Planning Pembrokeshire's Future

Local Development Plan

Cynllun Datblygu Lleol

Cynllunio Dyfodol Sir Benfro

Local Development Plan 2 (2017 – 2033)

Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Options July 2018

Sustainability Appraisal of the Strategic Options

Appraisal Method
This section outlines how the SA Framework was used to appraise the Strategic Options against the SA objectives set out in the SA/SEA Scoping Report.

Sustainability Appraisal Framework
The SA objectives form the basis of this methodology and have been used as methodological indicators against which the Strategic Options have been appraised. The SA objectives are supported by aims which guide the appraisal of the options against the SA objectives.

The methodology used in the derivation of the SA objectives and development of the aims was developed from that outlined in the ODPM's SEA guidance. The SA objectives and aims, detailed in the LDP review and SA/SEA Scoping Report were informed by environmental objectives established under law, policy or the sustainability objectives of other relevant plans and programmes that may influence, or be influenced by, the plan; as well as the key issues identified through baseline data collection and consultation. The SA objectives come under a list of topic areas. The SA objectives (in bold font) and key aims of these objectives used in this appraisal are as follows:

The reference in the + - ? column refers to the overall effects of the options on the achievement of the Sustainability Objectives.

Sustainability Appraisal of Growth Options -
The Spatial Options were appraised using the key:

+ Potential positive effects
- Potential negative effects
? Uncertain/unclear what effects.
0 No relationship with the SA Objective

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
1. Develop & maintain a balanced population structure	-	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Under this scenario there is a decline in the 0-15 and the 30-34 category.	-	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Under this scenario there is an increase in the 0-15 and the 30-34 category as a result of increased migration.	-	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Under this scenario there is an increase in the 0-15 and the 30-34 category as a result of increased migration.	_ ++	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	- ++	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	- ++	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	- -	Over the 2017–2033 plan period, there is substantial population growth projected in the 60+ age groups under all scenarios. Under the **Net Nil** scenario, a notably greater population decline is evidenced in the young adult and subsequently child (0–4) age groups, driven by the reduced migration flows.

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
2. Promote & improve human health & well being through a healthy lifestyle, access to healthcare & recreation opportunities & a clean & healthy environment	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.	0	There is no direct relationship between the number of houses and access to healthcare and recreation and promoting and improving health, this is more likely to be impacted on by location of growth and other plan policies. Opportunities to access a clean and healthy environment are the same for all options.
3. Improve education opportunities to enhance the skills & knowledge base	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.
4. Minimise the need to travel & encourage sustainable modes of transport	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.	0	The location rather than the level of growth will be the key determinant of compliance with this SA objective.
5. Provide a range of high quality housing including affordable	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing.	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing.	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing.	+	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing.	-	This option would not allow for the provision of a range of housing and failure to allow for any migration would

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
housing to meet local needs	-	The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a low growth option would equate to a smaller number of affordable housing overall.	+	including affordable housing. The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a slightly higher growth option would equate to a greater number of affordable housing overall.	+	including affordable housing. The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a slightly higher growth option would equate to a greater number of affordable housing overall.	+	The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a slightly higher growth option would equate to a greater number of affordable housing overall.	+	The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a slightly higher growth option would equate to a greater number of affordable housing overall.	+	The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen, therefore a slightly higher growth option would equate to a greater number of affordable housing overall.	-	put significant pressure on local housing stock, forcing up house prices significantly. This option would not contribute to meeting the backlog of need for affordable housing in Pembrokeshire.
6. Build safe, vibrant & cohesive communities which have improved access to key service & facilities	-	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category decline, whereas other scenarios allow for growth in these age groups.	+	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category increase.	+	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category increase.	++	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	++	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	++	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balanced population profile. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile	-	Cohesive communities are more likely to have a balance population profile. Under the **Net Nil** scenario, a notably greater population decline is evidenced in the young adult and subsequently child (0–4) age groups, driven by the reduced migration flows.
7. Protect & enhance the	-	A more youthful population profile is	+	A more youthful population profile	+	A more youthful population profile	++	A more youthful population profile is	++	A more youthful population profile is	++	A more youthful population profile is	-	

