



Local Plan 2035

Planning for the future

SECOND ADDENDUM TO ISSUES AND OPTIONS SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

APRIL 2017



Your Borough: Planning for the future

Contents

	page
1 Introduction and background	1
2 Testing the local plan options – the amount of growth	3
3 Testing the local plan options – the distribution of growth	10
4 Next steps	31
Appendix 1 Sustainability appraisal framework	32
Appendix 2 Sustainability appraisal testing – no growth “do nothing” option	36
Appendix 3 Sustainability appraisal testing – new settlement options	39
Appendix 4 Sustainability appraisal testing – potential option scenarios	43
Appendix 5 Sustainability appraisal testing – no distribution of growth “do nothing” option	73

1 Introduction and background

- 1.1 The process of sustainability appraisal is intended to identify the effects of plan proposals on environmental, economic and social objectives. This document is a second addendum to the sustainability appraisal of the 2014 Issues and Options paper, which was published in January 2014, and should be read in conjunction with that document as well as the first addendum, which was published in September 2015. As it is an addendum and not a full sustainability appraisal report, it does not include a summary of relevant plans, policies and programmes or baseline information: these were set out in the Scoping Report which was published in September 2013. The Scoping Report and the 2014 Issues and Options paper established the sustainability appraisal framework used in undertaking sustainability appraisal. It is reproduced in Appendix 1.
- 1.2 Comments made in response to consultation on the sustainability appraisal of the Issues and Options paper, the first addendum and this addendum will be taken into account in preparing the sustainability appraisal report which will accompany the local plan.
- 1.3 The 2014 Issues and Options paper was published for public consultation to seek views on what the new local plan should contain. In particular it set out options for the amount of growth that should be provided and how it should be distributed. In addition it invited landowners, developers and other interested parties to submit potential development sites for consideration to help the Council identify available land supply for the plan period. A sustainability appraisal was undertaken of the 2014 Issues and Options paper and published for consultation.
- 1.4 The 2015 further issues and options consultation was published because updated population projections and household forecasts meant that a higher level of growth needed to be planned for. This had implications for the distribution of growth and a revised option was published which took account of the availability of sites (put forward by landowners and developers in response to the call for sites). In addition, the opportunity was taken to refine the draft objectives of the local plan, taking account of the comments received in response to the earlier 2014 Issues and Options paper consultation. A further invitation was given to landowners and other interested parties to propose additional sites that could be considered for inclusion in the

local plan. A sustainability appraisal addendum was undertaken of the 2015 further issues and options paper and published for consultation.

- 1.5 In response to the further issues and options consultation the Council received details of about an additional 290 potential development sites, including several large-scale developments, four of which offered the opportunity for a stand-alone new settlement. In order to allow time to assess the additional sites, particularly the new settlement proposals, and undertake further consultation, it was decided to reschedule the plan-preparation programme and amend the plan period from 2012-2032 to 2015-2035 which would ensure that the local plan covers the full 15-year time horizon from adoption expected by the National Planning Policy Framework. Taking into account updated national population data (the 2014 based sub-national population projections) and the revised plan period, the Council's assessment was that the local plan now needed to find sites for at least 8,103 dwellings. This amount of development was greater than both that considered in the 2014 Issues and Options paper and in the 2015 further issues and options consultation. Furthermore, the possibility of the inclusion of a new settlement or settlements (together with a 'one off' large brownfield site opportunity at the former Stewartby brickworks), gave new strategy options for the distribution of growth that needed consideration.
- 1.6 This second sustainability appraisal addendum compares the sustainability effects of the potential option scenarios for distributing the amount of growth required for the 2015-2035 period. The result of this work has informed the Council's further consultation paper which sets out the Council's preferred strategy. This addendum also assesses the sustainability effects of the preferred strategy. It has been published alongside the consultation paper to help inform responses to the public consultation. The results of consultation will be taken into account in drafting the local plan to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination.

2 Testing the local plan options – the amount of growth

2.1 The appraisal of the strategy options for the amount of growth is set out in this section. The following symbols are used to illustrate likely significant effects and indicate their nature.

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
O	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

Issues and Options Paper 2014

2.2 The 2014 Issues and Options paper set out five options for the amount of housing growth to be planned for between 2012 and 2032. The options were derived by calculating 5% and 10% either side of a mid-point figure of 2,400 dwellings. In relation to employment land, initial indications were that land for 3,000 jobs needed to be planned for (in addition to existing commitments). The options were as follows.

- Option A – 940 dwellings and 3,000 jobs
- Option B – 1,680 dwellings and 3,000 jobs
- Option C – 2,400 dwellings and 3,000 jobs
- Option D – 3,140 dwellings and 3,000 jobs
- Option E – 3,860 dwellings and 3,000 jobs

2.3 For the purposes of the sustainability appraisal, because it would be difficult to distinguish the effects of small differences, these options were grouped into three – low, medium and high growth. The level of employment growth, being the same for each option and therefore having the same effect, was not included in the three options tested, which were as follows.

Low growth – 940 to 1,680 dwellings
Medium growth – 2,400 dwellings
High growth – 3,140 to 3,860 dwellings.

- 2.4 The results of testing the three options are set out in the sustainability appraisal of the 2014 Issues and Option paper. In summary, the sustainability appraisal found that higher growth levels were likely to involve a greater use of natural resources and greater greenfield land-take than lower growth levels. In addition, they were more likely to increase pressures on wildlife, habitats and landscapes. However, high growth levels would have significantly greater potential to support the delivery of new homes, infrastructure, services and facilities, and help support strong local economic growth.

Further Issues and Options Consultation 2015

- 2.5 The 2015 further issues and options consultation set out a revised growth option as a result of the further work to assess needs. The growth requirement was increased to at least 4,521 dwellings over and above existing commitments for the period 2012 – 2032 (in total 17,367 dwellings) and an increase of 15,500 jobs. In addition it was estimated that an increase in the amount of retail floorspace was needed.
- 2.6 The results of testing the revised growth option are set out in the 2015 sustainability appraisal first addendum. Not surprisingly, the sustainability appraisal reached a similar conclusion to that noted in the sustainability appraisal of the 2014 Issues and Option paper. In summary, the higher level of growth was likely to require a greater use of natural resources and greater greenfield land-take. In addition, it was more likely to increase pressures on wildlife, habitats and landscapes. However, the high growth level had significantly greater potential to support the delivery of new homes, infrastructure, services and facilities, and help support strong local economic growth.

New Growth Option

- 2.7 As a result of altering the plan period from 2012-2032 to 2015-2035 and updating the assessment of objectively assessed needs (referred to in paragraph 1.5 above), the local plan now needs to find sites for at least 8,103 dwellings over and above existing commitments for the period 2015 – 2035 (in total 19,000 dwellings). Although there is a need for 11,400 new jobs

over the plan period, no increase is needed in the requirement for employment land because it has been assessed that the amount of land already committed is sufficient to absorb any additional jobs generated. In addition, it is estimated that by 2035 the local plan needs to make provision for further retail floor space. The higher level of growth constitutes a further option that should be tested against the sustainability appraisal framework. The results of testing the revised growth option are set out in the table below.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Revised growth option
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) The higher level of growth is likely to result in higher levels of emissions from traffic, construction (temporary effect) and the operation of development, negatively affecting air quality. If this option resulted in development primarily on large sites, there is a greater risk of it increasing flood risk elsewhere. However large site development also increases the opportunities for low carbon development and renewable energy generation.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The higher level of growth is likely to result in greater use of resources, such as water, land and energy, and greater amount of waste production. It may also involve a greater level of development on greenfield sites. However, if development is concentrated in and around built-up areas, it will mean that land is used more efficiently than if development is dispersed. Furthermore, accessibility to services and facilities would be better, the need to travel reduced and walking and cycling encouraged.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT Impacts on heritage sites and conservation depend on the detailed location of new development. Where adverse impacts on heritage assets cannot be avoided (for example, by locating development elsewhere) they should be mitigated. The

	higher level of growth is likely to involve greater change to existing townscapes. This could be either a positive or negative effect depending on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) If this option requires the development of a greater amount of greenfield land, this could be more harmful to natural features, local environments, habitats and species. If this option resulted in development primarily on large sites, this could have a positive effect because of the opportunity for more extensive green infrastructure provision due to their scale (on or off-site). The impact on biodiversity and nature conservation depends on the detailed location of new development. Where adverse impacts on natural assets cannot be avoided (for example, by locating development elsewhere) these should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) The higher level of housing growth and increase in jobs will be best able to support economic growth and the local economy. It is also likely to involve a greater increase in infrastructure provision. It may also result in synergistic growth, particularly if development is located on large sites.
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between levels of growth and employability. However, if this option resulted in development primarily on large sites, this could have a positive effect because large sites are more likely to contribute to the provision of education and skills training (both in terms of temporary construction work and longer-term employment in large businesses).
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The higher level of housing, employment and retail growth is likely to be best able

