

Assessment Criteria		Option 1. 650 dpa	Option 2 800 dpa	Comments
1A	Does the option prevent biodiversity loss and habitat fragmentations?	The overall scale of development is expected to have an adverse impact. Policies on master planning GI and wildlife corridors will mitigate but not eliminate this impact	The greater scale of development will increase the risk that more sensitive sites of higher value will have to be allocated	SHELAA identifies sufficient land for 7917 units that have been considered under the methodology of the SHELAA which would have considered such impacts. Policies on master planning can mitigate the impact of both options. Therefore option 1 and 2 should be graded the same.
1B	Does the option allow for movement of habitats with climate change?	Overall a neutral impact is likely, assuming that the option allows for strategic wildlife corridors to be maintained	Greater risk of land take impacting on wildlife corridors	SHELAA identifies sufficient land for 7917 units that have been considered under the methodology of the SHELAA which would have considered such impacts. Option 2 can still allow for strategic wildlife corridors to be maintained. Therefore option 1 and 2 should be graded the same.
1C	Does the option enhance and/or restore biodiversity opportunities and create new habitat?	Opportunities for enhancement within strategic sites	Opportunities for enhancement within strategic sites	Impact considered the same. Agree
2A	Does the option protect water resources?	Overall a neutral impact is likely - the increase in overall demand could be mitigated by other policies on sustainable construction	Increase in overall level of development is likely to put more demand on water resources	Both options will increase the overall demand on water but the overall impact of Option 2 could be mitigated by other policies on sustainable construction in the same manner as option 1. Therefore option 1 and 2 should be graded the same.
2B	Does the option maximise use of waste resources	Not site specific	Not site specific	Agree
2C	Does the option make efficient use of energy?	Use of large scale strategic sites for most of the additional development is likely to allow for higher standards of efficiency	Use of large scale strategic sites for most of the additional development is likely to allow for higher standards of efficiency	Impact considered the same. Agree
3A	Does the option reduce air pollution from industrial process and transport?	On transport a package of mitigation measures, as identifies in the transport study is likely to be needed to reduce the impact of traffic, but no additional of AQ objectives are expected.	On transport a package of mitigation measures, as identifies in the transport study is likely to be needed to reduce the impact of traffic, but no additional of AQ objectives are expected.	Agree. Transport assessment considers both options can be accommodated with mitigation
3B	Will the option assist the remediation of contaminated land?	Increased scale of development is likely to result in the remediation of some sites, but the majority of new strategic development is expected to be greenfield and the exact effect is uncertain due to being site specific	Increased scale of development is likely to result in the remediation of some sites, but the majority of new strategic development is expected to be greenfield and the exact effect is uncertain due to being site specific	Impact considered the same. Agree

