CHAPTER 5: Policy Monitoring

Chapter 5: HDPF Policy Monitoring

5.1 The AMR provides a baseline position of the social, environmental and economic circumstances in the District. In addition, the AMR ensures that the policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) and any significant effects identified through the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) process[1] are measured against a range of indicators. Under Part 8 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 (as amended) if a local planning authority are not implementing a policy in a local plan, the AMR should identify that policy, and include reasoning as to why a local planning authority are not implementing that policy and any steps it intends to address that policy issue.

5.2 This chapter sets out the results of the monitoring of HDPF policies with the exception of the monitoring of housing delivery, affordable housing and progress in delivering land for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, which is set out in Chapter 3.

5.3 Chapter 12 of the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework sets out the 'Monitoring Framework' against which it is proposed the planning policies will be monitored. These are set out in Appendix 1 of this document for completeness. The choice of indicators were based on a number of different factors that included:

- Relevance;
- Availability of data over time (including issues of costs and reliability);
- Likely significant effects identified in the sustainability appraisal;
- Policy target timescales; and
- Proportionality

5.4 It has not yet been possible to collect information for the complete suite of indicators included in the HDPF Monitoring Framework, therefore indicators have been reported on as and where the information is available. The policies monitored are set out below in the order in which they appear in the HDPF.

[1] Please see the link attached - https://www.horsham.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/28641/HDPF-SA-SEA-2015.pdf

HDPF Chapter 4 - Policies for Growth & Change

5.5 As set out in the HDPF Monitoring Framework, policies 1 and 2 of the HDPF will not be monitored given their overarching nature.

Policy 3 – Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

5.6 The proposed indicator for Policy 3 was to monitor the number of planning permissions allowed outside the Built-Up Area Boundary (BUAB), which would not comply with the overarching settlement strategy of the HDPF. In general terms it would be expected that most development is focussed in built-up area boundaries, unless sites come forward as allocations in Neighbourhood Plans or as Allocations in the HDPF. The detailed list of planning permissions set out in Appendix 1 of Chapter 3 confirms the spread of committed development that has emerged.

5.7 It is possible to monitor the proportions of planning appeals that were allowed, dismissed, allowed in part or withdrawn for the 2019/20 monitoring year. This does not provide a context for the appeal decisions and encompasses all types of development, so it is not an accurate measure of progress against policy 3 of the HDPF. Nevertheless, when compared with the previous monitoring period, the total number (95) and percentage of appeals allowed (25.26%). has increased somewhat. The 2018/19 figures were 68 and 14.7% respectively. Prior to the adoption of the HDPF the percentage of appeals which were allowed was 36%. This may therefore indicate that the HDPF policies are being used to successfully ensure that development comes forward in line with up to date planning policies.

Table 1 Appeals Data 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020

AMR 2019/20	Appeal Decision					
Appeal Procedure	**ALLOWED**	**DISMISSED**	**PART**	**Enforcement Notice Quashed**	**WITHDRAWN**	**No Further Action**
Written Representation	17	55	1	1	1	0
Fast Track	4	8	0	0	1	0
Informal Hearing	3	1	0	0	0	0
Public Inquiry	0	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL	**24**	**65**	**1**	**1**	**3**	**1**
Total %	**25.26%**	**68.42%**	**1.05%**	**1.05%**	**3.16%**	**1.05%**
Total No. of Appeals	**95**					

Table 2 Total number of Dwelling Units Allowed on Appeal

Year	Appeals Allowed – Total Units		Total Units
	Sites with fewer than 6 units	Sites with more than 6 units	
2019/20 AMR (HDPF)	10	6	**16**
2018/19 AMR (HDPF)	0	0	**0**
2017/18 AMR (HDPF)	8	7	**15**
2016/17 AMR (HDPF)	12	80	**92**
2015/16 AMR (Part HDPF)	18	269	**287**
2014/15 AMR (Pre HDPF)	15	235	**250**

5.8 In addition to increase in appeals which have been allowed, Table 2 shows there were 16 dwelling units granted on appeal in the 2019/20 monitoring year.

5.9 As discussed above, Table 1 does not currently provide the context for the appeal decisions and it encompasses all types of development, meaning it is not an accurate measure of progress with regards to Policy 3 of the HDPF. However, the decrease in the total number of units allowed on appeal since adoption does seem to indicate that HDPF policies are being upheld by inspectors. An analysis of all appeals between 1 November 2015 and 18 May 2018 revealed inspectors quoted Policy 3 among the reasons for dismissal in 44 cases involving new builds and allowed appeals against Policy 3 in 3 cases.

Policy 4 – Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion

5.10 Policy 4 of the HDPF relates to settlement expansion and outlines the criteria for new developments, such as housing, employment or community developments, outside the built-up area boundary. It notes that such expansions of settlements will be supported where the site is either allocated in a Local Plan or in a Neighbourhood Plan and adjoins an existing settlement edge. Chapter four provides further detail on the plans which have been made and the allocations in each plan.

Policy 5 – Strategic Policy: Horsham Town

5.11 Policy 5 of the HDPF relates to Horsham Town Centre and seeks to promote the prosperity of Horsham town by maintaining and strengthening its role as the primary economic and cultural centre in the District and wider economic area. From data provided by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) in Table 3, it is noted that there has been a net loss in terms of retail floorspace, which is mainly due to the ongoing redevelopment of Piries Place.

5.12 Development has completed on planning application (DC/16/2506) for town centre uses at Piries Place which included a 92 bedroom hotel and a 3 screen cinema (237 seats), in addition to space for retail, restaurants and bars.

Table 3: Retail and Town Centre Uses Completed within Horsham Town Centre in 2019/20 Monitoring Period

Horsham Town Centre	Gross Floorspace (m^2)	Net Floorspace (m^2)
Previously Developed Land		
A1: Retail (Piries Place and Middle St)	3,482	-1,344
A2: Financial/Professional Services	300	300
D2: Leisure (East St)	110	0
Summary for Previously Developed Land	3,892	-1.044
Summary for Town Centre	3,892	-1.044

Policy 6 – Strategic Policy: Broadbridge Heath Quadrant

5.13 Policy 6 of the HDPF relates to the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant. This area is identified as an 'Opportunity Area' where redevelopment will reinforce its role as a successful 'out of town' retail location. There are general guidelines as to the design and appearance of new development within this part of Broadbridge Heath and moreover, criteria relating to the scale and type of new retail (and other town centre) development permissible within the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant.

5.14 The planning application for the redevelopment of the existing leisure centre within the Broadbridge Heath Quadrant (see reference DC/16/1844) approved in November 2016 was completed and the new leisure centre, "The Bridge", opened on 20 October 2018. In order to assess the impacts of this policy in future monitoring years, completions within each use class will be monitored to ensure that a) the vitality and viability of the Horsham town centre is protected; and b) that this successful out of town retail location continues to be used for this purpose. There has been 488 sq. m. of retail floor space added in the 2019/20 monitoring period from various locations.

Table 4: Retail and Town Centre Uses Completed within Broadbridge Heath Quadrant in 2019/20 Monitoring Period

Broadbridge Heath Quadrant	Gross Floorspace (m^2)	Net Floorspace (m^2)
Land Not Previously Developed		
A1: Retailing (various)	488	488
Summary for Broadbridge Heath Quadrant	448	448

HDPF Chapter 5 - Economic Development

Policies 7 and 9 – Economic Growth and Employment Sites

5.15 Policies 7 and 9 of the HDPF relate primarily to economic growth within the District including the retention of Key Employment Areas (KEAs). West Sussex County Council (WSCC) provides comprehensive data on land developed for employment uses during the monitoring period. This is presented in Table 4, overleaf.

5.16 The gross amount of employment floorspace completed on Previously Developed Land (PDL) in 2019/20 was 3,881 square metres, representing 16% of the total floorspace completed in the monitoring year. This is a decrease on the 2018/19 monitoring period where 81% of the total floorspace completed for employment uses was on PDL. This is mostly due to the expansion of existing employment sites into adjacent greenfield land at Warnham (Dawes Farm), Southwater (Wilberforce Way), Billingshurst (Rosier Business Park) and Storrington (Tesla Engineering). See Table 5 for comparison over the last five years.

5.17 In total, the gross and net employment floorspace developed within the District for the 2019/20 monitoring period was 24,803.2 square metres (the net figure is 24,373.2 square metres). This is considerably more than that last recorded for the 2018/19 monitoring year, which was 15,936.5 square metres, and equivalent to the 2017/18 monitoring year (25,070 sq. m.). Around 50% of new employment floorspace developed in the monitoring year was for B8 use (Storage & Distribution). There is no discernible trend from these figures, however the overall increase, particularly for non-storage uses, still reflects the desirable nature of Horsham District as a location for businesses.