	<p>to support high levels of economic growth and contribute to achieving this objective. This is likely to make a positive contribution to creating a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre through encouraging retail expenditure, business growth, expansion and significant retail and leisure investment. Development and redevelopment can also be expected to help improve and revitalise the public realm in the town centre. These effects are likely to be greatest if housing and employment growth are concentrated in and around the urban area rather than further away where there is a risk that increased spending power could divert to other centres, and if town centre uses are primarily located in the town centre.</p>
<p>8. Meet the needs of a changing population</p>	<p>✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) The higher level of housing provision is most likely to support the greatest level of infrastructure provision, which in turn improves accessibility to services for new and existing residents. If development is mostly on large sites, this is more likely to support a greater range of new homes of different types and sizes (including self-build housing), and may make the greatest contribution to specialised older people's housing and affordable housing. There is no direct relationship between the options for levels of growth and the provision of Traveller accommodation as these needs are identified separately.</p>
<p>9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) The higher growth option will involve the greatest level of housing and therefore the greatest potential to increase access to services and facilities. A high level of growth is also most likely to reduce levels of deprivation in the urban wards through improving income and employment opportunities and for rural residents through improving access to essential services. High growth is more likely to result in the provision of affordable and specialised older people's housing.</p>

<p>10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,T,MT,LT,P) The higher growth option is likely to make greater contribution to the provision of community infrastructure, including health facilities, community safety initiatives, recreation and leisure facilities, green infrastructure and walking or cycling infrastructure. However this contribution depends on a number of factors, including the location, design and quality of development. All strategy options are subject to public consultation and therefore are an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping.</p>
<p>11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The higher level of growth is likely to have greater potential to enhance the existing townscape and raise design quality through active place-making. However it may also substantially change the character and identity of existing villages, surrounding landscapes and the countryside, particularly if high design standards are not achieved.</p>
<p>12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) Higher levels of growth are likely to further increase traffic volumes and the number of additional cars. This effect can be reduced by locating a mix of uses in locations that reduce the need to travel and that can take advantage of public transport services. If development is concentrated, this option is likely to make a major contribution to increasing accessibility and the use of sustainable modes of travel.</p>

2.8 The result of testing the higher level of growth is the same as that previously noted for both the sustainability appraisal of the 2014 Issues and Option paper and the 2015 sustainability appraisal first addendum. However, the higher level of growth can be expected to intensify the magnitude of likely effects.

“Do Nothing” Option

- 2.9 A “do nothing” option has also been tested. This option assumes that no growth will occur in the borough. The results of testing against the sustainability appraisal framework are set out in Appendix 2. This shows that a “do nothing” option performs less well than options which include growth to meet needs. No positive effects are identified and there are several negative effects, particularly as a result of the lack of economic growth, the lack of additional housing to meet the needs of the population as it changes over time, and the likelihood of an increase in commuting to neighbouring areas for work, shopping and services.

Conclusion

- 2.10 In conclusion the sustainability appraisal has highlighted the differences between lower and higher levels of growth. Lower growth is likely to involve a lower use of natural resources and lower greenfield land-take than higher growth levels. It would also be likely to cause less of an increased pressure on wildlife, habitats and landscapes than higher growth. However lower growth (or no growth under the “do nothing” option) is not a realistic option for the local plan because of the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for local plans to meet objectively assessed needs (paragraph 14) and to plan positively for the development required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework (paragraph 157). In theory it would be possible to plan for even higher levels of growth that exceed objectively assessed needs. Such an option would intensify the magnitude of likely effects still further. However such higher growth is also not a realistic option. It would not be supported by the Council as it would be unpopular because of the perceived negative effects on existing communities. The new preferred growth option (which meets the objectively assessed need for growth) is the only realistic option. The local plan therefore must consider how the likely negative effects of the option can be mitigated. Nevertheless, the sustainability appraisal has also highlighted that higher growth levels are likely to have significantly greater potential to support the delivery of new homes, infrastructure, services and facilities, and help support strong local economic growth. The local plan should aim to maximise these positive effects. The sustainability appraisal has also highlighted that the size and type of some effects are largely dependent on how growth is distributed. This is considered in the following section.

3 Testing the local plan options – the distribution of growth

3.1 The appraisal of the strategy options for the distribution of growth is set out in this section. The following symbols are used to illustrate likely significant effects and indicate their nature.

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
O	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

Issues and Options Paper 2014

3.2 The 2014 Issues and Options paper considered five options for the distribution of growth. The paper also made clear that a combination of these five or some other option may be appropriate and that the final strategy would depend on suitable sites being made available for development by landowners. The options are summarised in the table below.

Option	Summary
Option 1 – Continue the current approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth area remains as currently defined and continues to accommodate majority of growth. • Limited development in the remaining rural area, mostly village infilling. • Development in open countryside restricted in line with government policy.
Option 2 – Expanded growth area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing growth area would expand through urban extensions and development adjoining the existing growth area. • Limited development in the remaining rural area, mostly village infilling.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in open countryside restricted in line with government policy.
Option 3 – Expanded growth area plus some rural growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth area as option 2. • More growth allowed in the larger villages than in smaller settlements. • Development in open countryside restricted in line with government policy.
Option 4 – Existing growth area plus new rural growth points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth area similar to option 1 but with less growth than option 1. • Some growth also to be focussed on a limited number of new rural growth points. • Development in the rest of the borough limited to infilling in existing villages. • Development in open countryside restricted in line with government policy.
Option 5 – Spread development around existing settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abandon concentration of development in the growth area. • Allocate development to settlements according to their size (about two thirds to the urban area and one third to rural villages). • Development in open countryside restricted in line with government policy.

- 3.3 The results of testing the five previous options are set out in the sustainability appraisal of the 2014 Issues and Option paper. In summary, the sustainability appraisal found that options that concentrated growth (options 1 and 2) were more likely to increase accessibility to services and facilities, whilst reducing the need to travel and encourage sustainable modes of travel. They were also less likely to increase pressures on wildlife, habitats and landscapes. They would preserve the existing rural character of existing villages beyond the growth area. However they restricted choice for developers, investors and home buyers, whilst further increasing development pressure in locations that had already absorbed substantial growth.
- 3.4 Conversely, those options that additionally directed development to the rural areas (options 3 and 5) were more likely to increase the need to travel and risked placing housing in locations which may reduce its ability to help sustain existing services and could involve extensive new infrastructure. However, these options would make a greater contribution to reducing inequalities between the urban and rural parts of the borough than options 1 and 2.

3.5 The creation of a limited number of new villages or settlements (option 4) involved the greatest risk for affecting sensitive landscapes. In addition, this option was likely to involve the greatest level of greenfield land-take and require significant infrastructure provision.

Further Issues and Options Consultation 2015

3.6 As a result of the 2014 consultation, further information became available about the availability of potential sites for development. This, combined with technical work on the sustainability of various locations in the borough together with updated population projections and household forecasts, led to a new strategy option for distributing growth being developed for consultation (option 6).

3.7 In summary, the proposed strategy was for suitable, available and deliverable sites in and adjoining the Bedford and Kempston urban area to be the first priority for allocation as this is the most sustainable location in the borough. The next priority was the larger villages, with growth apportioned having regard to the capacity of available sites and access to supporting infrastructure, taking account of school capacity, potential for school expansion and opportunities for the provision of new schools. A lower amount of development was proposed for smaller villages. The strategy option is shown in the table below.

