste by road. 							

Land rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are some residential properties located around the site. Access may be adjacent to residential property. Amenity may require protection and mitigation through the DM process, particularly during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	-	-	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. Highways Agency advise site is medium risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Protection/mitigation or PROW required.	PROW runs to the north of the site and may be affected particularly due to the potential access.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. FFZ 2 and 3b to be avoided.	The southern edge of the site is in Fluvial Flood Zone 2 and 3b. Provided that the flood risk area can be avoided, development would be appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located very close to the ALR. Preference would be given to the use (and improvement) of an existing access to the industrial estate, rather than a new access.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal would be an extension of the built form into the open countryside and may therefore affect the character of the area. There are also existing buildings in nearby which could add to the impact.

Land rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological survey and mitigation.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	A buffer from the southern boundary should be included otherwise no significant effects.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the brick clay MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. 30m buffer from river required.	No major constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land rear of Ricebridge Industrial Estate (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential impact on residential properties, particularly due to potential access point. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. PROW would require protection/mitigation. Omission of flood risk area would mean that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Site may provide employment for the local community and impacts on other businesses not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR but access requires improvement. Site would encroach into countryside therefore potential negative impact. Archaeological survey and mitigation required. Site is Greenfield. No significant impact on the water environment. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements but site would help to reduce the need for landfill and would have potential for energy from waste. 							

Land at Hickstead (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are some isolated properties around the site whose amenity may require protection through the DM process. Potential short term impacts during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is medium risk and an assessment of access details would be required at planning application stage to ensure safe vehicular access.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No PROW or countryside users are likely to be significantly affected.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	The eastern tip of the site is in Fluvial Flood Zone 2 which will be Flood Zone 3 in 2056 and 2106. Provided that the flood risk area can be avoided, the sequential test if passed and the development would be appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including improvements to access and visibility may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located adjacent to the ALR. No concerns in principal, however improvements to access and visibility may be required.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal may affect the character of the landscape. Site is currently open countryside.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological survey and mitigation.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.

Land at Hickstead (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	No specific ecological concerns at this site but hedgerows and woody features should be retained.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the brick clay MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land at Hickstead (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection of amenity of surrounding farms required through DM process. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No significant effect on PROW or countryside users. Omission of flood risk area would mean that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Site may provide employment for the local community and impacts on other businesses not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR but access improvements may be required. Site would encroach into countryside therefore potential negative impact. Archaeological survey and mitigation required. Site is Greenfield. No significant impact on the water environment. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements but site would help to reduce the need for landfill and would have potential for energy from waste. 							

Land adjacent to Sewage Works, Cuckfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	There are some isolated properties in the surrounding area but not immediately adjacent to the site therefore residential impacts are not considered to be significant.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site would be low risk if accessed via the A23 junction with the A272 at Bolney, but medium risk if accessed via the A23 junction with the B2115 junction at Cuckfield Lane.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	PROW runs to the east of the site which may be affected due to potential access. Amenity may require protection through the DM process.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls including routing agreement and access improvements may be necessary through the DM process.	Site could connect directly to the Strategic Road Network subject to access improvements which could be secured through the DM process. A routing agreement may be required to ensure traffic is not directed via the villages to the north and east of Haywards Heath.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal could affect landscape character as it is currently agricultural land, however, it is adjacent to an existing waste use and appropriate design and landscaping could be secured through the DM process.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	-	N	N	N	N	Archaeological survey and mitigation.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment. Potential impact on the Conservation Area to the north.

Land adjacent to Sewage Works, Cuckfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	A272 is a notable road verge which could be affected if junction improvements required. Boundary hedgerows should be protected.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the consolidated bedrock MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 2 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	-	-	-	-	-	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. 30m buffer from Copyhold stream required	Site is adjacent to Copyhold stream which is assessed as moderate under the Water Framework Directive.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land adjacent to Sewage Works, Cuckfield (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant impact on surrounding uses and no residential properties immediately close by. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. Protection/mitigation of PROW required. Omission of flood risk area would mean that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. Site may provide employment for the local community and impacts on other businesses not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR but access improvements and routing agreement may be required. Potentially significant impact on landscape character. Archaeological survey and mitigation required. Potential impact on conservation area nearby. Site is Greenfield. Potential impact on the Copyhold stream nearby which would need to be assessed. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements but site would help to reduce the need for landfill and would have potential for energy from waste. 							

Land adjacent to Goddards Green Waste Water Treatment Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	-	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Residential property to the west of the site. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to protect amenity, particularly during construction.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise site is low risk in terms of highway safety and capacity.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	-	N	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Public footpath through the site which is likely to be affected. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to protect amenity, particularly during construction.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	The northern tip of the site is in Fluvial Flood Zone 2 which will be Flood Zone 3 in 2056 and 2106. Provided that the flood risk area can be avoided, the sequential test if passed and the development would be appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	This site is positioned for easy access to the Strategic Road Network, without HGVs needing to pass sensitive areas.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	-	-	-	-	-	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Proposal could affect landscape character as it is currently agricultural land, however, it is adjacent to an existing waste use and appropriate design and landscaping could be secured through the DM process.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Archaeological assessment and mitigation.	Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.