Table 4: Land Developed for Employment by Type (m^2) in the 2019/20 Monitoring Period

AMR 2019/20	Gross	Loss	Net	Percentage of Gross
Previously Developed Land				
B1a: Offices	320	0	320	
B1b: Research and Development	0	0	0	
B1c: Light Industry	280	0	280	
B1 Mixed uses	703	0	703	
B2: General Industry	845	430	415	
B8: Storage and Distribution	1733	0	1733	7%
Completed Floorspace	**3881**	**430**	**3451**	**16%**
Land Not Previously Developed				
B1a: Offices	161.2	0	161.2	
B1b: Research and Development	0	0	0	
B1c: Light Industry	4819	0	4819	
B1: Mixed Uses	478	0	478	
B2: General Industry	4758	0	4758	
B8: Storage and Distribution	10706	0	10706	43%
Completed Floorspace	**20922.2**	**0**	**20922.2**	**84%**
Total Employment Floorspace Completed in Horsham District 2019/20	**24803.2**	**430**	**24373.2**	

Table 5: Land Developed for Employment by Type (m^2)

Gross Employment Floorspace Completed in Horsham District					
Year	**PDL**	**%**	**Not PDL**	**%**	**TOTAL**
AMR 2019/20	3,881	16%	20,922.2	84%	24,803.2
AMR 2018/19	12,911	81%	3,025	19%	15,936
AMR 2017/18	8,596	34%	16,474	66%	25,070
AMR 2016/17	12,694	66%	6,657	34%	19,352
AMR 2015/16	6,394	50%	6,487	50%	12,882
AMR 2014/15	3,602	54%	3,065	46%	6,667
AMR 2013/14	3,518	49%	3,643	51%	7,161
AMR 2012/13	9,771	100%	0.00	0%	9,771

5.18 In addition, WSCC, with assistance from HDC, also monitors the quantum and type of employment land available for development in the district. This land includes sites allocated for employment uses in Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and sites for which planning permission has been granted for employment uses (excluding allocated sites to avoid double counting).

Table 6: Land Available for Employment Use by Type (m^2)

Type of Employment	Gross Floorspace (m2)	Net Floorspace (m2)	Site Area (ha)	Net Per cent %
B1a: Offices	3241.3	1933.3	4.01	1.0%
B1b: Research and Development	0	0	0	0.0%
B1c: Light Industry	4828.5	3119.5	2.39	4.3%
B1: Mixed Use	136782.5	123332.5	286.80	56.3%
B2: General Industry	47298.6	44089.0	19.38	19.1%
B8: Storage and Distribution	24818.9	22478.4	15.07	19.2%
Total 2019/20	**216969.8**	**194952.7**	**327.65**	**100.0%**

5.19 Table 6 illustrates that the largest amount of net floorspace available for development in the District at present is for B1 mixed use. There is also significant land available for B2 (general Industry) and B8 (storage and distribution) uses. It is also notable in Table 6a that there has been further increase in office floorspace available since the end of the 2016/17 monitoring period (which recorded a net loss of 252 square metres).

Table 6a: Historic Net Floor space Availability (m^2)

Type of Employment	Net Floor space (m2)					
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
B1a: Offices	675.0	831.3	-252.2	671.8	1,837.2	1,933.3
B1b: Research and Development	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
B1c: Light Industry	4,487.0	3,639.0	4,438.4	4,455.5	6,621.5	3,119.5
B1: Mixed Use	6,221.3	11,203.0	1,887.0	15,176.0	87,328.5	123,332.5
B2: General Industry	32,495.0	32,071.2	31,678.0	27,089.0	29,549.0	44,089.0
B8: Storage and Distribution	72,195.3	28,771.0	32,951.0	14,692.0	29,751.4	22,478.4
Total 2015 to 2020	**116,073.6**	**76,515.5**	**70,702.2**	**62,084.3**	**155,087.6**	**194,952.7**

Policy 8 – Strategic Allocation: University Quarter Mixed Use Development

5.20 Policy 8 of the HDPF relates to a Strategic Allocation for a University Quarter Mixed Use Development at a former pharmaceutical research development and manufacturing site in Horsham, 'the Novartis site', which is bounded by Wimblehurst Road, Parsonage Road and the railway lines. Policy 8 envisaged that the site would be developed for a higher education facility that included complementary employment uses and associated infrastructure. However, the university previously considering purchase of the Novartis site confirmed that they were no longer looking to develop a higher education facility on the site.

5.21 In December 2016, WSCC confirmed that it had completed the purchase of the 18.6 acre site and wished to transform the site into a quality employment and residential space to provide a boost for small and innovative start-up businesses with the aim of attracting businesses from the health and life science sector.

5.22 West Sussex County Council held two rounds of public consultations between September and November 2018 with a view to submitting an outline planning application later in 2018. An outline planning application (DC/18/2687) for up to 300 dwellings, up to 25,000sqm of employment (B1) floor space and provision of 618sqm of flexible commercial/community space was submitted on 17 December 2018, was granted planning permission at Full Council on 4th September 2019, and the S106 legal agreement was signed on 11 February 2020.

Policy 10 – Rural Economic Development

5.23 This policy relates to sustainable rural economic development and enterprise within the District, which is encouraged in order to generate local employment opportunities and economic, social and environmental benefits for local communities. The policy sets out the criteria for when employment development within a countryside location is acceptable.

5.24 The proposed indicator for the policy offset out within the HDPF monitoring framework was to monitor the number of business uses granted planning permission outside of the BUAB. To date, such data has been difficult to obtain to ensure it can be reliably monitored, therefore a revised method of monitoring this policy indicator will be investigated as part of the Local Plan Review.

Policy 11 – Tourism and Cultural Facilities

5.25 Policy 11 of the HDPF outlines where support from the Council will be given for development proposals for tourism and cultural facilities within the district. The HDPF monitoring framework (see Appendix 1) indicated that the number of C1 (Hotels), D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) and D2 (Assembly and Leisure) uses granted planning permission in the monitoring year would be presented as a means to measure this policy. To date, relevant data has been difficult to obtain to ensure it can be reliably monitored, therefore a revised method of monitoring this policy indicator will be investigated as part of the Local Plan Review.

5.26 In addition to the monitoring of policies set out above, the attendance rates at the Horsham Museum, the Capitol and leisure centres were also identified as a measure for this policy. The Council has recorded leisure centre attendance figures for the 2019/20 monitoring year and this is discussed later within this report under Policy 43.

Policies 12, 13 and 14 – Town Centre Uses

5.27 WSCC also monitors the total amount of floorspace which has come forward for 'town centre uses.' This is illustrated in Table 7 for the 2019/20 monitoring year. This table splits the sites into four key areas; town centres, sites outside town centres but within built-up area boundaries, sites peripheral to built-up area boundaries, and sites outside built-up area boundaries. Within these four categories, the table provides a breakdown between previously developed land and not previously developed land and a summary of each in each category.

Table 7: Total Amount of Completed Floorspace for 'Town Centre Uses'

Location	Gross Floorspace (m2)	Net Floorspace (m2)	Site Area (Ha)
Inside Town Centres			
Previously Developed Land			
A1: Retail (Piries Place and Middle St)	3,482	-1,344	0.68
A2: Financial/Professional Services	300	300	0.03
D2: Leisure (East St)	110	0	0.02
Total in Town Centres	**3,892**	**-1,044**	**0.74**
Inside Built up Area (outside town centres)			
Land Not Previously Developed			
A1: Retailing (Broadbridge Heath)	488	488	0.58
Previously Developed Land			
A1: Retailing	639	429	2.28
D2: Leisure	532	320	0.05
Total in Built up Area outside town centres	**1,659**	**1,237**	**2.91**
Peripheral to Built-up Area			
Land Not Previously Developed			
A1: Retailing (Southwater)	300	300	0.08
Previously Developed Land			
D2: Leisure (Leonardslee Gardens)	884	769	1.85
Total in Peripheral to Built-up Area	**1,184**	**1,069**	**1.93**
Outside Built up Area			
Land Not Previously Developed			
B1a: Offices	161	161	0.19
Previously Developed Land			
A1: Retail (Hop Oast)	296	181	0.41
B1a: Offices (Stane Court Billingshurst)	320	320	0.35
Total for 'Outside Built up Area'	**777**	**662**	**0.95**
Overall Horsham District Total	**7,512**	**1,924**	**6.53**

HDPF Chapter 6 - Housing

5.28 The monitoring of overall housing completions, affordable housing completions, the 5 Year Housing Land Supply Position (5YHLS) and Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) provision (i.e. policies 15, 16, 21, 22 and 23 of the HDPF) are dealt with in Chapter 3 of the AMR.

Policy 17 – Exceptions Housing Schemes

5.29 Policy 17 of the HDPF relates to land that would not be released for general market housing, but may come forward for the development of affordable homes providing that the criteria within this policy is met. The HDPF monitoring framework states that the number of dwellings granted planning permission on 'exceptions sites' in accordance with Policy 17 of the HDPF would be monitored. There were no rural exceptions site permissions granted in the current monitoring year.

Policy 18 – Retirement Housing and Specialist Care

5.30 Policy 18 of the HDPF outlines criteria for when proposals for retirement housing and specialist care would be supported, particularly where it is accessible by foot or public transport to local shops, services, community facilities and the wider public transport network. The HDPF monitoring framework states that the number of retirement dwellings/care homes approved would be monitored on an annual basis. See Table 8.

