
Project	HRA for the Mid Sussex Core Strategy	Date	27th October 2009
Note	Discussion paper: avoidance and mitigation strategy	Ref	TESS-0023
Author	Nick Pincombe	Page	1 of 7

1. Introduction

This document presents a summary of the current status of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the Mid Sussex Core Strategy. The following four sections provide concise details on (i) progress with the HRA to date, (ii) the key findings of the appropriate assessment stage and how these relate to Core Strategy policy themes, (iii) proposals for an effective, achievable avoidance strategy, and (iv) the next steps for the HRA and approximate timetable in the run up to submission. It is important to note that the proposals for avoidance and mitigation relate directly to the number and location of housing allocations and as such may be subject to minor changes as the Core Strategy approaches completion.

The paper is intended to provide the context for further discussion between policy officers at Mid Sussex District Council, and between the Council and Natural England. It is assumed that readers have a good working knowledge of both the HRA process and Mid Sussex Core Strategy.

2. Overview of Progress to Date

Following the HRA screening and scoping stage, two baseline studies were carried out during late summer and autumn 2008 in order to provide relevant data for use in the appropriate assessment. The studies focused on the likely significant effects of the Core Strategy on Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA, namely air pollution (for the SAC) and disturbance from recreation (for the SPA; UE Associates & University of Brighton, 2009). A draft Appropriate Assessment (AA) report was prepared in late 2008 (UE Associates, draft 2008), based in part on the findings of the baseline studies, and this presented an assessment of the Pre Submission policy proposals for the Core Strategy.

A stakeholder meeting was held with Natural England in January 2009 to discuss the findings of the AA and baseline studies. Since then, further analysis of visitor survey data has been carried out, and numerous iterations of the AA undertaken to inform housing scenario planning for the Submission Core Strategy.

3. Key Findings

The 2008 draft AA report found that it was primarily the housing element of proposed Core Strategy policy that was the central driver for both impact types (lesser drivers being employment and tourism development).

With regard to air quality, the AA report identified traffic flow on the A22 and A275 through Ashdown Forest as a key determinant of whether adverse effects on ecological integrity associated with air pollution would be experienced. It proposed various options for avoiding and mitigating anticipated growth in traffic flows on roads through Ashdown Forest as a result of proposed new housing, for discussion with Natural England. During discussions it was agreed that development which led to an increase in traffic flow of less than 10% on key roads could be considered insignificant in relation to the SAC conservation objectives. Policy officers passed this to their transport counterparts and further scenarios were developed. Some avoidance and mitigation options were discarded as a result of discussions, while others have been retained in case growth in traffic cannot be limited.

Turning to disturbance, the AA report found that proposed new housing in areas close to Ashdown Forest is likely to increase the number of visitors, with associated impacts on bird populations. Again, various options for avoiding and mitigating anticipated growth in visitors were presented for discussion with Natural England, some of which were discarded and others retained. Natural England requested further analysis of some of the visitor data and associated predictions, which were provided. A detailed breakdown of the annual additional visits to Ashdown Forest generated by each of the current housing scenarios is provided in **Annex I**, with a summary in **Table 1**. It is clear that, while scenario 5 leads to the least additional visits generated from within 7.5km and has the lowest SANGS requirement, scenario 4a leads to the least additional visits overall.

Table 1: Summary of additional Ashdown Forest visits associated with current housing scenarios

Scenario	Visits <7.5km	Visits 7.5 – 15km	Total Visits	SANGS Required
1	47,581	52,874	100,455	48.25
2	47,581	45,966	93,547	48.25
3	61,457	48,280	109,737	72.65
4	47,581	34,257	81,838	48.25
4a	40,033	33,930	73,963	34.98
5	33,705	55,251	88,956	23.85

4. Avoidance Strategy for the Appropriate Assessment

Further analysis of visitor data was completed in May 2009; the study report has been endorsed by Natural England and was recently published on the websites of Mid Sussex and Wealden District Councils which jointly funded the work. In addition, further assessment of policy proposals has been undertaken, including assessments of new housing scenarios for the district (see **Annex I**), while transport planners and consultants have continued work on traffic growth modelling based on housing scenarios. Furthermore, informal discussions have been held with Natural England on the nature of avoidance measures. Suitable measures are summarised below.

4.1 Air quality

Key avoidance measure:

Reduce the number of new homes from Pre Submission proposals of up to 2,500 at land west of East Grinstead, to **up to 570 dwellings**.