Land adjacent to Goddards Green Waste Water Treatment Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Ecological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact. Important hedgerows to be retained and nearby SNCI should be protected.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the brick clay MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	N	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process. 30m buffer from river required.	Site is adjacent to River Adur, which is classed as 'poor' under Water Framework Directive.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.

Land adjacent to Goddards Green Waste Water Treatment Works (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mitigation and control of impact on residential property to the west of the site. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Protection/mitigation of PROW required. ▪ Omission of flood risk area would mean that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. ▪ Site may provide employment for the local community and impacts on other businesses not considered to be significant. ▪ Site is close to the ALR but junction improvements required. ▪ Potentially significant impact on landscape character. ▪ Archaeological survey and mitigation required. ▪ Ecological survey and mitigation, important hedgerows to be retained and nearby SNCI should be protected. ▪ Site is Greenfield. ▪ Potential impact on the River Adur nearby which would need to be assessed. ▪ Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements but site would help to reduce the need for landfill and would have potential for energy from waste. 							

Newtimber Chalkpit (Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	No residential properties immediately surrounding the site, which is well screened.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Public Footpath runs along the eastern edge of the site which could be affected but in the long term the site would be restored. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to ensure no impact.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	+	N	+	+	+	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is in Flood Zone 1 therefore the sequential test is passed and development is appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would help to maintain an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities and therefore will help meet social need and support economic growth.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may provide employment for the local community and support the local construction industry.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	+	+	+	+	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is located adjacent to the ALR.
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is enclosed with few views. Use is existing temporary use and would be co-located with mineral extraction. Proposal unlikely to impact upon character or quality of the landscape.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Appraisal of the impact on the nearby SAM and archaeological surveys and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	As a mineral extraction site, site is Greenfield.

Newtimber Chalkpit (Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Appropriate ecological surveys, mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process to ensure no impact on the adjacent SSSI.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal would involve recycling inert waste to provide secondary materials, which would help preserve primary mineral resources.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is not close to waste arisings therefore waste may need to travel further leading to more vehicle emissions. Facility may require suitable DM/waste regulation controls to ensure air quality is not affected.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is a mineral working and would not constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No significant constraints.
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Greenhouse gases most likely to result from transportation of waste. More facilities closer to waste sources would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing transport distances.

Newtimber Chalkpit (Inert Recycling)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No significant effect on surrounding uses. ▪ Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. ▪ Protection/mitigation of PROW required. ▪ Site is in flood zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed and development is appropriate. ▪ Development may provide employment for the local community and support the local construction industry. ▪ Site is close to the ALR. ▪ Site is enclosed therefore no significant impact on landscape character. ▪ Appraisal of the impact on the nearby SAM and archaeological surveys and mitigation required. ▪ Appropriate ecological surveys, mitigation and controls to ensure no impact on the adjacent SSSI. ▪ Site is Greenfield but is already operating as an inert recycling site. ▪ No significant impact on the water environment. ▪ Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. 							

Worthing District waste sites

Decoy Farm, Worthing (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Built waste facilities will be similar to the existing uses both on and surrounding the site so there will be little/no impact on wider area.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health and well-being of the public	N	-	-	N	N	N	Provide information about modern waste disposal techniques and facilities to discourage negative perception.	Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time. Highways Agency advise the site would be low risk.
C: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is not located within close proximity to any PROW.
D: To reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detrimental impact on public well-being, the economy, and environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is in flood Zone 2 and 3b, detailed FRA required at planning application stage to show that development would be appropriate.
E: To provide an adequate supply of minerals and suitable waste facilities to meet social need and support economic growth	+	N	+	+	+	+	NA	Proposal is for built waste facilities for recycling or treatment, which will move waste up the waste hierarchy and provide for social need. Part of site is currently occupied by an HWRS which means that facilities could work together.
F: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Development may create employment opportunities for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local tourism industry	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is not located near to any tourist attractions therefore no significant effect.
H: To minimise transport of minerals and waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to minimise use of rural roads and maximise use of the Strategic Road Network and the Advisory Lorry Routes	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. Site is not supported by good access, but is relatively close to the ALR. Site is located within an area that suffers from traffic congestion, and is close to land considered for the East Worthing Access Road (EWAR) which would access the ALR.