Location	Role	Implications	Amount of development
Bedford / Kempston urban area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within urban area • Extensions to urban area 	To provide the focus for regeneration within the urban area and growth in housing, employment, retail	The first choice location for sites for new housing, employment, retail and leisure development with preference being given to sites within the existing urban area of Bedford / Kempston. In particular the Kingsway area (Kings Quarter) provides an opportunity for significant regeneration. Main location for strategic facilities and for infrastructure investment, including improved transport choice.	Around 1,500 dwellings
Group 1 Villages – Key Service Centres	To provide a focus for further	The scale of development at individual villages will be related to development opportunities, the current and	Bromham 400-500 Clapham 800-900

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bromham, Clapham, Great Barford, Sharnbrook, Wilstead, Wootton (+ Eastcotts (Cotton End / Shortstown) and Wixams following further committed growth) 	<p>growth, primarily in housing and to provide a strong service role for the local community and surrounding area.</p>	<p>potential capacity of infrastructure and services, and the character of the village.</p> <p>Improved infrastructure and transport links where appropriate.</p> <p>Development in Wootton will be later in the plan period post 2025.</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Eastcotts</td> <td>200-300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gt Barford</td> <td>400-500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharnbrook</td> <td>75-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wilstead</td> <td>75-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wixams</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wootton</td> <td>250-350</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2,200-2,750</td> </tr> </table>	Eastcotts	200-300	Gt Barford	400-500	Sharnbrook	75-100	Wilstead	75-100	Wixams	0	Wootton	250-350	Total	2,200-2,750
Eastcotts	200-300																
Gt Barford	400-500																
Sharnbrook	75-100																
Wilstead	75-100																
Wixams	0																
Wootton	250-350																
Total	2,200-2,750																
<p>Group 2 Villages – Rural Service Centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carlton, Harrold, Oakley, Riseley, Roxton, Stewartby, Turvey, Willington, Wyboston 	<p>To provide growth opportunities and a more localised convenience and service role to meet day to day needs of residents and businesses in the rural areas.</p>	<p>The scale of development at individual villages and its contribution to meeting the borough’s development requirement will be related to development opportunities, the current and potential capacity of infrastructure and services, and the character of the village.</p>	<p>50-150 (average 100) per village</p> <p>Total 450 – 1,350 (mid-point 900)</p>														
<p>Group 3 Villages – remaining villages with a defined SPA*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bletsoe, Cardington, Colmworth, Cople, Felmersham, Little Staughton, Milton Ernest, Odell, Pavenham, Podington, Ravensden Church 	<p>Limited development.</p>	<p>The scale of development in individual villages and its contribution to meeting the borough’s development requirement will be related to development opportunities. It will be dependent upon the form, character and setting of the village and its proximity to larger villages and their services.</p>	<p>10-20 (average 15) per village</p> <p>Total 220 – 440 (mid-point 330)</p>														

<p>End, Renhold Salph End, Renhold Green End, Souldrop, Stagsden, Stevington, Swineshead, Thurleigh, Upper Dean, Wilden, Wymington, Yelden.</p>			
<p>Open countryside, including individual dwellings and settlements without a defined SPA* in the countryside</p>	<p>To provide a green setting for the network of villages and support the borough's self-reliance and resilience through food production, biodiversity resources, leisure and tourism. Very limited development to meet locally identified needs.</p>	<p>Development will be carefully managed to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Development is likely to be limited to 'rural exceptions' affordable housing schemes and replacement dwellings.</p> <p>Support for agricultural and forestry enterprises and other appropriate rural businesses. Opportunities for diversification including the re-use of buildings and new tourism and recreation activities. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the network of green infrastructure that provides an essential biodiversity and recreational resource.</p>	
			<p>Total 4,370– 6,040 (mid-point 5,205)</p>

*Settlement policy area (SPA)

- 3.8 The results of testing the new option are set out in the 2015 sustainability appraisal first addendum. In summary, the sustainability appraisal found that, although the new strategy option for distributing growth (option 6) would prioritise new development within and adjoining the urban area, a lack of suitable sites meant that it was likely to require the development of open land adjoining rural villages and therefore could potentially affect habitats, species and natural features. It could also result in more commuting by car and therefore increase emissions from transport. However it could encourage walking and cycling within existing settlements if development included improved infrastructure. It could also make rural public transport increasingly viable. The option was likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation, supporting the urban area and town centre, but also strengthening rural economies. It should help to reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increasing access to essential services in the rural area.

New Growth Option Scenarios

- 3.9 As noted in paragraph 1.5, the availability of additional potential development sites, particularly the new settlement opportunities, together with the 'one off' large brownfield site opportunity at the former Stewartby brickworks mean that new strategy options for the distribution of the revised level of growth (8,103 dwellings) can be considered. In order to generate realistic option scenarios an initial assessment of sites was undertaken so that only sites that are likely to be suitable, available and deliverable are considered. Further information on the initial assessment of sites and consideration of strategy options is contained in the 'Development Strategy and Site Selection Methodology' technical paper.
- 3.10 In relation to new settlement opportunities, several proposals for large-scale developments were put forward but only four of these were considered to offer the opportunity for a stand-alone new settlement. Eleven sites were put forward which proposed more than 1,000 dwellings. Of these, seven were excluded from consideration as new settlements either because the proposal could not be considered as a stand-alone development separate from existing settlements or because the proposal did not have the potential to deliver a strategic level of growth. Further information is contained in the 'New Settlements Assessment Framework Methodology and Initial Site Assessment' technical paper.
- 3.11 For completeness it is appropriate to test against sustainability objectives the principle of allocating smaller scale new settlements (1,000 – 2,000 dwellings) rather than larger scale new settlements (4,000 – 6,000 dwellings). The results of testing both options against the sustainability appraisal framework are set out in Appendix 3. This shows that a smaller scale

new settlements option performs less well against sustainability objectives than a larger scale new settlements option, with more negative effects and fewer positive effects identified. This is caused by larger scale new settlements being more likely to support the provision of supporting shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools) which is more likely to enable a degree of self-containment and internalisation of trips. Also larger scale new settlements provide greater amounts of housing and are more likely to be able to support affordable and specialised older people's housing. The only area where the smaller scale new settlements option performs better is in the use of greenfield land, which results in a smaller potential impact on habitats, species and natural features.

- 3.12 The option of smaller scale new settlements has not been taken forward in considering alternative option scenarios. Many of the smaller large-scale sites that were put forward adjoined existing settlements and were therefore considered in the initial assessment of sites along with the other site submissions.
- 3.13 A large range of alternative option scenarios potentially could be generated, for example: scenarios that include or don't include new settlements, scenarios that include or don't include the redevelopment of the Stewartby brickworks, and scenarios which involve lower or higher levels of growth in other locations. However it is only necessary to test those option scenarios that are realistically capable of informing the development strategy of the local plan. This means that options must be capable of meeting the level of growth required to meet assessed needs as a minimum. Options that deliver a lower level of growth could not be included in the local plan (unless there was special justification) because the plan would be found unsound at examination (see paragraph 2.10 above). Nevertheless, at this stage in plan preparation there remains an element of uncertainty in relation to the eventual capacity of individual sites and so it is appropriate to test more option scenarios than just those that exactly meet the level of growth required. In order to allow for this uncertainty and to ensure that all potentially realistic option scenarios are tested, the testing includes all scenarios that are able to deliver growth within 10% of the level of growth required (7,293 – 8,913 dwellings).
- 3.14 In order to generate realistic option scenarios the following assumptions have been made:
- New settlement(s) – the number of dwellings delivered by new settlements is limited to 2,200 dwellings in total within the plan period. The allocation of more than one new settlement would not increase this figure because of deliverability constraints and infrastructure provision.

- Stewartby brickworks – capacity is assumed to be 1,000 dwellings.
- Within and adjoining urban area – all suitable and available sites will be allocated (1,988 dwellings).
- Group 1 villages – the low (2,600 dwellings) and high (5,100 dwellings) growth options represent the allocations needed in villages to support the provision of a new primary school (one or two form entry respectively). Further information is given in the ‘Development Strategy and Site Selection Methodology’ technical paper.
- Group 2 villages – the low growth option (225 dwellings) represents the amount of development that could be supported given the space currently available in existing primary schools. The high growth option (2,000 dwellings) represents the allocations needed in villages to support the provision of a new one form entry primary school in the village. (This takes account of the availability of suitable development sites in villages – only four Group 2 villages have sufficient development sites that could potentially generate sufficient dwellings to support a new school.)
- No allocations are made in villages below Group 2 level.

3.15 Initial sensitivity testing showed that the difference in effect on sustainability objectives between the low growth option and no development in Group 2 villages is not discernible or significant in sustainability terms. As a result it has been decided not to include option scenarios in the sustainability appraisal testing that have no development in Group 2 villages. This does not mean that the local plan could not select such an option for Group 2 villages as part of the development strategy, only that its effect is not shown separately in the comparison of alternative option scenarios. For completeness, initial sensitivity testing was also undertaken for option scenarios that exceed the level of growth required by more than 10%. This showed that for such options the types of effects identified by the assessment were similar to those for the comparable options with lower growth levels but at a greater magnitude. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out in paragraph 2.10 above, significantly higher levels of growth are not being pursued in the local plan.

3.16 The alternative potential option scenarios that have been generated, taking account of the assumptions above, are shown in the table below. Those options that are to be tested are highlighted.