Transport planning work (Atkins, 2009) has concluded that up to **570** new dwellings are realistically achievable at land west of East Grinstead, in addition to small scale housing allocations for the town centre, without increases in traffic flow on the A22 or A275 by 5% or more. As mentioned, and confirmed by Natural England, increases in traffic on these roads of 10% or more is not acceptable in ecological terms while increases of less than 10% may become unacceptable in combination with plans and projects being developed in adjacent local authority areas; this is one of the primary reasons for considering a reduced development.

The reduction will be supported by a series of mitigation measures if an in combination assessment is required, and if it determines that an increase in traffic of less than 5% could become significant in combination with other plans and projects. Significant in this case would be defined as an overall increased in traffic of 10% or more (DfT, 2005). If required, such measures could include:

- Management measures to reduce traffic and pollution on the A22 and A275, such as diversion of heavy vehicles, imposition of a low emission zone, residential / access only zones, traffic calming, road pricing, etc. Some of these measures would be controversial and complicated given the A status of these roads, and would require cross-border working between Mid Sussex and Wealden District Councils, and between East and West Sussex Counties and their Local Transport Plans;
- Improved grazing and habitat management within Ashdown Forest, over and above that already carried out through environmental stewardship agreements and by the Conservators. Targeted to the right areas the initiative can be quite effective, but would need to be funded and managed in such a way to ensure habitat diversity is maintained in perpetuity; and
- Provision of educational environmental information to local residents with the intention of promoting behavioural change, although the efficacy of the measure is unproven.

4.2 Disturbance

Key avoidance measures:

1. Adoption of two zones of influence surrounding Ashdown Forest within which certain restrictions will be placed on new development:
 - (i) Zone A (<400m): major residential developments (ten dwellings or more) will not be permitted; developments of less than ten dwellings will be considered on a case by case basis.
 - (ii) Zone B (400m – 7.5km): all residential development leading to a net increase in dwellings will be required to contribute to the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) to the level of 8ha per 1,000 net increase in population.

Large scale developments taking place outside Zone B and close to its boundary will be considered on a case by case basis for potential effects on Ashdown Forest, and the need for avoidance measures.

2. Provision of SANGS: all development referred to in 1(ii) above will be required to make a financial contribution to the provision of SANGS in order to offset the impact of new development on the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area. SANGS will be provided at an appropriate scale, likely to be in the order of 10-15ha each, of the requisite quality and in the correct location in order to successfully offset the impact, as described in the *Ashdown Forest Access Management Strategy* (see item 3, below). It is likely that SANGS will be provided as part of strategic developments, at a sufficient scale to offset impacts from both the strategic development itself and other small scale development within Zone B.
3. An *Ashdown Forest Access Management Strategy* will be developed, in association with Natural England, the Conservators of Ashdown Forest (and if appropriate Wealden, Tandridge, Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells District Councils, and the High Weald AONB Management Unit). The strategy will specify measures for the management of visitors to Ashdown Forest in such a way that reduces their impact on European qualifying features.
4. It is proposed that measures 1 to 3 above are secured via a new policy for the Core Strategy, which should be similar in nature to the following text:

“The Core Strategy has been subject to assessment in relation to Regulation 85 of the Habitats Regulations 2007 to ensure that the proposals it contains will not lead to any adverse effect on the integrity of the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA. This process has influenced the development of strategic options and the proposals to avoid the effects of [air pollution and] recreational pressure on designated sites.

“The Council recognises that additional growth in the district, in-combination with growth in neighbouring authorities, could, without appropriate management, lead to adverse effects upon the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA.

“The Council commits to working with partners in the sub-region to develop and implement a strategic approach to protecting the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA. This approach will secure a suite of avoidance measures, including adequate provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) and support via developer contributions for access management measures within and around the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA.

“The provision of SANGS will be over and above that provided for public open space in accordance with national policy [PPG17]. It will include the development and implementation of a green infrastructure strategy in order to improve local access to informal open spaces, the countryside, the South Downs and the coast, in less sensitive areas which are easily accessible to the present and future populations living in the urban areas of West and East Sussex, and the provision of new alternative natural green spaces for people to enjoy a similar experience to that found at Ashdown Forest. This may potentially include the provision of a new country park, for example.”

Assuming these measures are successfully incorporated into the Core Strategy, the effect of disturbance from recreation has been effectively removed from plan, and it can proceed to adoption without further assessment of in combination effects.

The inclusion of the Zone A avoids additional recreational pressure from within this zone, as well as avoiding other effects associated with urbanisation such as predation from domestic pets and fly-tipping. Zone B avoids further recreational pressure from within a zone of influence of 7.5km from the SPA boundary, by providing sufficient SANGS to capture 73% of all visits to Ashdown Forest, including 71% of drivers and 90% of walkers. These figures are comparable with avoidance measures adopted in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The *Ashdown Forest Access Management Strategy*, once developed, will avoid adverse effects associated with the remaining 27% of visits originating from beyond 7.5km, where these are not also captured by the provision of SANGS.