Decoy Farm, Worthing (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
I: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character and quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Surrounding buildings are all industrial and warehousing. Site is adjacent to a Strategic Gap. Landscape character unlikely to be significantly affected.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site unlikely to affect the historic environment, although a geoarchaeological impact assessment may be required at planning application stage.
K: To make the best use of previously-developed land and reduce the need for greenfield sites	-	N	-	-	-	-	NA	Site is a former landfill and is technically greenfield.
L: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process	Site is close to a SNCI. Potential ecological interest, site survey may be required at planning application stage. Opportunity for enhancement.
M: To safeguard and use mineral resources wisely and encourage, where possible, the use of secondary materials	-	-	-	-	-	-	Prior extraction of mineral reserves.	Site is within the chalk MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources. However due to the extent of the chalk resources, the impact is not considered to be significant.
N: To reduce the amount of waste, increase the re-use and recycling of materials and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. The cumulative effect is positive as sites would work together.
O: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality, including reducing the emission of greenhouse gases	N	N	N	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Through helping to reduce landfill, the proposal could contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions.
P: To minimise the use of the best and most versatile land and protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	Site is a former landfill site. It may be contaminated. It does not therefore constitute the best and most versatile land.
Q: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	-	-	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Groundwater abstraction and surface water abstraction within 2km. Within SPZ 2 and 3.

Decoy Farm, Worthing (Built Waste Facility)								
Appraisal Objective	Direct	Indirect	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term	Cumulative	Mitigation/Enhancement	Commentary
R: To mitigate the causes, and adapt to the effects, of climate change, including by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting the use of renewable energy	N	+	N	N	N	N	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	It is not possible to predict emissions or use of renewable energy until further details of the built waste facility are known, however, the proposal would help to reduce the need for landfill and could generate energy therefore contribute to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The site would still generate HGV movements which would give rise to greenhouse gases.
Assessment Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No significant effect on surrounding uses. Possible negative perceptions of waste in the short term which may improve over time. No impact on PROW or countryside users. Site is within Flood zone 2 and 3b. Development may create employment opportunities for the local community. Impacts on other businesses in the area not considered to be significant. Site is close to the ALR. No significant impact on landscape character. Archaeological surveys and mitigation required. Ecological survey required. Potential impact on the water environment. Greenhouse gas emissions from vehicle movements. Potential for energy from waste. 							

Appendix I: Assessment of the Strategic Allocations

I1 The assessment of the strategic allocations against the sustainability objectives is shown in the following tables.

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	+	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects on amenity due to noise and impact on public views. Public perception of waste may be negative. In the medium term public attitude to waste use may improve due to a replacement building and landscaping. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict. By introducing a waste use that will be subject to modern controls, it could eliminate the existing noisy use.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Consideration of diversion footpath to allow for establishment of landscaping and planting along the northern boundary.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects but in the medium term there would be benefits as the PROW would no longer be shared with the vehicular traffic and landscaping and improved building design would enhance amenity. The medium term benefits will continue into the long term. For rail and road users the effects would be positive over the medium and long term due to the redevelopment of the site.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	New development should be built in accordance with SUDs giving rise to improvements.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	N/A	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	If the use was EfW, potential for low carbon energy network to supply local users. Could be achieved through the DM process.	The construction period would generate employment therefore short term positive effects. There would also be jobs created in the medium term as there would be a net gain in employment and the redevelopment of a derelict site would have a positive effect which could last in the long term.

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	There would be negative effects in the short term during the construction process. Development would be subject to routing agreement and limits on HGV movements which would bring positive effects given the previous use of the site. Once the alternative access has been established, this would bring improvements to the area in the medium and long term.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. If appropriate, consideration given to height restriction on stack.	There are no landscape designations but a large stack could impact on views from the SDNP. Development of the site represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of/or replace the existing derelict buildings. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	N	N		Listed buildings are listed for architectural merit and the site would not adversely affect this. Proposal would stay within footprint of existing site, therefore no further loss of potential archaeological remains. Construction period would give period of exploration/excavation if archaeological remains present.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	N/A	Site is previously developed land and the development of the site would not result in the loss of best and most versatile land and there are no strategically important mineral resources. Although the site is grade 1 agricultural land, the site is pdl and therefore there would be no loss.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	There are no nature designations to be affected but the landscaping improvements could attract wildlife. In the short term, the construction traffic could be quite disruptive.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	N	N/A	In the short term there may be opportunities to reuse recycled materials. In the medium to long term, the effect is positive because whether it is EfW it would be preceded by recycling activity and the site could accommodate a recycling process as well. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect in behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.