Table 8: Retirement Housing Permissions

AMR Year	Planning Ref	Site	Beds	Date Permitted
2019/20	DC/19/0529	Riverside Court Station Road Pulborough	1	07/02/2020
2018/19	DC/18/2131	Vehicle Garage Dukes Square Horsham	7	08/03/2019
2016/17	DC/16/1329	Halebourne Development Site Old Guildford Road Broadbridge Heath	70	24/02/2017
2016/17	DC/16/1860	The Anchorage Coombelands Lane Pulborough	40	21/12/2016
2014/15	DC/14/0590	Berkeley Homes Development Site Worthing Road Southwater	54	25/06/2015

Policy 19- Park Homes and Residential Caravans

5.31 Policy 19 of the HDPF relates to park homes and residential caravan sites and outlines where proposals for such development would be supported. The HDPF monitoring framework confirms that the number of approved park homes and residential caravans would be monitored on an annual basis. There were no park home or residential caravan site permissions granted in the current monitoring year.

Policy 20 – Rural Workers' Accommodation

5.32 Policy 20 of the HDPF relates to the development of rural worker accommodation outside of the built-up area boundaries and outlines the criteria for where such development would be supported. The HDPF monitoring framework proposes that the number of planning permissions for dwellings outside the built-up area boundary would be monitored to form an indicator for this policy.

Table 9: Rural Worker Dwellings Permissions

AMR Year	Planning Ref	Site	Dwellings	Date Permitted
2019/20	DC/19/1791	Aglands Farm Picts Lane Cowfold	1	29/10/2019
2019/20	DC/19/0610	The Meadows Fryern Road Storrington	1	17/07/2020
2018/19	DC/18/2733	Furnace Lake Stable Guildford Road Slinfold	1	13/03/2019
2018/19	DC/18/1326	Perrets Smithers Hill Lane Shipley	1	20/09/2018
2018/19	DC/18/0466	High Copse Farm Broadford Bridge Road West Chiltington	1	23/05/2018
2017/18	DC/17/1452	Moralee Farm Haglands Lane West Chiltington	1	04/01/2018

HDPF Chapter 7 - Strategic Allocations

Policy SD1 to SD9 – Strategic Policy: Land North of Horsham

5.33 Policy SD1 of the HDPF relates to the Land North of Horsham allocation, comprising an area north of the A264, between Langhurstwood Road and Wimlands Road. This area is allocated for a mixed used strategic development to accommodate at least 2,500 homes and associated infrastructure. Policy SD2 of the HDPF confirms that a new high quality business park shall be provided of approximately 46,450m^2, whilst the local centre is intended to have retail provision of no more than 6,000m^2 under policy SD3 of the HDPF.

5.34 An outline planning application for a mixed use scheme of 2,750 dwellings on Land North of Horsham was permitted 1 March 2018 (DC/16/1677).

5.35 In December 2018 ownership of the site was transferred from Liberty Property Trust to Legal & General.

5.36 Construction at the site has commenced with the building of the new school under application DC/19/1730.

5.37 It is currently projected that the first units will be delivered on the Land North of Horsham site in 2021/22. The projected delivery trajectory for the land North of Horsham strategic allocation is included in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Net Actual and Estimated Delivery of the Land North of Horsham Strategic Development

		2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	2031-32+	**Total**
Land North of Horsham	Expected	0	0	25	175	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	200	600	**2750**
	Completed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Policy SD10 – Strategic Policy: Southwater Strategic Site

5.38 Policy SD10 of the HDPF relates to the Land West of Southwater site, which comprises the area to the west of Worthing Road and to the south of Church Lane. This site was allocated for housing, open space and community facilities to accommodate around 600 homes and associated infrastructure.

5.39 Since the publication of the HDPF in November 2015, 572 units on Land West of Southwater has been granted in outline planning permission (DC/14/0590). Since the granting of the outline permission, a reserved matters application for the erection 244 dwellings was approved in February 2016 (DC/15/2064) and development is underway. In addition, a further reserved matters application for the provision of a sports pavilion, community building and various sports pitches (DC/16/1919) was approved in March 2017. Another reserved matters application (DC/18/1246) for 214 dwellings was approved in December 2018. The projected delivery trajectory for the Land West of Southwater strategic allocation is included in table 9 below.

Table 9: Net Actual and Estimated Delivery of the Land West of Southwater Strategic Development

		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	**Total**
Land West of Southwater	Expected	0	0	0	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	20	0	0	0	**370**
	Completed	56	128	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**227**

Policy SD11 – Strategic Policy: Land South of Billingshurst

5.40 Policy SD11 of the HDPF is a strategic policy in relation to the Land South of Billingshurst allocation. It relates to two parcels of land located to the south of Billingshurst, allocated for a housing development of around 150 dwellings. This land comprises the area west of Marringdean Road to the south of Blackthorn Avenue and land to the west of the recently approved A2 Dominion site.

5.41 A planning application on the Land South of Billingshurst allocation (2 separate sites) for 87 dwellings (DC/15/0896) was approved (on the 9 September 2016) with a further 51 dwellings (DC/16/0274) approved in March 2017. The projected delivery trajectory for the Land South of Billingshurst strategic allocation is included in table 10 below.

The part of the allocation at Kingslea Farm, Marringdean Road (DC/15/0896) is complete. The other part of the allocation still has 51 units left to build, and it is expected that these will be completed between 2023 and 2025.

Table 10: Net Actual and Estimated Delivery of the Land South of Billingshurst Strategic Development

		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28	2028-29	2029-30	2030-31	**Total**
Land South of Billingshurst (2 separate sites)	Expected	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	**51**
	Completed	74	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**87**

HDPF Chapter 8 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation

5.42 Information on the monitoring of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers is set out in chapter three of the AMR.

HDPF Chapter 9 - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural and Built Environment

Policy 24 – Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

5.43 Policy 24 of the HDPF relates to environmental protection and states that developments will be expected to minimise exposure to and the emission of pollutants including noise, odour, air and light pollution, and moreover, to address land contamination issues.

5.44 Within the district, there are declared Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) at Cowfold and Storrington; the main reason for these designations comes from road transport emissions. The air pollutant of most concern is nitrogen dioxide (NO_2). The Council's Environmental Health Department provides an Annual Status Report[2] for the two AQMAs. The most recent report dates to June 2020, and is summarised in the following paragraphs.

5.45 The monitoring results for 2019 indicate that only one monitoring location exceeded the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide (NO2), compared with three the year before. This site is at Storrington (School Hill). Another site at Storrington (Manleys Hill) recorded concentrations within 10% of the mean objective. Both sites are located within the existing Storrington AQMA. This demonstrates that the Storrington AQMA is still required. Another site at Cowfold recorded concentrations within 10% of the mean objective, and when distance correction was applied it complied with the objective. No other monitoring sites within the district exceeded the air quality objectives for NO_2 in 2019. A decision on the future revocation of the Cowfold AQMA will depend on the monitoring results in the next few years.

[2] HDC Annual Status Report AQ 2020 - https://www.horsham.gov.uk/environmental-health/air-quality/what-is-an-air-quality-management-area

5.46 Most of the diffusion tube monitoring sites have shown a decrease in 2019 on the previous year. Long-term sites have shown a continuing overall downward trend over the monitoring period, indicative of a gradual improvement in vehicle fleet emissions.

5.47 On the basis of the 2019 monitoring data for NO_2, the Council's Environmental Health team considered that the boundaries of the Storrington and Cowfold AQMAs can remain unchanged.

5.48 In respect of particulate matter (PM_{10}), automatic monitoring at the Horsham Park Way site indicates that both the annual mean and 24-hour UK objective for PM_{10} were compiled within 2019 and all the previous years of monitoring. Monitoring results collated from three permanent monitoring sites in the South East region show that both the annual mean and 24-hour UK objective for PM_{10} were complied with in 2019 and all the previous years. Regional monitoring for $PM_{2.5}$ has shown that the selected sites complied with the national annual mean limit value in 2019 and all previous years.

5.49 Regional monitoring for $PM_{2.5}$ has shown that the selected sites complied with the national annual mean limit value in 2019 and all the previous years. All sites have shown a decreasing trend throughout the monitoring period.

5.50 Detail of the actions the Council is taking to improve air quality in the district can be found in the HDC Air Quality Annual Status report 2020[3].

Policy 25 and Policy 31 – Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and District Character; and Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

5.51 Policy 25 of the HDPF relates to the natural environment and landscape character of the District and aims to protect landscapes and habitats against inappropriate development. Policy 31 of the HDPF relates to green infrastructure and biodiversity which states that particular consideration will be given to the hierarchy of sites and habitats in the district that includes Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Local Wildlife Sites (formally known as Sites of Nature Conservation

[3] HDC Annual Status Report AQ 2020 - https://www.horsham.gov.uk/environmental-health/air-quality/what-is-an-air-quality-management-area

Importance (SNCIs)), Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and any areas of Ancient Woodland.

5.52 The Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC) monitors the condition of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) throughout Sussex. SSSIs are one of the most important national environmental designations, covering sites of geological as well as wildlife importance. The results are illustrated in tables 11 and 12 below, which allow comparisons to be made between District and County levels. For Horsham District 42.5% of sites are considered to be in a favourable condition. This is the same as that formerly reported in all previous AMRs.