The provision of SANGS should aim not only to divert the inhabitants of new homes away from recreating at Ashdown Forest, but also to attract/divert existing residents who may be users of the Forest. Therefore, size, quality and location are all important considerations. In order to deliver alternative space that successfully draws visitors who might otherwise go to Ashdown Forest therefore, sites should be investigated that can fulfil the following criteria:

- ▶ Proximity to new and existing development;
- ▶ Feasibility to recreate a sense of the wide open countryside;
- ▶ The presence of attractive views and varied landscapes;
- ▶ Ability to offer long walks, short walks and circular routes;
- ▶ Nature conservation interest to provide the opportunity for people to feel in touch with the natural world, and which could include nature trails and other forms of interpretation;
- ▶ A sense of security, particularly for dog-walkers who are most likely to visit alone and at either extremity of the day; and
- ▶ Sufficient parking.

The catchment of SANGS will depend on the individual site characteristics and location, and their location within a wider green infrastructure network. As a guide, it can be assumed that (TBH JSPB, draft 2009):

- i) SANGS of 2-12ha will have a catchment of 2km
- ii) SANGS of 12-20ha will have a catchment of 4km
- iii) SANGS of 20ha+ will have a catchment of 5km

Access management measures at Ashdown Forest (making the Forest, and particularly sensitive areas within it, less easy to get to), could include:

- ▶ Further developing the use of zoned visitor management whereby certain parts of Ashdown Forest are designated as appropriate for particular activities (including exercise opportunities for people and dogs), while other areas are designated as wilderness or nature conservation areas;
- ▶ Decreased parking capacity across Ashdown Forest, to limit the numbers visiting;

- ▶ Decreased parking capacity on a zoned-management basis, whereby users are encouraged to visit less sensitive parts of Ashdown Forest, allowing other parts to be closed-off or restricted. This could be usefully supplemented by the provision of additional visitor facilities, such as WCs or a café, in areas where parking is to be maintain or improved; and
- ▶ Use of car park charging to further influence visitor behaviour (although the results of the 2009 study suggest that the majority of users (56.7%) are willing to pay for parking in any event) so long as the funds are put towards the management of Ashdown Forest.

Site management measures to reduce existing pressures and help restore original qualities and favourable conservation status, include:

- ▶ Strategic planting of gorse species (especially *Ulex europaeus*), particularly along tracksides and to help screen-off restricted access areas; and
- ▶ Increased wardening activity (notwithstanding the excellent work already carried out by the Conservators) to reduce the number of visitors not abiding by the general ban on dogs without a lead during the breeding bird season (as set out in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000).

The *Ashdown Forest Access Management Strategy* should also contain a monitoring regime to establish whether measures are successful in preventing an increase in recreational pressure at Ashdown Forest and, where they are not successful, establish further measures to ensure the site's conservation objectives are not compromised.

5. Next Steps

This note has been provided to Mid Sussex planning officers for review, and to Natural England to seek written support for the avoidance and mitigation package it proposes for the Mid Sussex Core Strategy. Once Natural England's response has been received, final amendments can be made to the package, and the final AA Report for the Core Strategy completed.

References

Atkins (2009): *East Grinstead Strategic Development Transport Advice, Stages 1 & 2*

Department for Transport (DfT, 2005): *Interim Advice Note 61/05: Guidance for Undertaking Environmental Assessment of Air Quality for Sensitive Ecosystems in Internationally Designated Nature Conservation Sites and SSSIs (Supplement to DMRB 11.3.1)*

Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board (TBH JSPB; draft, 2009): *DRAFT Thames Basin Heaths Delivery Framework*

UE Associates (draft, 2008): *Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Mid Sussex Core Strategy: Appropriate Assessment Report for the Pre Submission Document*

UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): *Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest*

Annex I: Summary of Disturbance Impacts of Housing Scenarios

Please see following pages.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 1

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	3200	7808	14.1	6,971.57	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	0	0	13.7	0.00	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	0	0	15.5	0.00	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	1250	3050	5.7	13,875.99	24.40	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	650	1586	11.6	3,066.90	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	0	0	10.6	0.00	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	600	1464	9.0	5,038.73	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	2500	6100	9.6	20,994.72	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				100,454.89	48.25	
Total pop increase:				37,314.92		
Total homes:				15293		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	47,581
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	48.25
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	52,874