Site adjacent to Sewage Works, Ford (Built Waste Facility)					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	N/A	Site would have a positive effect on diverting waste from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by the permit.	In the short term, during construction, there may be negative effects resulting from dust. A modern built waste management facility built, and operated, to modern standards would have negligible emissions.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Construction of development must not exceed the confines of the site.	The effects on soil quality are unknown but unlikely to negative because the site is pdl unless the construction exceeds the confines of the site, e.g. landscaping/planting.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Controls during DM process to ensure potential negative effects during construction are minimised.	Potential negative effects in the short term due to run off and spill from construction activity in view of the fact that site is located on a major aquifer. In the medium and long term the effects would be neutral as the site would have sealed drainage.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+		In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. The close proximity of the site to potential users of energy produced (if EfW technology built) does offer potential benefits.
Assessment Summary	<p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the building establishes itself into its surroundings.</p> <p>Development of the site would bring benefits to users of the PROW as the footpath could be diverted, avoiding the need to share with vehicular traffic.</p> <p>There may be potential to provide a local heat network to surrounding uses or new development in the future and the site would be adjacent to existing waste uses therefore bringing potential benefits of co-location.</p> <p>The site offer opportunities for improvements to the appearance of the area and controls on noise, dust and odour that the previous use may not have had, however, consideration should be given to the height of any chimneys.</p>				

Hobbs Barn, near Climping					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	+	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects on amenity due to noise and/or odour. Impacts on views would be minimal due to screening at the site. Public perception of waste may be negative. In the medium term public attitude to waste use may improve. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	N	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	No PROWs would be affected by the proposal. Site not considered to have a significant effect on users of the countryside as the site is well screened. There may be some impact from noise from the site, although these are existing commercial uses at the site.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. 30m buffer zone from rife required.	Site is within Flood Risk Zone 3a. Preference should be given to lower risk sites, however 'less vulnerable' development such as open-air composting may be appropriate. Exception test required for 'more vulnerable' development such as built waste facilities.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	There would be jobs created in the short to medium term as there would be a net gain in employment. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict which could have a negative effect.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	There may be negative impacts in the short term during construction but the site is adjacent to the ALR therefore minimising the need to use rural roads. No highways concerns, however, routing agreement and highway improvements (provision of right hand turn) may be required.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	Although the site is situated in the Strategic Gap, it is well screened.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N		Possibility of buried archaeological remains and construction period would provide opportunity to excavate. Listed buildings to the east of the site but as the site is well screened, there is not considered to be any significant impact.

Hobbs Barn, near Climping					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	NA	Site is previously developed land and the development of the site would not result in the loss of best and most versatile land and there are no strategically important mineral resources.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	There are no nature designations to be affected but any landscaping improvements could attract wildlife. In the short term, the construction traffic could be quite disruptive. No significant effect on biodiversity subject to protection of existing hedgerows.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	The effect is positive because the site could accommodate a recycling process. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect in behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	Site would have a positive effect on diverting waste from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by the permit.	In the short term, during construction, there may be negative effects resulting from dust. A modern built waste management facility built, and operated, to modern standards would have negligible emissions.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Construction of development must not exceed the confines of the site.	The effects on soil quality are unknown but unlikely to negative because the site is pdl unless the construction exceeds the confines of the site, e.g. landscaping/planting.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Controls during DM process to ensure potential negative effects during construction are minimised.	Potential negative effects in the short term due to run off and spill from construction activity in view of the fact that site is located on a major aquifer. In the medium and long term the effects would be neutral as the site would have sealed drainage.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	+	+	NA	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. Potential opportunities for local energy network with other businesses on the site.

Hobbs Barn, near Climping				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement
Assessment Summary	<p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to have positive impacts over time as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the site would provide additional waste management capacity. The site is well screened and there are existing commercial uses which would be compatible with a waste use.</p> <p>The site is not affected by any major nature, landscaping or historic designations but it should be subject to FRA to ensure that it would have no further impact on flood risk.</p>			

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	N	Assume that WLP development management principles are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects on amenity due to noise and impact on public views. Public perception of waste may be negative. In the medium term public attitude to waste use may improve. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict. Modern waste facility will have little or no impact on health, however, there could be an indirect negative effect in the short term because of the public's negative perception of waste and waste workings. In the medium term the site is likely to have a neutral effect as public perception changes over time.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	+	N	NA	The site is well screened from the countryside and no PROWS are directly affected. The site would be visible from the road which would result in negative effects in the short term (during construction) but presents an opportunity for an iconic building which could have a positive effect in the medium term. In the long term the impacts are uncertain as the site could be derelict.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	N	+	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. The site presents opportunities for SUDs which could bring benefits.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	N	N	+	Assume that WLP development management principles are applied.	There would be jobs created in the short to medium term as there would be a gain in employment. The opportunity for an iconic building could have a positive effect on the local economy attracting other uses to the area. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict which could have a negative effect. Caravan sites to the east which is likely to be affected by the introduction of a waste use nearby. A chimney stack could be visible from the main tourist route along the A27 towards Chichester.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Assume that WLP development management principles are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. Site has direct access to the ALR (A259) although there are existing congestion problems on the A27 which the site could contribute to when considered cumulatively. Access would be required to be a left in, left out arrangement only.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	+	+	Height restrictions may be necessary to protect views of Chichester Cathedral spire and to South Downs National Park.	The site presents an opportunity for an iconic building (subject to height restrictions). Improvements to landscaping could improve the appearance of the site in the medium to long term. In the short term the effects are considered to be negative due to construction.