Option scenario	New settlement	Stewartby brickworks site	Within and adjoining urban area	Group 1 villages	Group 2 villages	Total dwellings	Option to be tested
1	2200	1000	1988	low growth 2600	low growth 225	8013	yes
2	2200	1000	1988	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	9788	no

Option scenario	New settlement	Stewartby brickworks site	Within and adjoining urban area	Group 1 villages	Group 2 villages	Total dwellings	Option to be tested
3	2200	1000	1988	high growth 5100	low growth 225	10513	no
4	2200	1000	1988	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	12288	no
5	0	1000	1988	high growth 5100	low growth 225	8313	yes
6	0	1000	1988	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	10088	no
7	0	1000	1988	low growth 2600	low growth 225	5813	no
8	0	1000	1988	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	7588	yes
9	2200	0	1988	high growth 5100	low growth 225	9513	no
10	2200	0	1988	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	11288	no
11	2200	0	1988	low growth 2600	low growth 225	7013	no
12	2200	0	1988	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	8788	yes
13	2200	1000	0	high growth 5100	low growth 225	8525	yes
14	2200	1000	0	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	10300	no
15	2200	1000	0	low growth 2600	low growth 225	6025	no
16	2200	1000	0	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	7800	yes
17	2200	1000	1988	0	low growth 225	5413	no
18	2200	1000	1988	0	high growth 2000	7188	no
19	0	0	1988	high growth 5100	low growth 225	7313	yes
20	0	0	1988	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	9088	no
21	0	0	1988	low growth 2600	low growth 225	4813	no
22	0	0	1988	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	6588	no
23	2200	0	0	high growth 5100	low growth 225	7525	yes
24	2200	0	0	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	9300	no
25	2200	0	0	low growth 2600	low growth 225	5025	no
26	2200	0	0	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	6800	no
27	0	1000	0	high growth 5100	low growth 225	6325	no
28	0	1000	0	high growth 5100	high growth 2000	8100	yes
29	0	1000	0	low growth 2600	low growth 225	3825	no
30	0	1000	0	low growth 2600	high growth 2000	5600	no

Option scenario	New settlement	Stewartby brickworks site	Within and adjoining urban area	Group 1 villages	Group 2 villages	Total dwellings	Option to be tested
31	2200	0	1988	hybrid 3500	low growth 225	7913	yes
32	2200	0	1988	hybrid 3500	high growth 2000	9688	no
33	0	0	1988	hybrid 3500	high growth 2000	7488	yes
34	0	0	1988	hybrid 3500	low growth 225	5713	no
35	2200	0	0	hybrid 3500	high growth 2000	7700	yes
36	2200	0	0	hybrid 3500	low growth 225	5925	no

- 3.17 The sustainability appraisal testing process is able to identify the effects of each option scenario on sustainability objectives. In particular it is able to highlight the effect of including or not including any particular element in the strategy for distributing growth. This information has been used to assist in the choice of preferred option.
- 3.18 The table shows that in all scenarios the strategy must include allocations in Group 1 villages to be able to meet assessed needs, however any one of the other elements could be excluded and still achieve a scenario that meets assessed needs. In order to generate a greater range of options that are able to meet the level of assessed need, a variant is introduced by allowing for a hybrid level of growth in Group 1 villages (so that two villages have high growth and three have low growth).
- 3.19 Twelve options (1, 5, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, 23, 28, 31, 33 and 35) have been tested against the sustainability objectives. The full results of this testing are given in Appendix 4. Note that this testing is only of the option scenarios for distributing residential growth and not of the full development strategy (which is considered later). In summary the sustainability appraisal shows that distinct differences between options can be identified. Options which do not include growth in and around the urban area (options 13, 16, 23 and 35) perform least well, although option 28 is an exception to this rule: even though it does not include growth in and around the urban area, this is balanced by the effect of not including new settlements. Those options which do not include new settlements whilst including growth in and around the urban area (options 5, 8, 19 and 33) perform well, as does option 1 which includes growth in all locations. For several sustainability objectives the effect for each option is uncertain because it largely depends on the detailed location or design of development. (This is tested separately in the sustainability appraisal of sites.)

“Do Nothing” Option

- 3.20 A “do nothing” option has also been tested. This option assumes that the Council does not plan for the distribution of growth. Instead growth to meet identified needs is assumed to occur in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework’s presumption in favour of development. This states that, in the absence of a local plan, planning permission for development should be granted unless adverse impacts would outweigh benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework or if specific policies in the Framework restrict development (paragraph 14). As there is no Green Belt or designated areas for special landscape protection (such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) in Bedford borough, this means that development has few restrictions on location. Development is therefore likely to occur in locations that are most profitable to developers. For housing this is likely to be dispersed in rural locations, although not necessarily in or adjoining villages. The amount of development coming forward is likely to be similar to that if there were a local plan (as objectively assessed needs would still be expected to be met) but it would be on an uncoordinated and piecemeal basis. Infrastructure provision and any community benefits arising from development would not be coordinated. Development of brownfield land is unlikely to occur unless the site is particularly well located or does not require remediation.
- 3.21 The results of testing against the sustainability appraisal framework are set out in Appendix 5. This shows that a “do nothing” option is likely to have mainly negative effects on sustainability indicators and performs less well than any of the option scenarios tested above. No positive effects are identified. The likely negative effects include:
- an increase in journeys to access employment, shops, services and facilities
 - increased resource consumption
 - greater use of greenfield land which could affect habitats, species and natural features
 - rural economies, services and employment opportunities are likely to be harmed
 - there is likely to be a lack of provision of affordable housing, older persons housing and Traveller accommodation
 - development would be unlikely to help reduce deprivation in the urban area or increase access to essential services in the rural area
 - there is unlikely to be any opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping or building community cohesion
 - development is unlikely to promote local identity and sense of place, but is likely to harm landscapes and the countryside
 - there is likely to be an increase in car journeys to access employment, shops, services and facilities.

- 3.22 As explained in paragraph 2.10 above, it would not be reasonable to pursue a “do nothing” option because the National Planning Policy Framework requires local plans to plan positively for the development required in the area through a local plan.

Preferred Development Strategy

- 3.23 The Council’s preferred strategy for consultation is option 1, which includes development in each of the locations shown in the option scenarios (with lower growth in Group 1 and Group 2 villages). This option performed at least as well against the sustainability objectives as the options which do not include new settlements. Amongst other advantages, option 1 meant that the lower growth option for Group 1 and Group 2 villages could be selected which would reduce the impacts of development on those villages whilst still meeting assessed needs. The inclusion of development in Group 2 villages (as opposed to no growth in these locations) was considered to be an opportunity to support existing services and facilities. The selection of an option which includes new settlements means that it is important to mitigate the negative effects that have been identified for this option. This means that efforts should be made to promote sustainable lifestyles by improving infrastructure and encouraging walking and cycling within settlements (and particularly new settlements). Further information explaining how the preferred strategy was decided is contained in the ‘Development Strategy and Site Selection Methodology’ technical paper.
- 3.24 In relation to employment land, as previously noted once existing commitments are taken into account, there is no clear need to allocate additional land specifically for business, industry or warehousing uses. As a result, the preferred development strategy is not to allocate specific sites to provide additional land for such employment but to include a general policy in the local plan to explain how the Council will deal with any proposals to develop new free-standing employment sites. This is likely to support developments that provide a genuinely new form and / or quality of employment development rather than duplicate existing undeveloped sites. New employment development should be located near to main roads, preferably re-using existing employment sites, and be in locations with good access by public transport, bicycle and on foot. In accordance with national government guidance, the preferred location for retail and office development is the town centre.
- 3.25 In summary, the focus of the preferred development strategy is on:

- The creation of a new settlement or settlements that will provide a new focus for strategic growth.
- Regeneration of the large brownfield site opportunity at the former Stewartby brickworks site (subject to resolving concerns about the impact on historic buildings and structures, and the effect this might have on the viability of development).
- Regeneration in the urban area of Bedford and Kempston, together with sustainable urban extensions, with growth in housing, employment, retail and other facilities. This will include regeneration projects to create a vibrant and modern town centre while preserving the established character.
- Development in villages at a scale that takes account of existing commitments and infrastructure capacity / potential infrastructure capacity. Growth in the larger (Group 1) villages at the lower growth option level will provide primarily new homes but also services for the local community. Growth in the next size (Group 2) villages will be more limited to help support local services. Some development may also be appropriate in Group 3 and 4 settlements if needed and supported by the community but this is not allocated in the local plan.
- Maintaining a living, working countryside and improving the rural area's self-reliance by supporting opportunities to diversify the rural economy while conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