Table 11: Horsham District Sites Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Site Condition

SSSI Units in Horsham District										
Date of Study	**30/10/2016**		**31/10/2017**		**06/11/2018**		**01/11/2019**		**17/11/2020**	
Condition	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**
Favourable	31	42.5	31	42.5	31	42.5	31	42.5	31	42.5
Unfavourable Recovering	36	49.3	36	49.3	36	49.3	36	49.3	36	49.3
Unfavourable no change	2	2.7	2	2.7	2	2.7	2	2.7	2	2.7
Unfavourable declining	4	5.5	4	5.5	4	5.5	4	5.5	4	5.5
Part destroyed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Destroyed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total No. of Units	**73**		**73**		**73**		**73**		**73**	

5.53 The remaining 57.5% of sites in Horsham are considered unfavourable. Although this represents a majority of sites within the Horsham district, 49.3% are recovering through careful management and there are no sites destroyed/part destroyed as there were in previous monitoring years. Opportunities to maintain and enhance SSSI condition as a consequence of nearby development will continue to be offered through the planning system to continue the recovery process.

Figure 1: Horsham District SSSI Site Condition (2019/20)

5.54 At a wider county level, there has been a marked drop (5) in the number of favourable sites than last year. The number of recovering sites has also dropped by two. There has been a marked increase (21) in sites that are declining.

5.55 There is only a single destroyed SSSI Site in West Sussex (outside Horsham district) and this is the same as previous monitoring periods.

Table 12: West Sussex Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Sites Condition

SSSI Sites in West Sussex										
Date of Study	**31/10/2016**		**06/11/2017**		**01/11/2018**		**01/11/2019**		**17/11/2020**	
Condition	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**	**No of Sites**	**% of Sites**
Favourable	184	51.4	186	52.0	185	51.7	184	51.4%	179	50.0%
Unfavourable Recovering	158	44.1	155	43.3	157	43.9	141	39.4%	139	38.8%
Unfavourable no change	5	1.4	6	1.7	5	1.4	22	6.1%	8	2.2%
Unfavourable declining	10	2.8	10	2.8	10	2.8	10	2.8%	31	8.7%
Part destroyed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0%	0	0%
Destroyed	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3%	1	0.3%
Total No. of Units	**358**		**358**		**358**		**358**		**358**	

Figure 2: West Sussex County SSSI Site Condition 2020

Policy 26 – Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

5.56 Policy 26 of the HDPF relates to the protection of the countryside from inappropriate development and confirms that outside the built-up area boundaries, the rural character and undeveloped nature of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development, unless it is essential to its countryside location and either supports the needs of agriculture or forestry; enables the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste; provides a quiet informal recreational use; or enables the sustainable development of rural areas.

5.57 The HDPF monitoring framework stated that the number of planning applications approved outside the Built-up Area Boundary could be monitored in order to indicate whether the policy was being complied with. The monitoring of this policy to date is set out earlier in this chapter in relation to policy 3 in paragraphs 6.6-6.9.

Policy 27 – Strategic Policy: Settlement Coalescence

5.58 Policy 27 of the HDPF relates to settlement coalescence and confirms that development between settlements will be resisted unless it meets the four criteria listed. This includes whether there is no significant reduction in openness and that any proposed development does not generate urbanising effects within the settlement gap.

5.59 The HDPF monitoring framework states that the district will monitor planning decisions to note where 'settlement coalescence' has been considered as an issue in the determination of a planning application/appeal. Two significant outline planning applications (DC/18/0944) for 90 dwellings and (DC/18/2702) for 65 dwellings were

refused, in part, on settlement coalescence grounds. Further monitoring of these policies will continue in the next monitoring period.

Policy 28 – Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside

5.60 Policy 28 of the HDPF relates to both replacement dwellings and house extensions within the countryside (i.e. outside the Built-Up Area Boundary) and outlines the criteria where such development would be supported.

5.61 The HDPF monitoring framework states that the number of new planning permissions for replacement dwellings and/or extensions to dwellings within the countryside could be monitored; however, given that no target has been set with regards to replacement dwellings in the countryside (i.e. it is enabling policy), it is considered that an indicator is unnecessary.

Policy 29 – Equestrian Development

5.62 Policy 29 of the HDPF is an enabling policy relating to equestrian development and outlines the criteria where such development would be supported; namely that the proposal would be appropriate in scale and level of activity, and be in keeping with its location and surroundings.

5.63 The HDPF monitoring framework states that the number of new equestrian developments could be monitored; however, given that no target has been set with regards to new equestrian development, it is considered that an indicator is unnecessary.

Policy 30 – Protected Landscapes

5.64 Policy 30 of the HDPF relates to protected landscapes within the district. This includes the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within the north east portion of the district, and the transition to the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The SDNP is a separate planning authority area although the land remains in Horsham District for other purposes. The policy states that: *"Development proposals will be supported in or close to protected landscapes where it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse impacts to the natural beauty and public enjoyment of these landscapes as well as any relevant cross boundary linkages."*

5.65 The High Weald AONB body has completed a number of High Weald Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) Annual Reviews, with the latest review published for the 2019/20 period[4]. The document identifies that the High Weald AONB responded to 158 planning application consultations received from local authorities across the AONB during the 2019/20 period of which 19 were from Horsham District Council.

5.66 The review confirms that the High Weald AONB body were not engaged in any Horsham District neighbourhood plans in the 2019/20 monitoring period. This is in part because the Colgate Parish which is the main parish affected by the AONB is not designated as a Neighbourhood Planning Area. Other relevant parishes are at the early stages of plan preparation.

5.67 A revised High Weald AONB Management Plan[5] was approved by the JAC in December 2018 and adopted by Horsham District Council on 21 March 2019.

---

[4] The High Weald Joint Advisory Committee Annual Review 2019/2020
http://www.highweald.org/about-the-high-weald-unit/annual-reviews/
[5] The High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-2024
http://www.highweald.org/high-weald-aonb-management-plan.html

Policies 32 and 33 - The Quality of New Development and Development Principles

5.68 Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF relate to good design and requires all development to include high quality and inclusive design in the district based on a clear understanding of the local, physical, social, economic, environmental and policy context for development. Policy 33 (1) of the HDPF does aim to make efficient use of land, and prioritise the use of previously developed land and buildings. The number and percentages of new and converted dwellings on Greenfield and on previously developed, 'Brownfield' land (PDL) has already been reported on in Chapter 3.

5.69 Policy 33 (9) of the HDPF relates to the incorporation of measures for new development to reduce any actual or perceived opportunities for crime or antisocial behaviour on the site and in the surrounding area. In general, Horsham district is a safe place to live. Table 12 is a selective illustration of the crime type and notable offences reported in the Horsham district from AMR Years 2015/16 to 2019/20 provided by the Police recorded crime Community Safety Partnership[6]. (Note: this table differs from previous AMRs as the source of the information and selected crime categories have changed)

Table 12: Horsham District selected recorded Crime Statistics

AMR Year > Offence Group	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Year on Year	Yearly Difference %
Criminal damage and arson	919	798	740	817	911	94	11.5%
Drug offences	168	144	126	204	202	-2	-1.0%
Miscellaneous crimes	132	128	135	116	156	40	34.5%
Possession of weapons offences	34	68	56	81	98	17	21.0%
Public order offences	382	488	525	640	683	43	6.7%
Robbery	29	30	32	29	53	24	82.8%
Sexual offences	182	202	254	210	258	48	22.9%
Theft offences	1959	2100	2345	2131	2285	154	7.2%
Violence against the person	1549	1668	1890	2213	2351	138	6.2%
TOTAL	**5354**	**5626**	**6103**	**6441**	**6997**	556	8.6%

5.70 As can be seen from the table, the total number of recorded crimes in the selected categories have increased by 8.6% between the last two monitoring years, with the biggest increase relating to robbery. It should be noted that although crime statistics can be affected by the design of new buildings and public spaces (i.e. such a lack of

[6] Police recorded crime Community Safety Partnership
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-recorded-crime-open-data-tables

public surveillance for new development), crime rates are also substantially impacted by other factors, such as economic recessions, poverty, deprivation, better reporting and an increasing population etc.

Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

5.71 Policy 34 of the HDPF relates to cultural and heritage assets and this policy states that the Council will look to sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets. The policy outlines a number of requirements for developments affecting cultural and heritage assets to satisfy.

5.72 Historic England holds a 'Heritage at Risk' register[6] for the south east region that is updated annually. To be considered for inclusion on the Register, buildings or structures must be:

- designated and included on the National Heritage List for England;
- a grade I or II* listed building;
- a grade II listed building in London;
- a structural scheduled monument with upstanding remains; or
- in secular (non-worship) use.

In addition, the risk assessment includes places of worship, conservation areas and historic park and gardens. For Horsham District there were six entries on the risk register that included one scheduled monument, two places of worship, two archaeological entries and a single Conservation Area (Billingshurst). This is one less than for the last period. The full details of the Risk Register are provided in Table 13 below.

[6] Historic England Heritage at Risk 2020 Registers
https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/har-2020-registers

Table 13: Historic England Heritage at Risk 2020 Register – South East

Site Address	Designation	Priority Category	Previous Priority Category	Condition
Ruins of Sedgewick Castle, Moated site, Nuthurst	Scheduled Monument, RPG grade II	C	C	Poor
Parish Church of St Peter, Station Road, Cowfold	Listed Place of Worship grade I, CA	C	C	Poor
Parish Church of St Peter, Upper Beeding	Listed Place of Worship grade II*	C	C	Poor
Site Address	**Designation**	**Trend**	**Vulnerability**	**Condition**
Bowl Barrow on Black Hill, Colgate	Scheduled Monument	Declining	Plant Growth	Generally unsatisfactory with major localised problems
Alfoldean Roman site, Slinfold	Scheduled Monument	Declining	Arable Ploughing	Extensive significant problems
Billingshurst	Conservation Area	Deteriorating	Medium	Poor

5.73 The priority categories are defined by Historic England in their report, with Category A being the worst case and Category F being the best case scenario. Category C that is defined as ‘slow decay, no solution agreed’; and Category F that is defined as ‘repair scheme in progress’. These heritage assets will be reviewed in 2021 by Historic England. It is however considered that the majority of the sites at risk are in need of repair. Some have received funding for these repairs to be completed.