3C	Does the option reduce levels of water pollution?	A neutral impact is expected. Development is unlikely to reduce levels of water pollution, but provided that highway and hard-standing runoff is properly dealt with and mitigated then an increase is unlikely.	A neutral impact is expected. Development is unlikely to reduce levels of water pollution, but provided that highway and hard-standing runoff is properly dealt with and mitigated then an increase is unlikely.	Impact considered the same. Agree
3D	Does the option require new waste water treatment capacity?	Will require new waste water treatment capacity and potentially technological treatment upgrades due to nitrogen constraints at the Harbour	Will require new waste water treatment capacity and potentially technological treatment upgrades due to nitrogen constraints at the Harbour	Conclusions reached within the SA are the same but option 2 is assessed as double negative as opposed to option 1 being only negative. Both options will require upgrades therefore both should be considered to have the same impact.
4A	4A Does the option maximise the use of renewable and low carbon energy sources?	Large strategic sites have the potential for CHP, district heating and also the space for a wide range of renewable energy technologies	Large strategic sites have the potential for CHP, district heating and also the space for a wide range of renewable energy technologies	Impact considered the same. Agree
4B	4B Does the option reduce the need to travel?	Insufficient brownfield sites within existing settlements to meet identifies needs. The strategic sites identifies are generally greenfield, located on the edge of settlements with a range of facilities and services. This is likely to result in an increased need to travel.	Increased use of edge of centre and settlement hubs compared to option 1.	The delivery of option 2 could require more larger scale strategic sites that could deliver new infrastructure such as primary schools, doctors, employment etc which would be intergrade into the wider masterplan and actually reduce the need to travel. Furthermore, Option 2 could be accommodated through the delivery of sites adjoining the main settlements with existing infrastructure and can be integrated to the existing settlement to encourage walking.
5A	Does the option reduce the risks of coastal, fluvial surface water and groundwater flooding?	Negative impact is likely due to increased runoff. Could be mitigated down to neutral (no significant effect) by full use of Sustainable Drainage System (SuDs) but this may not be possible for all sites	Negative impact is likely due to increased runoff. Could be mitigated down to neutral (no significant effect) by full use of Sustainable Drainage System (SuDs) but this may not be possible for all sites	Impact considered the same. Agree
5B	Does the option increase the use of SuDs and provide opportunities for restoring natural functions to rivers and coastal systems?	Allows for enough choice between locations to account for sites suitable for SuDs	Same issues as for option 3 but to a lesser degree	SHELAA identifies sufficient land for 7917 units that have been considered under the methodology of the SHELAA which would have considered such impacts. Therefore option 1 and 2 should be graded the same.
6A	Does the option achieve modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport, integrating bus and train networks?	Positive impact likely, on the basis that as much development as possible is near to Chichester City and/or train stations	Increasing development near the smaller stations in the east-west corridor means that an improved rail service maybe required to increase modal shift in the medium to long term.	Both options considered the same. However in addition to note will be seeking as much development as possible at the available strategic locations at Chichester. An increased amount over and above that tested could be allocated at Southbourne as identified in the Council's SHELAA to assist in the delivery of 800 dpa which is a settlement hub with a train station and good bus connections.
6B	Does the option improve networks for cyclists and pedestrians?	Overall a positive impact is likely, but requires mitigation and improved links for Southbourne over the railway line.	Impacts likely to be between Options 1 and 3	An increased amount over and above that tested could be allocated at Southbourne as identified in the Council's SHELAA to assist in the delivery of the railway line, therefore option 1 and 2 should be considered the same

6C	Does the option reduce congestion?	Analysis of journey times and delays as part of the Transport Study shows that without mitigation measures on junctions on the A27 then congestion, is likely to increase significantly by 2035	Analysis of journey times and delays as part of the Transport Study shows that without mitigation measures on junctions on the A27 then congestion, is likely to increase significantly by 2035	Both options will increase traffic on the A27, but both options are considered possible with mitigation
7A	Does the option encourage sustainable land management practices to conserve landscapes	Overall neutral - allows for selection of least damaging sites	Increased local impacts on landscape across the Bournes and at East Wittering but still avoids the most sensitive areas	Agree
7B	Does the option ensure protection of traditional urban forms?	Overall a natural impact is likely - allows for selection of least damaging sites	Increased impacts likely Broadbridge, Hambrook, Selsey, East Wittering, Fishbourne	An increased amount over and above that tested could be allocated at Southbourne as identified in the Council's SHELAA to assist in the delivery of 800 dpa which will assist in minimising the increase of development at Broadbridge, Hambrook, Selsey, East Wittering Fishbourne and therefore the impact .
7C	Does the option ensure conservation and enhancements of the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings?	The impact is largely site specific. This option is assessed as likely to be a neutral but uncertain effect on the basis of being able to re-allocate development away from sites that could have a negative impact	The impact is largely site specific. This option is assessed as likely to be a slight negative but uncertain effect on the basis of being able to re-allocate development away from most sites that could have an negative impact.	Both options have same conclusions but have been ranked differently. Both should be considered as neutral.