3.26 The new development strategy is shown in the table below.

Location	Role	Implications	Amount of housing development
New settlement(s) (precise location to be decided)	To provide a new focus for growth, primarily in housing, but also with employment and associated facilities to serve the new community	A new sustainable stand-alone growth point which will deliver a strategic level of growth, including employment, environmental and community infrastructure.	Between 4,000 and 6,000 dwellings in total however only 2,200 of these will be developed by 2035 2,200
Brownfield site	To regenerate	Stewartby brickworks site	1,000

opportunities	underused land resources		
Bedford / Kempston urban area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within urban area • Extensions to urban area 	To provide the focus for regeneration within the urban area and growth in housing, employment, retail	<p>The first choice location for sites for new housing, employment, retail and leisure development with preference being given to sites within the existing urban area of Bedford / Kempston. In particular the Kingsway area (Kings Quarter) provides an opportunity for significant regeneration. Large extensions to the urban area are proposed at Salph End and Gibraltar Corner with smaller extensions elsewhere.</p> <p>Main location for strategic facilities and for infrastructure investment, including improved transport choice.</p>	Within urban area 877 Extensions 1,111 Total 1,988
Group 1 villages – Key Service Centres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bromham, Clapham, Great Barford, Sharnbrook, Wilstead, Wootton • + Shortstown and Wixams (following further committed growth) 	To provide a focus for further growth, primarily in housing and to provide a strong service role for the local community and surrounding area.	<p>Development at individual villages and its contribution to meeting the borough’s requirements will be related to opportunities, the current and potential capacity of infrastructure and services, and the character of the village.</p> <p>Development may be allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Improved infrastructure and transport links where appropriate.</p>	Bromham 500 Clapham 500 Gt Barford 500 Sharnbrook 600 Shortstown 0 Wilstead 500 Wixams 0 Wootton 0 Total 2,600
Group 2 villages – Rural Service Centres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton, Harrold, Milton Ernest, Oakley, Roxton, Stewartby, Turvey, Willington 	To provide growth opportunities and a more localised convenience and service role to meet day to day	<p>Development at individual villages and its contribution to meeting the borough’s requirements will be related to opportunities, the current and potential capacity of infrastructure and services, and the character of the village.</p> <p>Development may be allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Carlton 25-50 Harrold 25-50 Milton Ernest 25-50 Oakley 25-50 Roxton 25-50 Stewartby 0 Turvey 25-50 Willington 0

	needs of residents and businesses in the rural areas.		Total (mid point) 225
Group 3 and Group 4 settlements	Limited development in appropriate locations.	<p>Development in individual settlements with defined settlement policy areas will be dependent upon the form, character and setting of the settlement and its proximity to larger villages and their services (including to settlements outside of the borough where relevant).</p> <p>Settlements without a defined settlement policy area are considered to be part of the countryside.</p> <p>Development may be allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan. If no Neighbourhood Plan is in preparation, planning applications for development will be guided by policy.</p>	No specific allocation in the local plan however Parish Councils may bring forward sites through Neighbourhood Plans with the support of their local communities. If no Neighbourhood Plan is in preparation, planning applications for development will be guided by policy.
Open countryside, including individual dwellings and other settlements without a defined settlement policy area in the countryside	To provide a green setting for the network of villages and support the borough's self-reliance and resilience through food production, biodiversity resources, leisure and tourism. Very limited	<p>Development will be carefully managed to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Development is likely to be limited to 'rural exceptions' affordable housing schemes and replacement dwellings.</p> <p>Support for agricultural and forestry enterprises and other appropriate rural businesses. Opportunities for diversification including the re-use of buildings and new tourism and recreation activities. Opportunities will be taken to enhance the network of green infrastructure that provides an essential biodiversity and recreational resource.</p>	No allocation in the local plan

	development to meet locally identified needs.		
			Total 8,013

3.27 In broad terms, the preferred development strategy differs from the strategy published as part of the 2015 Further Issues and Options Consultation in the following respects:

- The inclusion of one or more potential new settlements.
- The identification of a large brownfield site opportunity at Stewartby brickworks.
- More development in and adjoining the urban area.
- Less development in Group 2 villages.
- No allocated development in Group 3 villages, although it is recognised that development may come forward in Neighbourhood Plans.
- The total amount of residential development is greater. The amount and distribution of employment development is unchanged.

3.28 The testing the preferred development strategy option against sustainability objectives is different from the testing of the growth option scenarios referred to in paragraphs 3.9 – 3.19 above. That testing was restricted to the distribution of residential growth, while this testing includes the distribution of employment and other forms of growth. Note that in the preferred strategy the detailed location of sites has not yet been finalised. Possible alternative sites have been published for consultation but the final selection has not been made. This sustainability appraisal is of the general principle of the amount of development in each broad location in the preferred strategy. A sustainability appraisal of individual sites has been carried out and is published separately. In relation to new settlements, these larger sites have been assessed separately due to the scale and nature of the areas they encompass. In addition there are criteria that are specifically appropriate to the assessment of new settlements that need to be included. These criteria have been developed by looking at the Government’s National Planning Practice Guidance, the Town and Country Planning Association Garden City Principles, and

the DCLG Locally Led Garden Towns and Villages Prospectus, 2016. Further information is contained in the ‘New Settlements Assessment Framework Methodology and Initial Site Assessment’ document.

3.29 The results of testing the preferred development strategy option against sustainability objectives are set out in the table below. The symbols used to illustrate likely significant effects and indicate their nature are explained in paragraph 3.1 above.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Preferred strategy option
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) The preferred option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective. Greater emissions from construction are a likely temporary effect. However, poorer air quality is also a likely permanent effect in all locations because of more journeys by car to work and facilities. There is no direct relationship between the preferred option and the provision of low carbon buildings or generation of renewable energy. An increased risk of serious flooding would make a site unsuitable, although minor impacts can be mitigated.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The preferred option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Although the use of previously developed land is maximised (by allocating development at the former Stewartby brickworks and urban area sites), most new development will still be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. Improved infrastructure as a result of development could encourage walking and cycling within settlements. However, the focus of employment on the primary route network and town centre could result in more commuting by car from rural settlements unless public transport is improved. There is no direct relationship between the preferred option and the generation of renewable energy or recycling of waste.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a

and their settings	seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on the built environment and existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Although the use of previously developed land is maximised (by allocating development at the former Stewartby brickworks and urban area sites), most new development will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) The preferred option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect). The focus of employment on the primary route network and town centre is likely to benefit economic growth, job creation and the regeneration of older stock.
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The preferred option is likely to improve skills levels by providing new employment opportunities.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The preferred option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth throughout the borough will increase its viability and support regeneration. The focus of business and employment on the town centre is particularly likely to help create an attractive and successful town centre.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) The preferred option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs

	of a growing population through providing a range of housing (including affordable and older persons), employment, services, facilities and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between the preferred option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) The preferred option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area. The focus of business and employment on the town centre is particularly likely to benefit the most deprived wards in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The preferred option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to promote healthy and safe communities by providing walking and cycling facilities, open space and leisure facilities, and designing out crime, particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT, P) The preferred option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The preferred option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable. Improved infrastructure as a result of development could encourage walking and cycling within settlements. However, focussing employment on the primary route network and town centre could result in more commuting by car from rural settlements and greater

	traffic congestion unless public transport is improved.
--	---

3.30 In summary the preferred strategy is likely to have both positive and negative effects on sustainability indicators. The likely positive effects include:

- maximising the use of previously developed land
- improved infrastructure
- economic growth, job creation and improved skills
- Bedford town centre becoming more attractive and successful
- providing a range of housing (including affordable and older persons) and helping reduce deprivation
- promoting healthy communities by providing walking and cycling facilities, open space and leisure facilities
- reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough
- making rural public transport and other sustainable modes of travel increasingly viable
- promoting a strong local identity and sense of place in new settlements.

3.31 The likely negative effects include:

- most new development will be on greenfield land
- use of greenfield land could potentially affect habitats, species and natural features
- increased resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production
- more commuting by car from rural settlements, which could lead to greater traffic congestion and poorer air quality unless public transport is improved.

3.32 To minimise the negative effects of the preferred strategy and increase sustainability benefits, the following mitigation measures should be included in detailed policies in the local plan.

- Ensure that the best use is made of previously developed land so as to minimise the use of greenfield land.
- Avoid development of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

- Ensure that development avoids land at risk of flooding
- Avoid low density development so as to make efficient use of land and encourage higher density in appropriate locations.
- Maximise the energy efficiency of development so as to reduce carbon emissions.
- Minimise the water consumption of development so as to reduce impact on water resources.
- Ensure that development minimises impacts on heritage and nature conservation assets.
- Ensure that development is of high quality design that is sensitive to local character and is appropriately landscaped so as to reduce the impact on the built environment and existing communities.
- Ensure that housing development meets a range of needs.
- Prioritise development on sites with good access to local facilities, public transport links and key infrastructure so as to minimise the need to travel support public transport and discourage car use.
- Improve the provision of dedicated walking and cycling infrastructure with new development so that the use of private cars is minimised.

4 Next steps

- 4.1 The appraisal process will be used to help determine which policies and proposals are the most sustainable and should be included in the draft local plan that is formally submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. The results from the consultation on this sustainability appraisal addendum will be taken into account in preparing the sustainability appraisal report of the draft local plan. The appraisal will also influence the wording of policies and detail of the local plan's proposals so that they are as sustainable as possible and any negative impacts mitigated.