HDPF Chapter 9 -Climate Change

Policies 35, 36 and 37 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change

5.74 The Council is committed towards tackling climate change through land use policies within the HDPF, that includes measures to improve the energy efficiency of new developments, the promotion of decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy supply systems (Policy 35 – Strategic Policy: Climate Change), the promotion of District Heating and Cooling Systems (Policy 36 – Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use) and the sustainable construction and design of new development (Policy 37: Sustainable Construction).

5.75 Horsham District Council sources its carbon emissions data from the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy[7] (DBEIS) and this information is considered to be a key indicator pertaining to the above policies. However, there is a two year time delay in acquiring the information and such data is considered an 'estimate' and is revised each year; the latest data was produced in June 2020 for the 2018 calendar year. For a fourth consecutive year the figures have also retrospectively changed compared to previous AMRs. The figures in Table 14 are from a data subset which only includes emissions estimates within the scope of influence of the Local Authority, and excludes large industrial sites, railways, motorways and land-use.

5.76 As illustrated in the Table 14, the per capita carbon emissions has been reduced significantly since 2005 from 8.0 Kilotonnes per capita to 4.9 Kilotonnes per capita. The industrial and commercial sector has seen the biggest reduction from a high in 2006 of 324.7 Kilotonnes of CO_2 to 177.4 Kilotonnes of CO_2 in 2018.

[7] Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-local-authority-and-regional-carbon-dioxide-emissions-national-statistics-2005-to-2018

Table 14: Horsham District CO_2 emissions 2005-2018

Year	Industry and Commercial Total	Domestic Total	Transport Total	Grand Total (kt)	Population (1000's mid- yr estimate)	Per Capita Emissions (t)
2005	322.4	340.3	344.0	1006.8	125.9	8.0
2006	324.7	344.4	331.5	1000.6	127.2	7.9
2007	316.2	334.7	332.9	983.9	128.3	7.7
2008	297.3	336.4	314.2	947.9	129.1	7.3
2009	261.7	305.9	302.7	870.4	129.8	6.7
2010	288.8	327.8	300.4	917.1	130.9	7.0
2011	263.9	286.5	296.8	847.2	131.5	6.4
2012	275.1	309.0	296.9	881.0	132.3	6.7
2013	260.1	302.4	286.7	849.2	133.2	6.4
2014	223.2	260.2	292.9	776.3	134.5	5.8
2015	210.5	252.5	300.5	763.6	136.3	5.6
2016	192.6	240.2	310.2	743.0	138.5	5.4
2017	182.8	225.5	305.3	713.6	140.1	5.1
2018	177.4	227.8	298.1	703.3	142.2	4.9

Units are in Kilotonnes of Carbon Dioxide.

5.77 Policy 37 of the HDPF in part seeks to achieve satisfactory arrangements for all new development for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials as an integral part of the design, and moreover, seeks to minimise construction and demolition waste and to utilise recycled and low impact materials.

5.78 In terms of recycling, Horsham district is performing well and for the 2019/20 monitoring period, a total of 27,075 tonnes of household waste was recycled or composted. This represents 53% of total household waste (51,091 tonnes) generated in the district. There has been an increase in the recycling rate since 2015, though the rate has remained constant during the last two monitoring periods. The overall amount of household waste (including refuse, recycling and compost) collected per household has increased by 19% over the last 5 years.

Table 15: Horsham District Waste and Recycling 2019/20

AMR Year	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20
Domestic Waste (t)	28,100	26,929	26,280	23,647	24,016
Domestic Mixed Dry Recycling (t)	22,911	12,967	13,242	13,870	13,643
Garden Waste (t)		12,647	12,614	12,893	13,432
TOTAL (t)	**51,090**	**52,543**	**52,136**	**50,229**	**51,091**
Total Recycled (t)	22,991	25,614	25,865	26,676	27,231
Recycling Rate (%)	**45%**	**49%**	**50%**	**53%**	**53%**
Total per Household (kg)	850	909	896	813	1010

5.79 West Sussex's non-recycled household waste is currently taken to a landfill site at Brookhurst Wood. Biffa and West Sussex County Council have signed a 25 year contract to treat the County's non-recycled black bag household rubbish at a Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT) facility at Brookhurst Wood, to the north of Horsham. This flagship facility for West Sussex will ensure that the site continues to process non-recycled waste, but in a more environmentally friendly and cost effective way. It will use a combination of sorting and treatment technologies to maximise the amount of rubbish that is recycled or used as a resource by separating out metals which will be sent for recycling, and using waste to create alternatives to fossil fuels for industry and homes.

5.80 Planning permission was granted on appeal[7] for a recycling, recovery and renewable energy facility and ancillary infrastructure at the site of the Former Wealden Brickworks, Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, under West Sussex County Council planning application WSCC/015/18/NH on 27 February 2020.

[7] Appeal Decision WSCC/015/18/NH
https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/ViewCase.aspx?CaseID=3218965

Policy 38 – Strategic Policy: Flooding

5.81 During the 2019/20 monitoring year, there were five objections to planning applications from the Environment Agency[8] on flooding grounds and there were no objections on water quality grounds. Table 16 shows Horsham District Council in comparison to other local planning authorities within West Sussex.

Table 16: Environment Agency Objections (Flooding and Water Quality)

Environment Agency 2019/20		
LPA Name	**Number of objections (Flood)**	**Number of objections (Water Quality)**
Arun District Council	15	0
Adur & Worthing Councils	13	0
Chichester District Council	8	3
Crawley Borough Council	3	0
Horsham District Council	**5**	**0**
Lewes District Council	4	1
Mid Sussex District Council	1	0
Mole Valley District Council	4	2

5.82 Of the objections in the Horsham Area two were due to an unsatisfactory Flood Risk Analysis or Flood Consequence Assessment (FRA/FCA) and three were due to no FRA/FCA being submitted.

[8] Environment Agency objections to planning on the basis of flood risk https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-agency-objections-to-planning-on-the-basis-of-flood-risk

HDPF Chapter 10 - Infrastructure, Transport and Healthy Communities

Policy 39 – Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision

5.83 Policy 39 of the HDPF relates to infrastructure provision and confirms that arrangements for new or improved infrastructure provision, will be secured by planning obligations (S106 agreements), the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and in some circumstances, through planning conditions attached to a planning permission.

5.84 The Council publishes a separate CIL Annual Report[9] and Infrastructure Funding Statement on S106 and CIL contributions and a summary is presented in Table 17.

Table 17: S106 and CIL Contributions Secured for the 2019/20 Monitoring Year

Contribution Type 2019/2020	Total (£)	Per Cent s106
Affordable Housing	260,427.07	4.6%
Education - WSCC	3,299,664.60	58.8%
Community Facilities	233,412.95	4.2%
Community Halls and Buildings	23,745.84	0.4%
Fire & Rescue - WSCC	40,103.35	0.7%
Health Provision - West Sussex PCT	49,242.21	0.9%
Libraries - WSCC	126,130.20	2.2%
Local Recycling Facilities	17,703.32	0.3%
Open Space (commuted sum)	274,274.14	4.9%
Open Space Sport and Recreation	444,969.58	7.9%
Other Contributions	117,354.55	2.1%
Safeguarding the Environment	70,080.91	1.2%
Sustainable Transport - WSCC	657,973.01	11.7%
Total S106	**5,615,081.73**	100.0%
CIL Contributions	1,693,304.77	
Total CIL	**1,693,304.77**	

5.85 As illustrated in the table, the total monetary contribution towards infrastructure secured through planning applications in the 2019/20 monitoring period was £5,615,081.73 with by far the largest proportion (58.81%) of this income being collected for West Sussex County Council education. In addition this is the second full year of CIL receipts, £1,693,305.77 which is three times the first full year amount of £549,632.56.

[9] Community Infrastructure Levy Report
https://www.horsham.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy/cil-annual-report

Policy 40 – Sustainable Transport

5.86 Policy 40 of the HDPF relates to sustainable transport and confirms that in order to manage the anticipated growth in demand for travel, development proposals which promote an improved and integrated transport network, with a re-balancing in favour of non-car modes as a means of access to jobs, homes, services and facilities will be encouraged and supported.

5.87 The Census for 2011 provides information on both the distance travelled to work by residents in Horsham district, together with the mode of transport used to travel to work. Of the 66,229 residents in employment aged between 16 and 74 the average distance travelled to work in 2011 was 19km. Table 18 shows all the categories for the distances travelled to work, out commuting from Horsham district.