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	A full record should be made of the wartime fuel depot structures. Archaeological and geo-archaeological assessments required.	Potential impact on wartime fuel depot structures on site. Construction period represents opportunity to excavate and record archaeological features but could cause damage.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	Consider prior extraction of minerals.	Site is PDL and was previously used as a fuel depot. Site is within the unconsolidated gravel MSA therefore site could potentially lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process. Ecological assessment and mitigation. If an EfW is proposed, applicant must show no adverse effect on interest features or integrity of the nearby SAC.	There are no designations on the site but there may be issues with breeding common terns and other wildlife on nearby water bodies. HRA identifies a potential effect on Kingley Vale SAC if EfW is proposed. Detailed assessment of any such proposal would therefore be required to ensure no unacceptable impact. Potential for improvements in the medium to long term with landscape improvements.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA.	The effect is positive because the site could accommodate a recycling or treatment process. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect on behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	Site would help to move waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by permit. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant.

Fuel Depot, Bognor Road, Chichester					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes. Desk top study to consider contamination required.	The soil quality is grade 4 and 5 and is not therefore the best and most versatile land. The site is also contaminated so there could be negative effects in the short term, however redevelopment of the site could provide an opportunity to remediate the site.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	N	N	Desktop study to consider contamination of site. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation process.	No significant constraints.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Use of renewable sources of power and energy efficiency within the facility will be encouraged	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. The close proximity of the site to potential users of energy produced (if EfW technology built) does offer potential benefits.
Assessment Summary	<p>The site is well-located to manage waste in the county due to its proximity to waste arisings in the south west of the county, proximity to the A27 and it has potential to move waste by rail (subject to viability assessment).</p> <p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as public attitudes to waste facilities changes and the building establishes itself into its surroundings.</p> <p>Development of the site presents an opportunity for an iconic building and for a local energy network which could have a positive effect on the local economy and public attitudes to waste. Consideration should be given to the height of any chimney to protect views of Chichester Cathedral and the South Downs National Park.</p>				

Brookhurst Wood, near Warnham					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	+	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Some residential properties in wider area, clay pit to the east, brickworks on the site, industrial units to the north. Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects on amenity due to noise. No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses on site and surrounding area. Public perception of waste may be negative. In the medium term public attitude to waste use may improve. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Protection/mitigation of PROW.	Construction impacts may give rise to negative effects due to noise and views. Improved landscaping would reduce impact on public views in the medium term. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	+	+	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is in Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land. New development could incorporate SUDs therefore giving rise to improvements.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	If the use was EfW, potential for low carbon energy network to supply local users. Could be achieved through the DM process.	The construction period would generate employment therefore short term positive effects. There would also be jobs created in the medium term as there would be a net gain in employment and the redevelopment of a derelict site would have a positive effect which could last in the long term.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is relatively close to a large centre of population, meaning waste is transported shorter distances. There is also potential for co-location of waste uses. The site benefits from being located close to the ALR (A264). Potential for non-road based transport if quantities of waste justify it the as site is adjacent to the railway.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	N	Site currently has adequate screening, however new facilities may require additional landscaping/screening.	There are no landscape designations. Development of the site represents an opportunity to improve the appearance of/or replace the existing derelict buildings. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	-	-	-	Mitigation of archaeological remains.	Brickworks are of archaeological interest, therefore possible negative effects if the site is redeveloped and buildings are lost.

Brookhurst Wood, near Warnham					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	+	+	NA	Site is located on former brickworks and would therefore make best use of land.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	N	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary though the DM process. Boundary hedges and tree line should be avoided. Assessment/mitigation of rare species required at planning application stage.	There are no designations but potentially protected species which would require survey and mitigation in the short term. Opportunities for enhancement in long-term.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	The effect is positive because the site could accommodate a recycling or treatment process. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect on behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	Site could provide a treatment facility which would divert waste from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by permit. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	N	N	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land but is previously developed land occupied by buildings. The effects on soil quality therefore unlikely to be negative/
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.