Appendix 1

Sustainability appraisal framework

Headline Objective	Headline Indicator	Detailed decision making criteria	Detailed Indicator
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	Emissions of greenhouse gases in the local authority area	Will it reduce the risk of flooding?	Number of dwellings in flood risk zones 3a and 3b
		Will it contribute to improving air quality?	Nitrogen dioxide levels in the AQMA Air quality in transport corridors
		Will it provide a low carbon building?	Number of 'net zero carbon' homes
		Will it increase the amount of energy from renewable sources?	Number of planning applications for renewable energy schemes granted permission.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	None identified	Will it increase the amount of energy from renewable sources?	Number of planning applications for renewable energy schemes granted permission.
		Will it encourage walking and cycling?	Mode of travel to work
		Will it maximise the use of previously developed land?	% of development on previously developed land
		Will it increase the % of municipal waste recycling?	% of municipal waste recycled
		Will it increase the proportion of waste re-used	None identified
		Will it minimise water use?	Water consumption
		Will it minimise energy use?	Energy consumption
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and	Management of the historic environment	Will it reduce the number of heritage assets at risk?	Number of heritage assets at risk
		Will it protect or enhance designated assets and their setting?	Number of conservation area management plans in place in the borough.
		Will it protect or enhance non-designated assets	None identified

Headline Objective	Headline Indicator	Detailed decision making criteria	Detailed Indicator
their settings		and their setting, including assets of archaeological interest?	
		Will it improve knowledge and recording of the historic environment where appropriate?	Number of new HER records added
		Will it improve the quality of the built environment?	Number of planning applications permitted referencing policy BE30 High Standard of Design
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	None identified	Will it help to halt the decline in condition of any SSSI?	SSSI in favourable condition
		Will it protect / enhance priority habitats and species?	Local sites in positive conservation management
		Will it contribute to the objectives of the Marston Vale Community Forest?	New woodland in the community forest
		Will it maintain and enhance the multi-functionality of green infrastructure networks?	Number of planning applications with green infrastructure conditions attached.
		Will it protect areas of biodiversity importance?	Changes in areas of biodiversity importance
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	Economic growth	Will it provide more employment opportunities?	Number of jobs in the borough
		Does it encourage business growth?	Number of company registrations
		Does it regenerate older industrial stock?	None identified
		Will it facilitate the provision of infrastructure?	Level of infrastructure provision through S106/CIL
		Will it increase employment land supply?	Overall amount of employment land (B1,B2, B8) developed
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	Qualification levels	Will it improve skill levels and qualifications for young people?	Number of young people not in work, education or employment (NEET)
		Will it narrow the gap between skills base and market needs?	Skills and qualification levels
7. Create a	None identified	Will it reduce town centre vacancy?	Town centre vacancy rates

Headline Objective	Headline Indicator	Detailed decision making criteria	Detailed Indicator
distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre		Will it support business growth?	Number of new company registrations
		Does it improve the public realm within the town centre?	Number of town centre regeneration projects started and completed
		Does it help to deliver the Townscape Heritage Initiative?	Number of grants issued for repairs, reinstatement of traditional shop fronts and bringing vacant units back into use
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	Housing provision to meet local need	Will it provide needed services and facilities?	Level of infrastructure provision through S106 / CIL (education / affordable housing)
		Will it meet the accommodation needs of Travellers?	Number of traveller pitches/plots granted permission.
		Will it increase the provision of housing?	Housing units completed per year
		Will it meet affordable housing needs?	Number of affordable dwelling completions
		Will it provide a range of homes to meet needs?	Size of dwellings completed per year
		Will it meet the needs of the ageing population?	Number of beds in residential care homes (communal) completed / number of apartments in specialist accommodation for the elderly
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	Indices of deprivation by local authority	Will it increase access to services and facilities?	New residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of services
		Will it reduce deprivation in the wards of Castle, Cauldwell and Queens Park?	Deprivation levels by ward
		Does it take account of the needs of the elderly and disadvantaged?	None identified
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	None identified	Will it encourage walking and cycling?	% of people travel to work by walking and cycling % of population cycling for any purpose regularly (3+ times a week), frequently (once a week) and cycling at all (more than once a month)
		Will it minimise crime?	Crime rates
		Will it minimise the fear of crime?	Fear of crime levels

Headline Objective	Headline Indicator	Detailed decision making criteria	Detailed Indicator
		Will it promote community involvement from ethnic minority groups?	Number of representations on policy documents received from ethnic minority groups
		Will it improve drinking water quality	Drinking water quality
		Will it provide sufficient recreation and leisure facilities?	Range of recreation and leisure facilities
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	Number of developments that meet CABI Building for Life standards	Will it enhance the townscape?	Number of grants issued for repairs, reinstatement of traditional shop fronts and bringing vacant units back into use
		Will it provide a strong local identity and sense of place?	None identified
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	Overall travel pattern	Will it support infrastructure needs?	Level of infrastructure provision (highways, public transport, rights of way) through S106 / CIL
		Will it encourage walking and cycling?	% of total defined strategic urban cycle network completed and signed Number of cyclists into the town centre
		Will it encourage the use of modes of transport other than the private car?	Mode of travel to work
		Will it improve accessibility?	Services within 30 minutes public transport time (GP, hospital, schools, employment area, retail centre)
		Will it reduce traffic congestion?	Traffic levels in the town centre

Sustainability appraisal testing – no growth “do nothing” option

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
O	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

Sustainability appraisal objective	No growth “do nothing” option
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) No growth is likely to mean that there is no increase in emissions from traffic, reduced air quality or increase in flood risk as a result of new development. However, there is no opportunity for development to bring about improvements to the existing situation, for example by making public transport viable and thereby increasing its use overall or providing cycle routes. Furthermore, the lack of growth is likely to increase in commuting by car to neighbouring areas for work, shopping and services.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	O NEUTRAL EFFECT No growth is likely to mean that there is no increased use of resources, such as water, land and energy, or greater amount of waste produced.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	O NEUTRAL EFFECT No growth means that there will be no impact from new development on heritage assets.

<p>4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species</p>	<p>O NEUTRAL EFFECT No growth means that there will be no development of greenfield land or any consequential harm to natural features, local environments, habitats and species. However, there may be a slight negative effect as there is no opportunity for development to improve green infrastructure.</p>
<p>5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors</p>	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) No growth means that there is likely to be little job creation or increase in spending that may support the local economy. This is likely to result in an increase in commuting to neighbouring areas for work, shopping and services. Furthermore, there is likely to be no growth in infrastructure provision which might benefit existing users.</p>
<p>6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P,T) Although there is no direct relationship between levels of growth and employability, the lack of growth in jobs means that there are likely to be fewer opportunities for education and skills training (both in terms of temporary construction work and longer-term employment in large businesses).</p>
<p>7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre</p>	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The lack of housing, employment and retail growth is likely to mean that economic growth is not supported which would have a consequential effect on this objective through reduced retail expenditure, business growth, and retail and leisure investment. The effect is likely to be reinforced as the relative attractiveness of competing centres elsewhere results in diversion of expenditure away from Bedford.</p>
<p>8. Meet the needs of a changing population</p>	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) The lack of additional housing provision is likely to mean that there is little or no provision of affordable housing or specialised older people's housing required to meet the needs of the population as it changes over time. Furthermore, the lack of growth in housing may also affect accessibility to services and facilities for existing residents.</p>
<p>9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) The lack of additional housing provision is likely to reduce access to employment opportunities, income, skills development and health facilities. It is also likely to affect the provision of affordable</p>

	housing or specialised older people's housing.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT No growth means that there is unlikely to be any contribution to the provision of community infrastructure, including health facilities, community safety initiatives, recreation and leisure facilities, green infrastructure and walking or cycling infrastructure. However this may be balanced by the lack of change in communities which can increase community cohesion.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT Although the lack of development means that there is no change to the character and identity of existing villages, surrounding landscapes and the countryside, it also means that there is no potential to enhance the existing townscape and raise design quality through active place-making.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) No growth is likely to mean that there is no increase in traffic volumes as a result of new development. However, there is no opportunity for development to bring about improvements, for example by making public transport viable and thereby increasing its use overall or providing cycle routes. Furthermore, the lack of growth is likely to increase in commuting by car to neighbouring areas for work, shopping and services.