Table 16: Distance Travelled to Work (Census 2011)

Distance Travelled	Total Population	Percentages of population in employment
Less than 2km	9,117	13.8%
2km to less than 5km	6,810	10.3%
5km to less than 10km	6,815	10.3%
10km to less than 20km	12,849	19.4%
20km to less than 30km	6,075	9.2%
30km to less than 40km	2,779	4.2%
40km to less than 60km	4,281	6.5%
60km and over	2,107	3.2%
Work mainly at or from home	9,683	14.6%
Other	5,783	8.7%
All categories	**66,229**	**100%**

5.88 The table illustrates that the distance most commonly travelled to reach employment is 10 – 20km, with 19.4% of the working population undertaking such a journey. The second highest category are based at or close to home, (14.6% of the working population). It is noted that there is a substantial proportion of people who travel a significant distance to work, with at least 9,167 people travelling over 30km to get to work (or 13.9% of the working population), and 2,107 people travelling 60km or more (3.2%).

5.89 The 2011 Census also provides information on the modes of travel used to get to their work destination. Table 19 illustrates which travel modes were the most used in the district.

Table 19: Method of Travel to Work (Census 2011)

Method of Travel to Work	Total Population	Percentage of working population
Underground, metro, light rail, tram	102	0.2%
Train	4,719	7.1%
Bus, minbus or coach	1,161	1.8%
Taxi	77	0.1%
Work mainly at or from home	409	0.6%
Driving a car or van	43,221	65.3%
Passenger in a car or van	2,817	4.3%
Bicycle	1,121	1.7%
On foot	6,607	10.0%
Other method of travel to work	370	0.6%
All categories	**66,229**	**100%**

5.90 As illustrated in the table, the main mode of transport used within Horsham district to get to work was the private motor vehicle, at 65.3% of the working population. There is a significant minority of the working population 10% (or 6,607 people) who walk to work, and some 7.1% (or 4,719 people) who use the train.. The overall results, and particularly the reliance upon the private motor vehicle is not unsurprising given the rural nature of the district, and moreover, the distances travelled by the working population outside of the district, particularly to London and the south coast.

Policy 41 – Parking

5.91 Horsham District Council operates a number of pay car parks in Horsham for which usage data can be obtained. The data and indicator summarised below can also be used as a proxy for the vitality and viability of Horsham Town Centre (see policies 12 and 13 of the HDPF) more generally. Table 20 shows car parking ticket sales per annum and compares that with previous years.

Table 20: Car Parking Figures (Horsham Town) since 2007/08

Year	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Total number of ticket sales	1,514,301	1,435,283	1,346,466	1,338,266	1,349,298	1,356,836
Year	**2013/14**	**2014/15**	**2015/16**	**2016/17**	**2017/18**	**2018/19**
Total number of ticket sales	1,559,618	1,460,473	1,499,788	1,677,872	1,620,838	1,408,000
Year	**2019/20**					
Total number of ticket sales	1,387,000					

5.92 Both the maintenance and refurbishment of existing car parks can impact the number of car parking tickets sold each year; however, the indicator is considered to be robust given the length of time over which monitoring has taken place. After the 2007/08 period the number of visitors fell and remained around 1,350,000 until 2012/13, which was likely due to the economic recession over this period post the 2008 financial crash. It also predates the increase in housing numbers that have recently been developed in and around Horsham town. The number of visitors to the town appeared to have recovered from 2013/14 reaching a peak in 2016/17. However the figures since then show a downward trend over previous years and in 2019/20 are down 14.5% from the 2016/17 peak. This may in part be due to the demolition and rebuilding of Piries Place Car Park between 18 June 2018 and 9 October 2019.

Policy 42 – Strategic Policy: Inclusive Communities

5.93 Policy 42 of the HDPF aims to aid inclusive communities and to provide positive measures which help create a socially inclusive and adaptable environment where the particular needs of specific groups are met, such as Gypsies and Travellers, faith groups etc.

5.94 The Index of Deprivation[10] produced by the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) provides a useful indication of the overall level of deprivation in a district by scoring a set of 38 indicators across seven distinct domains; income, employment, health, education, housing, living environment and crime. To allow districts to be compared, the Index combines all topics to produce a ranking system containing all 326 local authorities within England. The ranking system is presented on a scale of 1 (most deprived) to 326 (least deprived).

5.95 As the indices is a ranking system, it is important to remember that it is a comparison against other local authorities; therefore a high ranking does not necessarily mean there is no deprivation within the district, it just means there is less deprivation compared to that of other areas. The local authority level result also combines scores from numerous smaller areas within that location, meaning that a high score could in some circumstances, mask the fact that there are very localised pockets of severe deprivation hidden within the district.

5.96 The Indices of Deprivation, 2019, is the latest year for figures to have been produced by the MHCLG and shows overall deprivation within the Horsham District to be relatively low with only 36 local authorities in the rest of the UK considered to be less deprived. However, this is a reduction to that reported in the 2015 Indices where only 31 authorities were considered to be less deprived.

5.97 Table 21 below compares 2019 County and local authority levels of deprivation against the previous 2015 and 2010 results. Whilst the study only measures deprivation in relative terms, all local authorities in West Sussex have declined in rankings from 2015-2019 with the exception of Adur & Worthing which improved.

[10] English indices of deprivation
https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/english-indices-of-deprivation

Table 21: Indices of Multiple Deprivation (2010 - 2019)

County Level (ranking out of 152 upper tier authorities)				
	Rank 2019	**Rank 2015**	**Rank 2010**	**Change 2015-2019**
West Sussex	**125**	**130**	**130**	-5
East Sussex	93	99	90	-6
Hampshire	136	141	141	-5
Brighton & Hove	89	76	53	13
Surrey	147	150	150	-3
Local Authority (ranking out of 317)				
	Published Rank 2019	**Published Rank 2015**	**Published Rank 2010**	**Change 2015-2019**
Adur	169	150	145	19
Arun	156	174	154	-18
Chichester	225	231	222	-6
Crawley	149	151	170	-2
Horsham	**290**	**295**	**304**	-5
Mid Sussex	311	321	315	-10
Worthing	175	172	160	3

5.98 Table 21 shows that in 2019, Horsham was ranked 290 out of 317 authorities. This means that approximately 90 % of all local authorities within the UK experienced higher levels of deprivation than can be found in Horsham District. It should be noted that this is an average; therefore a wide range of deprivation scores could be present within the smaller area of Horsham district.

Policy 43 – Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation

5.99 Policy 43 of the HDPF relates to community facilities, leisure and recreation and outlines where the provision of new and improved community facilities or services will be supported, particularly where developments of this nature would be in accordance with the Development Hierarchy (policy 3 of the HDPF) or Strategic Development locations.

5.100 Horsham District Council monitors the throughput for the district's leisure centres each year. A record total of 1,134,600 visitors were recorded during the 2019/20 monitoring period. This represents a 4.2 % increase since the last monitoring period. Table 22 below shows the total throughput for HDC Leisure Centres per annum since 2011/12.

Table 22: Horsham District Council Leisure Centres Attendance since 2011/12

HDC Sport Centres		
Monitoring Year	**Total throughput**	**Per cent change**
2019/20	1,134,600	4.2%
2018/19	1,087,307	2.8%
2017/18	1,057,591	6.5%
2016/17	993,335	-2.9%
2015/16	1,023,524	-2.7%
2014/15	1,052,102	-1.7%
2013/14	1,069,978	10.2%
2012/13	970,771	-2.3%
2011/12	993,697	

5.101 There were three leisure developments completed within the 2019/20 monitoring period with a net floor space gain of 1,089 sq. m. as detailed in Table 22a. The majority of which (769 sq.m.) was from the re-opening of the Leonardslee Gardens.

Table 22a: Horsham Leisure Development Completions 2019/20

Location	**Gross Floorspace (m2)**	Net Floorspace (m2)	Site Area (Ha)
Inside Town Centres			
D2: Leisure (East Street)	110	0	0.02
Total in Town Centres	**110**	**0**	**0.02**
Inside Built up Area (outside town centres)			
D2: Leisure (White Hart Fitness Pulborough)	212	0	0.02
D2: Leisure (Bodywise Gym Warnham)	320	320	0.03
Total in Built up Area outside town centres	**532**	**320**	**0.05**
Peripheral to Built up Area			
D2: Leisure (Leonardslee Gardens)	**884**	**769**	**1.85**
Total in Peripheral to Built up Area	**884**	**769**	**1.85**
Overall Horsham District Total	**1,526**	**1,089**	**1.92**

Appendix 1: Monitoring Framework for the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF)

Policy & Description	Policy Objective/ Significant Effect	Target	Indicator	Notes	Baseline	Source
1. Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development Policy to ensure Council takes a positive approach which reflects the presumption in favour of Sustainable Development	To ensure compliance with NPPF • SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO4 Recognising and promoting the role of market towns • SO5 The rural economy • SO6 Housing delivery • SO7 Sustainable Locations • SO9 Character and built heritage • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality • SO12 Climate Change and Renewable Energy	N/A	N/A	This is an overarching policy set by national Government. We are unable to monitor this at District level	N/A	N/A

Topic: Policies for Growth & Change						
2. Strategic Policy: Strategic Development To maintain the Districts unique rural character whilst ensuring the needs of the community are met	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO6 Housing delivery • SO7 Sustainable Locations	N/A	N/A	This is an overarching policy to be monitored in more detail through the policies in the HDPF	N/A	N/A
3. Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy To ensure development takes place in a manner which protects the settlement pattern and rural character of the district.	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO6 Housing delivery • SO7 Sustainable Locations	No development to be delivered outside the BUAB unless through Neighbourhood Development Plans, Housing Exceptions sites or under the provisions of Strategic Policy 4. Neighbourhood plans	Number of permissions granted outside the BUAB which do not comply with local policy	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed from a baseline of zero each year	HDC
4. Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO6 Housing delivery	To meet identified local needs	Number of units allocated through Neighbourhood Development Plans	The housing trajectory showing actual and projected completions	Zero	WSCC facilitated by District Council