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 2

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	3200	7808	14.1	6,971.57	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	550	1342	13.7	1,198.24	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	600	1464	15.5	n/a	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	1250	3050	5.7	13,875.99	24.40	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	0	0	11.6	0.00	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	0	0	10.6	0.00	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	0	0	9.0	0.00	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	2500	6100	9.6	20,994.72	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				93,547.50	48.25	
Total pop increase:				37,070.92		
Total homes:				15193		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	47,581
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	48.25
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	45,966

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 3

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	0	0	14.1	0.00	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	550	1342	13.7	1,198.24	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	600	1464	15.5	n/a	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	2500	6100	5.7	27,751.99	48.80	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	650	1586	11.6	3,066.90	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	250	610	10.6	1,179.58	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	600	1464	9.0	5,038.73	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	2500	6100	9.6	20,994.72	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				109,737.12	72.65	
Total pop increase:				35,972.92		
Total homes:				14743		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	61,457
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	72.65
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	48,280

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 4

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	3200	7808	14.1	6,971.57	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	550	1342	13.7	1,198.24	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	0	0	15.5	0.00	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	1250	3050	5.7	13,875.99	24.40	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	650	1586	11.6	3,066.90	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	250	610	10.6	1,179.58	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	600	1464	9.0	5,038.73	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	0	0	9.6	0.00	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				81,837.98	48.25	
Total pop increase:				33,166.92		
Total homes:				13593		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	47,581
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	48.25
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	34,257

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 4a

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	3200	7808	14.1	6,971.57	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	400	976	13.7	871.45	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	0	0	15.5	0.00	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	570	1390.8	5.7	6,327.45	11.13	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	650	1586	11.6	3,066.90	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	250	610	10.6	1,179.58	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	600	1464	9.0	5,038.73	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	0	0	9.6	0.00	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				73,962.65	34.98	
Total pop increase:				31,141.72		
Total homes:				12763		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	40,033
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	34.98
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	33,930

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.

Overview of Submission Housing Scenario Effects

Scenario 5

Source & description	Recreational disturbance (UE-A/UofB)					Comment
	No. homes	Pop± (ONS)	Aprx. dist.	Visits (pa)	Mit (8ha)	
Northern Arc, Burgess Hill	3200	7808	14.1	6,971.57	0.00	
Former STW, Fairbridge Way & land to the east, BH (Inner Arc)	500	1220	14.5	1,089.31	0.00	
Land east of Kings Way, B. Hill (g)	550	1342	13.7	1,198.24	0.00	
Land south of Folders Lane, B. Hill (h)	0	0	15.5	0.00	0.00	
Land west and south west of East Grinstead	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land west of East Grinstead (v)	0	0	5.7	0.00	0.00	
Land south and west of Sandrocks, Haywards Heath (l)	650	1586	11.6	3,066.90	0.00	
Land at Hurst Farm, H. Heath (t)	250	610	10.6	1,179.58	0.00	
Land east of Gravelye Lane, Lindfield (k)	600	1464	9.0	5,038.73	0.00	
Land at Crabbet Park, east of Crawley (nn)	2500	6100	9.6	20,994.72	0.00	
Development to be allocated to the District's villages	1435	3501.4	??	??	??	
Town Centre redevelopment, East Grinstead	300	732	4.7	8,274.60	5.86	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
Town Centre redevelopment, Haywards Heath	750	1830	9.5	6,298.42	0.00	
Town Centre redevelopment, Burgess Hill	250	610	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Windfall development 2021 - 2026	925	2257	??	??	??	No geo-reference - impact not determinable
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Burgess Hill *	890	2171.6	15.2	n/a	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around Haywards Heath/Lindfield	1121	2735.24	9.5	9,414.03	0.00	
Small sites (SHLAA) in and around East Grinstead	922	2249.68	4.7	25,430.61	18.00	Zone B distance (7.5km): TBC
TOTAL possible visits pa:				88,956.71	23.85	
Total pop increase:				36,216.92		
Total homes:				14843		

DOES NOT meet RSS requirement

Key:

	Negative impact
	Mixed/uncertain impact
	Positive impact
n/a under Visits pa denotes that homes are outside predictive model (>15km)	
All distances are approx. straight lines from boundary to boundary	

Overall additional visits from w/in 7.5km:	33,705
Overall SANGS requirement (ha):	23.85
Additional visits from beyond 7.5km:	55,251

References:

ONS - Office for National Statistics Mid Year Estimates 2007
UE-A/UofB - UE Associates & University of Brighton (2009): Visitor Access Patterns on Ashdown Forest

Footnote:

* Sites that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has identified as deliverable or developable. This does not necessarily mean that these sites will be allocated. However in the absence of a Site Allocations DPD, the SHLAA provides the best available information on the possible amount of development in the villages over the period to 2026.