Sustainability appraisal testing – new settlement options

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
O	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

SA objective	Smaller scale new settlements option (1,000 – 2,000 dwellings)	Larger scale new settlements option (4,000 – 6,000 dwellings)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P)</p> <p>This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport due to increased journeys. This scale of settlement is unlikely to be able to support shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools) and is therefore likely to result in increased commuting to neighbouring areas. This is likely to be by car because the scale of development is insufficient to support significant improvements in public transport.</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT</p> <p>The effect of this option is likely to be uncertain. The scale of settlement is more likely to enable a degree of self-containment by supporting shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools). Furthermore, the scale of development is more likely to be able to support significant improvements in public transport. Nevertheless, there could still be out-commuting to higher order settlements where a greater range of facilities are available. If public transport does not improve then this could lead to more journeys by car and increased emissions.</p>

SA objective	Smaller scale new settlements option (1,000 – 2,000 dwellings)	Larger scale new settlements option (4,000 – 6,000 dwellings)
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production as development is likely to be on greenfield land. However new infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within the new settlements to some extent.	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production as development is likely to be on greenfield land. However new infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within the new settlements. The likelihood of settlements supporting a greater range of shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools) means that the shift to sustainable transport could be greater, however this effect is still outweighed by the resource consumption associated with this amount of development.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Development is likely to be on greenfield land, use of which can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features. Nevertheless new settlements have the potential to enhance green infrastructure significantly.	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Development is likely to be on greenfield land, use of which can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features. The greater land take of larger new settlements is likely to have a greater adverse effect on this objective. Nevertheless new settlements have the potential to enhance green infrastructure significantly.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The opportunity for job creation associated with this option is likely to be less than for larger scale settlements.	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation, both within the new

SA objective	Smaller scale new settlements option (1,000 – 2,000 dwellings)	Larger scale new settlements option (4,000 – 6,000 dwellings)
growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	Development may benefit nearby rural settlements as new residents support local shops and services, however the likely use of car travel means that any benefit could be realised out of the borough.	settlement itself and in nearby rural settlements which are likely to benefit from the new opportunities available. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) The lower level of development associated with this option means that there are likely to be fewer opportunities for education and skills training (both in terms of temporary construction work and longer-term employment in large businesses).	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P,T) The higher level of development associated with this option means that there are likely to be more opportunities for education and skills training (both in terms of temporary construction work and longer-term employment in large businesses).
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	O NEUTRAL EFFECT This option is unlikely to affect Bedford town centre.	O NEUTRAL EFFECT This option is unlikely to affect Bedford town centre.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure.	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing a significant amount of housing (especially affordable and specialised older people's housing), employment and associated infrastructure.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The opportunity to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment and increase access to essential services is uncertain. At this scale of development it is not clear that new settlements will be able to support the provision of community facilities and	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment and increase access to essential services. The scale of development is likely to be able to support the provision of community facilities, employment and help meet housing needs.

SA objective	Smaller scale new settlements option (1,000 – 2,000 dwellings)	Larger scale new settlements option (4,000 – 6,000 dwellings)
	employment.	
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The smaller scale of development means that there is uncertainty about whether new settlements can provide health and leisure facilities.	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) There is potential for a significant size of new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on reducing the need to travel. This scale of settlement is unlikely to be able to support shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools) and is therefore likely to result in increased commuting to neighbouring areas. This is likely to be by car because the scale of development is insufficient to support significant improvements in public transport.	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option is likely to be uncertain. The scale of settlement is more likely to enable a degree of self-containment by supporting shops, services and community facilities (including secondary schools). Furthermore, the scale of development is more likely to be able to support significant improvements in public transport. Nevertheless, there could still be out-commuting to higher order settlements where a greater range of facilities are available. If public transport does not improve then this could lead to more journeys by car.

Sustainability appraisal testing – potential option scenarios

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
O	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

Potential option scenario assumptions:

- New settlement – 2,200 dwellings
- Stewartby brickworks site – 1,000 dwellings
- Within and adjoining urban area – 1,988 dwellings
- Group 1 Villages – high growth 5,100 dwellings, low growth 2,600 dwellings, hybrid 3,500 dwellings
- Group 2 Villages – high growth 2,000 dwellings, low growth 225 dwellings.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 1 New settlement, brickworks, urban area, Group 1 (low), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T)</p> <p>This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.</p>

<p>2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.</p>
<p>3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.</p>
<p>4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.</p>
<p>5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).</p>
<p>6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs</p>	<p>O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.</p>
<p>7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability and support regeneration.</p>
<p>8. Meet the needs of a changing</p>	<p>✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P)</p>

population	This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 5 Brickworks, urban area, Group 1 (high), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements. Higher

adaptation and mitigation	growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The advantage of not including new settlements is balanced by higher growth in villages.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability

	and support regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 8 Brickworks, urban area, Group 1 (low), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements. Higher

adaptation and mitigation	growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks and urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The advantage of not including new settlements is balanced by higher growth in villages.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly diluted because of the higher growth in Group 2 villages competing with Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability

	and support regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 12 New settlement, urban area, Group 1 (low), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in

adaptation and mitigation	particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly diluted because of the higher growth in Group 2 villages competing with Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.

7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability and support regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 13 New settlement, brickworks, Group 1 (high), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in Group 1 villages. It will also benefit

	construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth away from the urban area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation and increase access to essential services in the rural area although not in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage,	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT

reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.
--	---

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 16 New settlement, brickworks, Group 1 (low), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor

	adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly diluted because of the higher growth in Group 2 villages competing with Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth away from the urban area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation and increase access to essential services in the rural area although not in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.

11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 19 Urban area, Group 1 (high), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. Any use of greenfield

features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The advantage of not including new settlements is balanced by higher growth in villages.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability and support regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health

	and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 23 New settlement, Group 1 (high), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. All new development will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P)

enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	All new development will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth away from the urban area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation and increase access to essential services in the rural area although not in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping,	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping

promote healthy and safe communities	(temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 28 Brickworks, Group 1 (high), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment,	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful

heritage assets and their settings	impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Most new development (apart from the brickworks) will be on greenfield land. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The advantage of not including new settlements is balanced by higher growth in villages.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in rural villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth away from the urban area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9. Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation and increase access to essential services in the rural area

	although not in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 31 New settlement, urban area, Group 1 (hybrid), Group 2 (low)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in some villages slightly emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development. Effects marginally reduced as fewer villages grow.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements. Effects marginally reduced as fewer villages grow.

<p>3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.</p>
<p>4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species</p>	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.</p>
<p>5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly enhanced because of the higher growth in Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).</p>
<p>6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs</p>	<p>O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.</p>
<p>7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre</p>	<p>✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability and support regeneration.</p>
<p>8. Meet the needs of a changing population</p>	<p>✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.</p>

9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 33 Urban area, Group 1 (hybrid), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently,	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. Most

maximise recycling and re-use	new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) Most new development (apart from the urban area sites) will be on greenfield land. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact could make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The advantage of not including new settlements is balanced by higher growth in villages.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly diluted because of the higher growth in Group 2 villages competing with Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect on Bedford town centre as growth will increase its viability and support regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing population	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship

	between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area as well as increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The effect of this option depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Sustainability appraisal objective	Option 35 New settlement, Group 1 (hybrid), Group 2 (high)
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect) in existing settlements and in particular in new settlements which increase journeys and require new infrastructure. Higher growth in villages emphasises effect. The extent of the impact depends on the type and build-standard of development.
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles,	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P)

use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. All new development will be on greenfield land. New settlements will use substantial land resource. However, improved infrastructure could encourage walking and cycling within settlements.
3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.
4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) All new development will be on greenfield land. New settlements are also likely to use large areas, but have potential to significantly enhance green infrastructure. Any use of greenfield land can potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.
5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T) This option is likely to make a positive contribution to economic growth and job creation because it is likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. This effect is likely to be slightly diluted because of the higher growth in Group 2 villages competing with Group 1 villages. It will also benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).
6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs	O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.
7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth away from the urban area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.
8. Meet the needs of a changing	✓✓ MAJOR POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P)

population	This option is likely to have a positive effect and is likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between this spatial option and the provision of Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to help reduce deprivation and increase access to essential services in the rural area although not in the urban area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,T,P) The option consultation itself represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping (temporary effect). If development needs are met through neighbourhood planning, this is likely to build community cohesion and capacity. There is potential for new development to provide associated health and leisure facilities, and design-out crime particularly when it is on sites of a significant size.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	✓ POSITIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) This option is likely to have a positive effect because new settlements make up a substantial proportion of growth. New settlements are likely to provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	? UNCERTAIN EFFECT This option may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable and therefore reliable.

Summary of effects on objectives

Objective 1

Although all options show major negative effects because of the high level of growth, the options that include new settlements and high growth in Group 1 villages are likely to have the strongest negative effect and this is reinforced when both are included

together in an option. The effect of high growth in Group 2 villages is likely to have only a very marginal additional effect. Options 1, 12 and 16 (because they have low Group 1 village growth), and options 5, 8, 19, 28 and 33 (because they have no new settlements) perform slightly better, as does option 8 (which has both low Group 1 village growth and no new settlements). Options 13 and 23 (because they have both high Group 1 village growth and new settlements) perform slightly worse.