Brookhurst Wood, near Warnham					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. The close proximity of the site to potential users of energy produced (if EfW technology built) does offer potential benefits.
Assessment Summary	<p>The site is well-located to manage waste due to its proximity to waste arisings in the north of the county, close to the ALR and it has potential to move waste by rail (subject to viability assessment).</p> <p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as it would benefit from co-location of other waste facilities and replace existing derelict buildings.</p>				

Land west of Wastewater Treatment Works, Goddards Green					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Site would be developed as part of the 'Northern Arc' development therefore construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects. There may be negative perceptions of waste which may improve over time as the site becomes operational.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	N	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Diversion of footpath.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects but in the medium to long term the footpath would be diverted. Comprehensive nature of development would provide opportunities for improvements to the PROW through footpath diversion and landscaping. For rail and road users the effects would improve over the medium and long term due to the development of the site.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	+	+	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	The northern tip of the site has been excluded from the site in accordance with the recommendations from the sequential test. New development could incorporate SUDs therefore giving rise to improvements.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	If the use was EfW, potential for low carbon energy network to supply 'Northern Arc' development.	The construction period would generate employment therefore short term positive effects. There would also be jobs created in the medium term as there would be a net gain in employment which could last in the long term.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	This site is positioned for easy access to the Strategic Road Network, without HGVs needing to pass sensitive areas.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	-	N	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	West Sussex Landscape Sensitivity Study (2011) classifies the site as having medium sensitivity with moderate capacity to accommodate large scale waste facilities. The short term impacts are therefore negative but improving over time as landscaping is established. The northern boundary of the site has been removed to account for the river corridor.

Land west of Wastewater Treatment Works, Goddards Green					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	N	N	Archaeological assessment and mitigation.	No impact is envisaged as there are no historic designations. Archaeological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact on the historic environment.
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	NA	Site is Greenfield land therefore site scores negatively. Although the site is located within the brick clay MSA, it is not in close proximity to brickworks, therefore safeguarding is unlikely to be an issue.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Ecological survey and mitigation may be required through the DM process to ensure no impact. Important hedgerows to be retained and nearby SNCI should be protected. Potential negative impacts during construction but opportunities for enhancement in the long term through landscaping.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	The effect is positive because the site could accommodate a recycling or treatment process. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect on behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	Site could provide a treatment facility which would divert waste from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by permit. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	-	-	-	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is situated on grade 3 agricultural land classification and could lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land.

Land west of Wastewater Treatment Works, Goddards Green					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Site is near to River Adur, which is classed as 'poor' under Water Framework Directive but site boundary has been amended to avoid the river. Development of the site presents opportunity for improvements to the river quality therefore positive score in the medium to long term.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled. If the use was EfW, potential for low carbon energy network to supply 'Northern Arc' development.
Assessment Summary	<p>Although the site is Greenfield, it presents an opportunity for comprehensive development as part of the 'Northern Arc' development north of Burgess Hill. The site would be close to waste arisings in the east of the county and close to the ALR. An EfW facility could provide a local energy network for other development in the 'Northern Arc'.</p> <p>The site boundary has been amended to exclude the flood risk area to the north and SUDs could be incorporated to alleviate flood risk in the area. Development of the site could also present opportunities to improve the water quality of the river Adur and the PROW.</p>				

Decoy Farm, Worthing					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	-	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Construction impacts in the short term would give rise to negative effects on amenity due to noise. No significant effect on surrounding uses in view of existing uses in the surrounding area. Public perception of waste may be negative. In the medium term public attitude to waste use may improve. In the long term the effects are unknown as the building/use may remain or the site could become derelict.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied.	Site is not located within close proximity to any PROW. Site would be visible to road and rail users therefore negative impact in the short term but public views would improve over time provided building is high quality design.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	-	N	+	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Majority of the site is within flood zone 1 but part of the site is in flood Zone 2 and 3b, detailed FRA required at planning application stage to show that development would be appropriate. Development of site presents opportunity for SUDs which could improve flood risk in the long term.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	+	+	NA	Site would provide new waste facility(ies) and even in the short term, the additional capacity would be counted. Once the waste use is established, it could attract other, synergistic, waste uses which could continue beyond the life of the facility.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	+	+	NA	The construction period would generate employment therefore short term positive effects. There would also be jobs created in the medium term as there would be a net gain in employment which could last in the long term. Potential for site to provide benefits to other commercial uses on the site or in the surrounding area.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	N	N	N	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is in close proximity to a large centre of population meaning waste is transported shorter distances. Site is not supported by good access, but is relatively close to the ALR. Impacts are therefore uncertain in the absence of detailed transport information. Site is located within an area that suffers from traffic congestion, and is close to land considered for the East Worthing Access Road (EWAR) which would access the ALR.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Surrounding buildings are all industrial and warehousing. Site is adjacent to a Strategic Gap. Landscape character unlikely to be significantly affected.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site unlikely to affect the historic environment, although a geoarchaeological impact assessment may be required at planning application stage.