5. Strategic Policy: Horsham Town	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability	To promote and maintain the prosperity of Horsham town	• Amount of new retail floorspace in town centre • Number of retail units converted to other uses • Amount of retail permitted outside the defined town centres • Retail vacancy rates / Retail vitality • Total amount of floorspace for 'town centre uses'	WSCC CIL LA information Horsham Residents Survey Town Centres Manager	Zero in base year of 2011 and monitored annually to present cumulative additions year on year	District Council monitored through planning applications
6. Strategic Policy: Broadbridge Heath	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO6 Housing delivery	Delivery of new district wide leisure provision Delivery of 35% affordable housing	• Delivery of development in accordance with policy / SPD • Number of dwellings completed • Delivery of affordable housing onsite • Amount of floorspace delivered for retail and leisure	N/A	Policy will be monitored once the application is received and determined	District Authority

Topic: Economic Development						
7. Strategic Policy: Economic Growth	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO5 The rural economy • SO7 Sustainable Locations	Delivery of 90,000sqm of Office floorspace throughout the District to 2031 Delivery of 270,300sqm of Industrial floorspace throughout the District to 2031 Delivery of 46,450sqm of commercial floorspace on land north of Horsham	• Amount of land developed for employment land / land supply by type (B1 / B2 / B8), particularly in strategic locations • Amount of employment land lost from Key Employment Areas • Amount of employment land lost to residential development • Total number of jobs in Horsham District • Levels of Unemployment • Average annual income • Employment land available	N/A	Zero at the start of plan period 2011	CILLA figures from WSCC and planning applications
9. Employment Development – Key employment areas	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO7 Sustainable Locations	No loss of key employment areas	• Amount of land developed for employment land / land supply by type (B1 / B2 / B8), particularly in any strategic locations • Amount of employment land lost from Key Employment Areas • Amount of employment land lost to residential development • Levels of Unemployment • Average annual income • Employment land available	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	CILLA figures from WSCC and planning applications

10. Rural economic development	• To support rural businesses • SO1 Sustainable Development • SO5 The rural economy • SO7 Sustainable Locations	For the number of rural businesses to increase over the plan period	Number of business use (A1, B1, B2, B8) permission granted outside BUAB Loss of business use – Monitored through change of use B1 – C3	HDC to analyse business permissions	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	District Council
11. Tourism and cultural facilities	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO5 The rural economy	No net loss of tourism and cultural facilities in District To provide an increase in leisure provision in the District Achieve or increase target attendance rates for Horsham Museum, Capitol and leisure centres	Number of C1, D1, D2 uses granted permission Number of leisure facilities in District Target attendance rates at Horsham Museum, Capitol and leisure centres	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	District Council
12. Strategic Policy: Vitality and viability of existing retail centres	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO4 Recognising and promoting the role of market towns	Maintain or increase present levels of retail floorspace in defined frontages and primary shopping area Reduce or maintain present levels of retail space outside defined town centre	• Amount of new retail floorspace in town and village centres • Number of retail units converted to other uses • Amount of retail permitted outside the defined town and village centres • Retail vacancy rates / Retail vitality • Monitor usage of car parks • Number of market stalls let through HDC • Number of outdoor events • held each year	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	CILLA figures from WSCC and planning applications

13. Town centre uses	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO4 Recognising and promoting the role of market towns	Maintain or increase present levels of retail floorspace in defined frontages and primary shopping area To retain 70% A1 use in primary retail frontages To retain 50% A1 use	• Amount of new retail floorspace in town centres • Number of retail units converted to other uses • Mix of uses- A3 / A1 split	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	CILLA figures from WSCC and planning applications
		in secondary retail frontages				
14. Shop Fronts & advertisements	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO9 Character and built heritage	Enabling policy – no target	No of applications for new, temporary or replacement shop fronts granted and refused	This is an enabling policy, therefore no target has been set	N/A	District Council

Topic: Housing						
15. Strategic Policy: Housing Provision	SO1 Sustainable Development SO6 Housing delivery The SA identified three significant effects from the plan. Namely that • housing allocations could not come forward within planned timescales; and • that the appropriate type and size of housing may not be delivered	Delivery of 13,000 units over plan period in the whole District. Delivery of 2,500 units on land West of Bewbush as allocated through Core Strategy 2007 Delivery of the remaining 1,946 units on land West of Horsham as allocated through the Core Strategy, 2007 Delivery of 750 units through windfall development Delivery of 1,500 units through Neighbourhood Planning	• Housing completions • Average house prices • Affordable Housing Completions • Affordable housing schemes granted permission • Number if people on Housing waiting list • % of households which are owner occupied • Total number of house sales • Number of windfall sites granted permission • Number of units granted through Neighbourhood Development Plans	Information will be presented in the Districts housing trajectory	Baseline was zero in 2011. Currently an undersupply of 555 units in monitoring year 2013-14	WSCC HDC Zoopla.com
16. Strategic Policy: Meeting Local Housing Needs	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery	35% affordable housing on residential development of 15 or more dwelling and 20% affordable housing on site between 5-15 dwellings	• Affordable Housing Completions • Affordable housing schemes granted permission • Housing permissions by dwelling size and type	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	District Council Registered Affordable Housing Providers

		70% affordable rented and 30% intermediate/ shared ownership Reduction in the number of people on the Districts housing waiting list Completed housing reflects the type, mix and size evidenced through the SHLAA Update 2014				
17. Exception Housing Schemes	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery	Reduction in the number of people in priority housing need in rural areas	Number of dwellings granted permission on exceptions sites accordance with policy 17	N/A	2011 baseline	District Council
18. Retirement Housing and Specialist Care	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery	Target to be provided through SHMA Update 2014	Number of retirement dwellings/care home permitted.	N/A	The monitoring of this indicator will be assessed on an annual basis	District Council
19. Park Homes and Residential Caravans	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO5 The rural economy • SO6 Housing delivery	No target enabling policy	Number of permitted sites Number of applications for change of use to C1	N/A	This is an enabling policy therefore no target was set	District Council

20. Rural Workers Accommodation	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO5 The rural economy • SO6 Housing delivery	No target – enabling policy	Number of permissions for dwellings outside BUAB	Enabling policy in order to achieve a key objective in the plan permissions outside BUAB will show if its working	This is an enabling policy therefore no target was set	District Council
Topic: Strategic Allocations						
Land North of Horsham						
SD1: Strategic Policy: Land North of Horsham	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO6 Housing delivery • SO7 Sustainable Locations • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality	N/A	Policy will be monitored through other policies in the Monitoring Framework	N/A	N/A	N/A
SD2: Employment and Business Opportunities on land north of Horsham.	• SO2 Economy & Employment • SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability	Provision of 46,450sqm of employment land	Amount of new office floorspace provided within Strategic development site	N/A	Zero at start of plan period	WSCC
SD3: Local Centre (at land north of Horsham	• SO3 Protection of economic vitality and viability • SO7 Sustainable Locations	Delivery of 6,000 sqm provision of retail	Amount of new retail floorspace provided within Strategic development site	N/A	Zero at start of plan period	WSCC

SD4: Housing Needs (at land north of Horsham)	SO6 Housing delivery	Delivery of 2,500 residential units to 2031 35 % of units delivered to be affordable	Housing completions	N/A	Zero at start of plan period	WSCC
SD5: Open Space, Sport and Recreation (at land north of Horsham)	SO7 Sustainable Locations	Delivery of 3.2Ha of playing pitches	Delivery of open space and recreation in accordance with policy SD5	This will be monitored by referring to the planning application	Zero at start of plan period	HDC
SD6: Landscape Buffer, Biodiversity and green Infrastructure (on land north of Horsham)	SO10 Landscape Character SO11 Environmental Quality	Delivery of a 10ha Cemetery	Delivery of cemetery and landscape buffer in accordance with policy SD6	This will be monitored by referring to the planning application	Zero at start of plan period	HDC
SD7: Design (on land north of Horsham)	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO12 Renewable Energy & Climate Change	No development within the 'Landscape Buffer'	Delivery of development design in accordance with policy SD7	This will be monitored by referring to the planning application	Zero at start of plan period	HDC
SD8: Education	SO1 Sustainable Development	Provision of school places amounting to • Two, two form of entry primary schools • one six form of entry secondary school; • up to 60 Special Education Needs places; and • up to 98 early years places	Delivery of education facilities in accordance with policy SD8 Educational attainment levels	This will be monitored by referring to the planning application	Zero at start of plan period	HDC
SD9: Transport Infrastructure (on land north of Horsham)	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO12 Renewable Energy & Climate Change	Delivery of pedestrian, cycling, equestrian, public transport and road infrastructure	Delivery of transport infrastructure in accordance with Policy SD8	This will be monitored by referring to the planning application	Zero at start of plan period	HDC