Objective 2

The options that include new settlements have negative effects because of the greater use of greenfield land. However this effect is tempered because development will result in improved infrastructure which could encourage walking and cycling within settlements. For options which do not include new settlements, this tempering effect is sufficient for the overall effect to be uncertain rather than negative. For options which include new settlements but also exclude the brickworks or urban area sites (brownfield sites) the negative effect is strengthened because of the even greater use of greenfield land and failure to reuse previously developed land. Options 5, 8, 19, 28 and 33 (because they do not include new settlements) perform best. Options 12, 13, 16, 23, 31 and 35 (because they do not reuse previously developed land) perform worst.

Objective 3

All options show an uncertain effect because impact on heritage assets largely depends on the detailed location of development. Seriously harmful impacts would make a site unsuitable for allocation, while minor adverse impacts should be able to be mitigated. All options perform equally.

Objective 4

All options show negative effects because most development is likely to be on previously undeveloped (greenfield) land. Nevertheless, for the options that both include new settlements and also exclude the brickworks or urban area sites (brownfield sites) the negative effect is strengthened because of the even greater use of greenfield land. Option 1 (because it has low village growth while using all brownfield opportunities), and 5 and 8 (because they have no new settlements while using all brownfield opportunities) perform best. Options 12, 13, 16, 23, 31 and 35 (because they have higher village growth, new settlements and do not reuse previously developed land) perform worst. Seriously harmful impacts would make a site unsuitable for allocations, while minor adverse impacts should be able to be mitigated.

Objective 5

All options show positive effects because they all include significant rural growth and are likely to strengthen existing rural economies, services and increase employment opportunities. However, this effect is likely to be slightly greater for those options that have higher growth in the Group 1 villages because these are the rural locations that have the best facilities and services (options 5, 13, 19, 23 and 28). Higher levels of growth in Group 2 villages are likely to dilute the generally positive effect slightly (options 8, 12, 16, 33, 35) as they compete with the facilities and services in Group 1 villages. These differences are not sufficiently significant to affect the overall positive effect rating. In addition, all options show a temporary positive effect on construction jobs. This is likely to be slightly greater for options which include new settlements because of the expected greater infrastructure requirements.

Objective 6

All options show a neutral effect because there is no direct relationship between the options for the spatial distribution of growth and skills development and employability.

Objective 7

Most options show a positive effect on Bedford town centre as population growth will increase the number of visitors and spending, enhancing its viability and supporting regeneration. However options 13, 16, 23, 28 and 35 (no growth within and adjoining the urban area) show an uncertain effect. This is because, with growth more dispersed, there is a possibility that some residents will choose to travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, reducing its viability and thus harming its regeneration.

Objective 8

All options show a positive effect and are likely to help meet the needs of a growing population through providing housing, employment and associated infrastructure. There is no direct relationship between the options and the provision of Traveller accommodation.

Objective 9

All options show a positive effect and are likely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment. All options are likely to improve access to essential services in the rural area and contribute to reducing inequalities between the urban

and rural parts of the borough. However options 13, 16, 23, 28 and 35 (no growth within and adjoining the urban area) are likely to be less beneficial as they are less likely to reduce deprivation in the most deprived wards, which are located in the urban area.

Objective 10

All options show a positive effect and are likely to promote healthy and safe communities as new development has potential to provide health and leisure facilities and design-out crime. Consultation represents an opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping, which is a temporary effect. Involvement in neighbourhood planning has potential for a more permanent effect.

Objective 11

The options that include new settlements are likely to perform better than other options because new settlements provide the opportunity to incorporate garden city principles which should promote strong local identity and sense of place. Where new settlements are included in an option they make up a substantial proportion of the dwelling requirement within the plan period (and beyond it). Other options show an uncertain effect on the objective as the effect largely depends on the quality, design and distinctiveness of development which is more difficult to predict when it is an extension to existing development.

Objective 12

All options show an uncertain effect as they may contribute to reducing the need to travel by increasing the overall provision of services, facilities and employment across the borough and making rural public transport and other sustainable modes increasingly viable. However this is not certain: development could instead lead to more travel by car to services and facilities in the urban area.

Summary of potential option scenario testing

SA objective	Potential option scenario											
	1	5	8	12	13	16	19	23	28	31	33	35
1	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
2	X	?	?	XX	XX	XX	?	XX	?	XX	?	XX

3	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
4	X	X	X	XX	XX	XX	X	XX	X	XX	X	XX
5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	O
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	✓	?	?	✓	✓	?
8	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
9	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓
10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
11	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	✓	?	✓
12	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

Sustainability appraisal testing – no distribution of growth “do nothing” option

✓✓	Major positive effect	ST	Short-term effect
✓	Positive effect	MT	Medium-term effect
○	Neutral effect	LT	Long-term effect
?	Uncertain effect	P	Permanent effect
X	Negative effect	T	Temporary
XX	Major negative effect		

Sustainability appraisal objective	No distribution of growth “do nothing” option
1. Ensure resilience to and reduce the effects of climate change through effective adaptation and mitigation	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P,ST,T)</p> <p>This option is likely to have a major negative impact on the achievement of this objective as a result of increasing emissions from transport and construction (temporary effect). The likelihood that growth will be very dispersed in rural locations means that there will be an increase in journeys to access employment, shops, services and facilities. The extent of the impact also depends on the type and build-standard of development. An increased risk of serious flooding would make a site unsuitable, although minor impacts can be mitigated.</p>
2. Promote sustainable lifestyles, use resources efficiently, maximise recycling and re-use	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P)</p> <p>This option is likely to increase resource consumption (energy, water, land) and waste production. All new development is likely to be on greenfield land and may not be well related to existing settlements. Development is unlikely to improve infrastructure which might encourage walking and cycling.</p>

<p>3. Conserve and enhance the built and historic environment, heritage assets and their settings</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The impact on heritage depends on the exact location of development sites although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated. The impact on existing townscapes largely depends on the quality of design.</p>
<p>4. Create, conserve, protect and enhance the borough's natural features, distinctive local environments, habitats and species</p>	<p>XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT LT,P) It is likely that all new development will be on greenfield land, which could potentially affect habitats, species and natural features depending on the exact location of development sites, although a seriously harmful impact would make a site unsuitable. Minor adverse impacts should be mitigated.</p>
<p>5. Promote strong, sustained and balanced economic growth, stimulating job creation across a range of sectors</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a negative effect on economic growth and job creation. Existing villages (especially the larger Group 1 villages) are the rural locations that have the best facilities and services, however in this option it is likely that growth is dispersed. Existing rural economies, services and employment opportunities are therefore likely to be harmed. As a result, there is likely to be an increase in commuting to neighbouring areas for work, shopping and services. Nevertheless, this option is likely to benefit construction jobs (temporary effect).</p>
<p>6. Improve the skills of the labour force, matching skill outcome with market needs</p>	<p>O NEUTRAL EFFECT There is no direct relationship between this option and skills development and employability.</p>
<p>7. Create a distinctive, attractive and multi-functional town centre</p>	<p>? UNCERTAIN EFFECT The dispersal of growth across the rural area means that some residents may travel to other nearby town centres rather than Bedford town centre, potentially reducing its viability and delaying its regeneration.</p>
<p>8. Meet the needs of a changing population</p>	<p>X NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT.LT,P) It is unlikely that this option will help meet the needs of a changing population as development is likely to focus on the most profitable housing types rather than what is</p>

	most needed. As a result there is likely to be a lack of provision of affordable housing, older persons housing and Traveller accommodation.
9.Reduce levels of deprivation, inequalities and exclusion	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) As development is likely to focus on the most profitable housing types and locations rather than what is most needed, this option is unlikely to help reduce deprivation in terms of health, income, skills and unemployment in the urban area or increase access to essential services in the rural area.
10. Promote community involvement in place-shaping, promote healthy and safe communities	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (ST,MT,LT,P) In this option there is unlikely to be any opportunity for community involvement in place-shaping or building community cohesion and capacity unless development needs are met through neighbourhood planning. New development is unlikely to promote healthy and safe communities by providing walking and cycling facilities, open space and leisure facilities.
11. Promote a strong local identity and sense of place	X NEGATIVE EFFECT (MT,LT,P) The dispersal of growth across the rural area means that it is unlikely to promote local identity and sense of place. Uncoordinated development is likely to harm landscapes and the countryside.
12. Minimise growth in car usage, reduce the need to travel and promote the shift to more sustainable modes of transport	XX MAJOR NEGATIVE EFFECT (LT,P) This option is likely to have a major negative impact on reducing the need to travel. The likelihood that growth is very dispersed in rural locations means that there will be an increase in car journeys to access employment, shops, services and facilities. It is also likely to undermine the viability of public transport by reducing its use.