Decoy Farm, Worthing					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	-	-	-	NA	Site is a former landfill and is technically greenfield.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process	Site is close to a SNCI. Potential ecological interest, site survey may be required at planning application stage. Potential negative effects in the short term during construction period. Opportunity for enhancement as part of the development.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	+	+	+	NA	The effect is positive because the site could accommodate a recycling or treatment process. In the longer term, it could result in a cultural shift which would result in a positive effect on behaviour. By building a waste facility it is bringing the site into people's consciousness.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	+	+	+	NA	Site could provide a treatment facility which would divert waste from landfill.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	N	Assume that pollution would be controlled by permit. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Development likely to have a limited effect on the existing air quality due to modern technologies associated with built waste facilities. There may be some effect on air quality in the short term at the construction phase but it is not considered to be significant. Off site traffic movements will need to be considered in terms of impact on AQMA in the vicinity of the Grove Road roundabout.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	+	+	+	NA	Site is a former landfill site. It may be contaminated. It does not therefore constitute the best and most versatile land. Opportunities for remediation of the land as part of the development.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied Appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Groundwater abstraction and surface water abstraction within 2km. Within SPZ 2 and 3. Site is near to Teville Stream, which is classed as 'poor' under Water Framework Directive. Development of the site presents opportunity for improvements to the river quality therefore positive score in the medium to long term.

Decoy Farm, Worthing					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs plus i.e.	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	+	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	In the medium to long term, the effects would be positive as the site is located close to waste arisings and reducing overall waste miles travelled, Potential for low carbon energy network to supply neighbouring uses.
Assessment Summary	<p>The site is well-located to manage waste due to its proximity to waste arisings in the south east of the county, close to the ALR. It is within an existing industrial area therefore any impacts over and above the surrounding uses are considered to be minimal.</p> <p>Although there would be some negative impacts in the short term during the construction period, development of the site is considered to bring overall benefits in the medium to long term as it would benefit from co-location of other waste facilities, help to remediate the former landfill site and improve the quality of the Teville Stream.</p> <p>The site is not affected by any major nature, landscaping or historic designations but it should be subject to FRA to ensure that it would have no further impact on flood risk.</p> <p>Consideration would need to be given to the access to the site as there are residential properties in the surrounding area.</p>				

Extension to Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
A: To protect and, where possible, enhance the health, well-being and amenity of residents and neighbouring land-uses	N	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	Some residential properties in wider area, clay pit to the east, brickworks on the site, industrial units to the north. In view of continuation of existing use, public perception expected to be neutral rather than negative. In the long term the site will be restored.
B: To protect and, where possible, enhance the amenity of users of the PROW and other users of the countryside including transport networks	-	+	+	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation may be necessary through the DM process.	There are no PROW in close proximity but site would be visible from the railway therefore negative score in the short term. In the long term the site will be restored.
C: To ensure the risk of flooding is not increased	+	NA	NA	FRA and appropriate mitigation and controls required as part of the DM process.	Proposal is in Flood Risk Zone 1 therefore sequential test is passed. Med-high risk of flooding from land.
D: To provide an adequate supply of suitable waste facilities to sustain economic growth and maintain social welfare	+	NA	NA	NA	Site would provide landfill site and would work in synergy with other waste facilities nearby.
E: To protect and, where possible, enhance the vitality and viability of the local economy	+	NA	NA	NA	Positive effects in the short term as the site would provide continuation of jobs but the site would be finished after the short term.
F: To minimise transport of waste by roads. Where road use is necessary, to reduce the impact by promoting use of the Advisory Lorry Route	+	NA	NA	Assume that development management principles in WLP are applied. Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM process.	Site is relatively close to a large centre of population, meaning waste is transported shorter distances. The site would work in synergy with nearby waste uses therefore reducing the need to transport waste by road. Potential for non-road based transport if quantities of waste justify it the as site is adjacent to the railway.
G: To protect and, where possible, enhance landscape and townscape character	N	N	+	Site currently has adequate screening, however new facilities may require additional landscaping/screening.	Site is likely to enhance landscape character in the long term due to restoration.
H: To protect and, where possible, enhance the historic environment	N	NA	NA	Mitigation of archaeological remains.	Listed buildings nearby but unlikely to be affected as the site is well screened. Buried archaeological remains require mitigation.

Extension to Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site					
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement	Commentary
I: To make the best use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of best and most versatile land and strategically significant mineral resources.	+	NA	NA	NA	Part of the site is brownfield and is a former brickworks.
J: To protect and, where possible, enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	N	+	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary though the DM process. Assessment/mitigation of rare species required at planning application stage.	There are no designations but potentially protected species which would require survey and mitigation. Boundary hedges and tree line should be avoided. Opportunities for enhancement in long-term.
K: To reduce the amount of waste and increase the re-use and recycling of materials and encourage, where possible, the production and use of secondary materials	-	NA	NA	NA	The site is landfill therefore does not encourage re-use or recycling.
L: Promote recovery of value from residual waste and reduce the amount of waste going to landfill for disposal	-	NA	NA	NA	The site is landfill therefore scores negatively against this objective.
M: To reduce air pollution and to protect and, where possible, enhance air quality.	-	N	+	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Landfill would produce methane therefore negatively scored in the short term. Air quality would improve in the medium to long term as the site is restored.
N: To protect and, where possible, enhance soil quality	N	NA	NA	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Site is previously developed land therefore unlikely to be negative impacts on soil quality.
O: To protect and, where possible, enhance water resources, water quality and the function of the water environment	N	NA	NA	Appropriate mitigation and controls will be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	No major constraints.
P: To reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and promote the use of renewable and lower carbon energy sources.	N	N	NA	Appropriate mitigation and controls may be necessary through the DM/waste regulation processes.	Landfill site would produce methane gas but opportunities for this to be used for energy production.