Southwater						
SD10 Strategic Policy: Southwater Strategic Site	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment • SO6 Housing delivery • SO7 Sustainable Locations • SO10 Landscape Character	Delivery of 500 residential units to 2031 Provision of formal and information open space within the planning application Delivery of a Landscape Buffer Delivery of pedestrian, cycling, equestrian, public transport and road infrastructure	To ensure the application is in compliance with policy SD10	N/A	Zero at start of plan period	HDC
Topic: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation						
21. Strategic Policy: Gypsy & traveller Site Allocations	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery • Significant Effect: That sufficient gypsy pitches are not provided to meet local need	39 pitches up to 2017	Total number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches in District Number of permitted pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	N/A	Zero from start of plan period 2011	District Council /WSCC
22. Gypsy and Traveller Sites	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery • Significant Effect: That sufficient gypsy pitches are not provided to meet local need	39 pitches between 2017 and 2027	Number of permitted pitches for Gypsies and Travellers on sites allocated	N/A	Zero from start of plan period 2011	District Council /WSCC

23. Strategic Policy: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO6 Housing delivery • Significant Effect: That sufficient gypsy pitches are not provided to meet local need	Delivery of 78 pitches to 2026 No growth of unauthorised sites	Number of permitted pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Authority will monitor the number of applications on allocated and non-allocated sites	Zero from start of plan period 2011	District Council /WSCC

Topic: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment						
24. Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity. Also the environmental quality of the District particularly in terms of air quality is as risk from further development due to additional traffic movements.	No exceedances in UK air quality No new AQMA's declared in the District No deterioration of River Quality No applications permitted contrary to the advice of HDC on the grounds of contaminated land, air quality or noise that cannot be mitigated	• Exceedances in UK Air Quality Objectives • Number of AQMA's in District • Number of noise complaints • River quality • Permissions granted contrary to policy	N/A	UK exceedances in air quality will be monitored year on year Currently 2 AQMA's in District River quality baseline is that recorded by EA in 2014	District Council /WSCC

25. Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and District Character	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO9 Character and built heritage • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality • Significant Effect: Risk that new development will be damaging to the landscape	No deterioration of landscape character areas No applications to infringe an area of environmental designations No applications to infringe protected habitats	• Condition of landscape character areas • Area of designation / reserve in Horsham infringed by planning applications (ha) • Area of habitats infringed by planning applications • % of habitats infringed by planning applications • SSSI condition	N/A	Baseline is the Districts Landscape Character Assessment 2013 Condition of SSSI's 2014 baseline	District Council Environment Agency Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre
	Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	No deterioration in the condition of SSSI's				

26. Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality • Significant Effect: Risk that new development will be damaging to the countryside Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	No deterioration in landscape character Ensure appropriate development outside BUAB	Condition of landscape character areas Number of applications outside BUAB	District council then to consider why permission was granted outside BUAB	Baseline is the Districts Landscape Character Assessment 2013	District Council

27. Strategic Policy: Settlement coalescence	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character	No permitted applications which will have a perceived impact on settlement coalescence	Condition of landscape character areas Development within former strategic gaps between Horsham and Crawley Number of applications which have 'settlement coalescence' picked up as an issue in the determination	District will monitor planning decisions to note anywhere 'settlement coalescence' was picked up as an issue in the determination	This will be monitored annually	District Council
28. Replacement Dwellings House Extensions in the Countryside	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character	No net loss of dwellings in countryside locations No net gain of dwellings in countryside locations	Number of replacement dwellings, house extensions and conversions permitted outside BUAB Monitor prior notifications too	Enabling policy in order to achieve a key objective in the plan permissions outside BUAB will show if its working	District council then to consider why permission was granted outside BUAB Year on year base rate	District Council
29. Equestrian development	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character	Enabling policy therefore no target was set	Number of permissions for Equestrian development	Evidence of permissions being granted should demonstrate the policy is working	Enabling policy therefore no baseline was set	District Council

30. Protected landscapes	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	No deterioration of landscape character No loss of ancient woodland	• Condition of Landscape Character Areas • % of District classified as Ancient Woodland	District will monitor planning decisions to note anywhere 'settlement coalescence' was picked up as an issue in the determination	This will be monitored annually	District Council
31. Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO10 Landscape Character • SO11 Environmental Quality Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	No deterioration of landscape character areas No applications to infringe an area of environmental designations No applications to infringe protected habitats No deterioration in the condition of SSSI's	• Condition of SSSI's • Permitted applications in designated sites • Permitted applications in priority habitats • Number of records of protected species within 500m buffer of a planning application • Number of records of protected species, bats and notable birds	N/A	Baseline as per 2014 AMR	District Council Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre Environment Agency

32. Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO9 Character and built heritage	To deliver development in compliance with Policy 31 To deliver a network of open spaces	• Number of Design Statements produced • Number of applications refused on the grounds of bad design • Open space and community facilities provided through CIL contributions		This will be monitored annually	District Council
33. Development Principles	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO9 Character and built heritage Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	For majority of windfall development to be on PDL	• Gross housing completions on PDL • Permitted applications in designated sites • Number of Design Statements produced • Enforcement against Site Waste Management Plans • Incidents of antisocial behaviour • Number of recorded offences • Number of recorded offences per 1000 population	N/A	The number and proportion of gross completions on PDL will be monitored annually	District Council Sussex Police
34. Cultural and Heritage Assets	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO9 Character and built heritage Significant Effect Risk: there is a risk that the uncertainties regarding the scale and size of development coming forward through neighbourhood planning could individually or cumulatively have an impact on biodiversity	Reduction in the number of sites/ buildings on the Heritage at Risk register No applications granted contrary to specialist advice	• Number of sites/ buildings on the Heritage at Risk register • Number of permissions in Conservation Areas • Number of Listed Building Consents granted permission • Number of buildings on Local List • Number of applications permitted contrary to advice of English Heritage or HDC	N/A	Baseline as of 2014	District Council

Topic: Climate Change						
35. Strategic Policy: Climate Change	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO12 Climate Change and Renewable Energy	Reduction in the tonnage of non-inert waste sent to landfill Reduction in total emissions of CO2 Reduction in carbon emissions by sector	• Number of District Heating networks in District • Total emissions of CO2 • Carbon emissions by sector (Industrial & Commercial, Domestic and Road) and per capita • Tonnage of non-inert waste sent to landfill	N/A	2014 baseline	District Council WSCC DECC
36. Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use	SO12 Climate Change and Renewable Energy	Reduction in total emissions of CO2 Reduction in carbon emissions by sector Facilitation of a District Heating Network within Horsham District All qualifying residential development to be accompanied by an Energy Statement	• Number of District Heating networks in District • Total emissions of CO2 • Carbon emissions by sector (Industrial & Commercial, Domestic and Road) and per capita • Number of permissions for renewable energy installations	N/A	2014 Baseline	WSCC

37. Sustainable Design and Construction	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO12 Climate Change and Renewable Energy	Reduction in the tonnage of non-inert waste sent to landfill All properties to have access to superfast fiberbased broadband by 2016 All permitted residential development supported by a Sustainability Statement	• Percentage of inert waste sent to landfill • District recycling rates • Number of schemes achieving CSH or BREEAM standards • Coverage of superfast broadband 24Mbps	Superfast broadband part of West Sussex Better Connected initiative	2014 Baseline	District Council WSCC
38. Strategic Policy: Flooding	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO11 Environmental Quality • SO12 Climate Change and Renewable Energy	All developments over 1ha in Flood Zone 1 and All developments in Flood Zones 2&3 require an FRA No applications granted against the advice of the Environment Agency	• Percentage of new development located in floodplain • Permissions granted contrary to advice of EA on flooding and water quality grounds	The District Council should not validate any applications without an appropriate FRA	This indicator will be monitored each year	District Council Environment Agency West Sussex Lead Local Flood Authority
Topic: Infrastructure, Transport and Healthy Communities						
39. Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision	SO1 Sustainable Development	Monitor the collection of S106 and CIL monies against the infrastructure in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Total revenue from CIL Contributions Total revenue from S106	N/A	Baseline to be set once CIL is adopted	District Council / WSCC

40. Sustainable Transport	• SO1 Sustainable Development • SO2 Economy & Employment	Increase ticket sales for rail and bus routes Increase number of bus routes servicing District	• Number of Green Travel Plans submitted • Proportion of households with two or more cars • Travel to work data (mode and distance) • Number of bus routes provided throughout District • Ticket sales on	Annual monitoring to assess demand/capacity and respond accordingly	2014 baseline	Census Data Metrobus Southern Rail
41. Parking	SO1 Sustainable Development	No target set as an increased use of car parks could benefit town centre policies	Monitor usage of car parks	Annual monitoring to assess demand/capacity and respond accordingly	2014 baseline	District Council/ WSCC
42. Strategic Policy: Inclusive communities	SO1 Sustainable Development	Maintain or increase educational attainment levels Provide adequate number of gypsy pitches	• Indices of Multiple Deprivation • Employment rates based on gender, age, race and ethnicity • Number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches granted permission • Percentage of housing stock in fuel poverty • Number of permissions for D1 uses which meet the needs for faith or minority groups • Life expectancy • Educational attainment levels – number of GCSE’			District Council

43. Community Facilities, Leisure and Recreation	SO1 Sustainable Development	Increase provision of community facilities in District	• Visitor numbers to HDC leisure facilities • Amount of new leisure space in town & village centres • Community Right to Build Orders and Community Development Orders	N/A	2014 Baseline	