Extension to Brookhurst Wood Landfill Site				
Appraisal Objective	Short-term effects 0-5yrs	Medium-term effects 6-25	Long-term effects 25 yrs	Mitigation/ Enhancement
Assessment Summary	<p>Although the site scores negatively against objective L to reduce the amount of waste going to landfill, it would be an extension to an existing site, providing a short term need. The site is also close to other waste facilities bring potential benefits of co-location.</p> <p>In the medium to long term the site would be restored, bring landscape improvements.</p>			

Appendix J: Cumulative Assessment of all strategic policies in the plan

Appraisal Objective	Policy W1	Policy W2	Policy W3	Policy W4	Policy W5	Policy W6	Policy W7	Policy W8	Policy W9	Policy W10	Policy W11	Policy W12	Policy W13	Policy W14	Policy W15	Policy W16	Policy W17	Policy W18	Policy W19	Policy W20	Policy W21	Policy W22	Policy W23
A	NA	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	+
B	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA
C	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	+	N	NA	NA
D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+
E	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA
F	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	+	+	NA	+	NA	+
G	NA	+	+	+	+	+	-	N	N	+	+	+	+	NA	+	+	NA	+	+	+	+	NA	+
H	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	+	+	+	NA	+	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	NA	N
I	NA	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	N	NA	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	NA	+
J	NA	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	NA	+	NA	+	+	NA	+	+	+	+	NA	NA
K	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+
L	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	+	+	N	NA	NA	+
M	+	NA	+	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	+	NA	+	+	NA	NA
N	NA	NA	+	+	+	+	N	N	N	N	NA	+	NA	+	NA	+	+	NA	NA	+	+	NA	NA
O	NA	NA	+	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	NA	+	NA	+	NA	+	+	NA	+	+	+	NA	NA
P	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	+	NA	+	NA	+	+	+	+	+	+	NA	+

Commentary

A: Cumulative impacts are generally positive as although the use specific policies would have some negative effects, location criteria direct sites to areas which would have the least impact and DM policies would minimise impacts and may bring enhancements.

- B:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as although the use specific policies would have some negative effects, location criteria direct sites to areas which would have the least impact and DM policies would minimise impacts and may bring enhancements.
- C:** Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with DM policy on flooding, impacts would be generally positive.
- D:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as use specific policies would help to provide an adequate supply of waste facilities
- E:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as use specific policies would help to provide waste facilities which are important for the local economy. Location criteria and DM policies would minimise impacts on the local economy, including the tourism economy.
- F:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as policies are worded to minimise the distance waste has to travel and prioritises use of the Advisory Lorry Route.
- G:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as strategies for sites guide them to appropriate locations to minimise impacts on landscape and townscape character. DM policies would minimise impacts on landscape and townscape character. Concern about the lack of location criteria in policy W7. Mitigation: Consider including location criteria or cross-reference to policy W3.
- H:** Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with DM policy on historic environment, impacts would be generally positive.
- I:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as strategies for sites guide them to appropriate locations to make best use of BMV and PDL. The issue of mineral sterilisation is not picked up in the DM policies. Concern about the lack of location criteria in policy W7. Mitigation: Consider including location criteria or cross-reference to policy W3.
- J:** Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with DM policy on biodiversity and geodiversity, impacts would be generally positive.
- K:** Cumulative impacts are generally positive as use specific policies would help to provide an adequate supply of waste facilities. Landfill policies W8 and W9 are worded negatively worded to discourage landfill. Only one site is located on Greenfield.

L: Cumulative impacts are generally positive as use specific policies would help to provide an adequate supply of waste facilities which would decrease the amount going to landfill and provide recovery facilities. Landfill policies W8 and W9 are worded negatively worded to discourage landfill.

M: Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with DM policy on air quality, impacts would be generally positive.

N: Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with DM policy on soil quality, impacts would be generally positive.

O: Cumulative impacts could be positive or negative. Provided use specific policies are applied in conjunction with water quality, impacts would be generally positive.

P: Cumulative impacts are generally positive as policies aim to drive waste up the hierarchy, therefore reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promote energy recovery from waste.