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
role of the Welsh language & culture		more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category decline, whereas other scenarios allow for growth in these age groups.		is more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category increase.		is more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Under this scenario both the 0-15 and 30-34 category increase.		more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile		more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile		more likely to support the role of the Welsh language and culture. Whilst an increase in the older (65+) age groups is estimated under all scenarios, larger net migration flows estimated under the dwelling-led scenarios, results in the maintenance of a more youthful population profile		
8. Provide a range of good quality employment opportunities accessible to all sections of the population	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.
9. Support a sustainable & diverse local economy	+	Providing housing growth is likely to support local building trades.	++	A greater level of growth is likely to enhance support for local building trades.	++	A greater level of growth is likely to enhance support for local building trades.	++	A greater level of growth is likely to enhance support for local building trades.	++	A greater level of growth is likely to enhance support for local building trades.	++	A greater level of growth is likely to enhance support for local building trades.	-	Such a low level of growth is likely to have a significantly negative impact on local building trades.
10. Prepare for & reduce the impact of Pembrokeshire' s contribution to climate change	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results in an increased use of resources.	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results in an increased use of resources.	-	More housing growth may impact negatively on climate change, depending on location as an increase in households results in an increased use of resources.	+	Limited housing growth may reduce impacts on climate chane, as a reduced number of households may result in a lower level of use of resources.

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
	+	in an increased use of resources. More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	+	in an increased use of resources. More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	+	in an increased use of resources. More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	+	More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	+	More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	+	More housing growth based may also support services which are sustainable (such as bus and train services), which in turn reduces Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.	-	Less housing growth may make some services uneconomic resulting in a loss of bus and train services, which in turn increases Pembrokeshire's impact on climate change.
11. Maintain & improve air quality	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.
12. Minimise the generation of waste & pollution	- +	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).	-	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	- -	More housing may result in increased waste and pollution, both in construction and once built. As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective.	+	As the lowest growth option, this Option is likely to best achieve this objective.

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
13. Encourage the efficient production, use, re-use & recycling of resources	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	-	Greater housing growth is likely to result in the increased use of non recycled materials in construction.	+	Limited housing growth is likely to result in less use of non recycled resources.
	+	Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective.		
14. Maintain & protect the quality of inland & coastal water	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.
15. Reduce the impacts of flooding & sea level rise	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.	?	Impacts on this SA objective are more likely to be dictated by the location of new development.
16. Use land efficiently & minimise contamination	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	-	More housing is likely to result in more land take and associated issues of contamination.	+	Limited housing growth is likely to result in less land take and reduced

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
	+	Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective.		associated issues of contamination.
17. Safeguard soil quality & quantity	- +	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).	-	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-- -	More housing is likely to result in a need to use greenfield sites which may impact on soil quality. As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective.	+	Limited housing growth is likely to result in less land take and therefore safeguard soil quality.
18. Protect, enhance & value biodiversity	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	- -	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on biodiversity.	+	Limited housing growth is likely to result in lower associated impacts on biodiversity.

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
	+	Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective		
19. Protect & enhance the landscape & geological heritage	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	-	Greater levels of housing may result in associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.	+	Limited housing growth is likely to result in lower associated impacts on landscape and geological heritage.
	+	Meeting the minimum levels of need for housing (as in Option 1 is likely to perform better against this objective than some of the other Options).		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.		Options 2,3,4 and 5 are all proposing between approx. 340-440 homes a year and will therefore perform similarly against this SA objective.	-	As the highest growth option, this is option performs worst against this objective		

SA Objectives		Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario 196 dwellings a year		Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends) 340 dwellings a year		Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends) 408 dwellings a year		Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years) 443 dwellings a year		Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years) 416 dwellings a year		Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario) 570 dwellings a year		Option 7: Zero migration scenario 6 dwellings a year
20. Encourage quality, locally distinct design that complements the built heritage	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.
21. Protect, enhance & value the built heritage & historic environment	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.	0	No relationship between the level of growth option and this SA Objective.
SUMMARY		This growth option performs less well against the SA objectives around population structure, community cohesion and delivering affordable housing than Options 2, 3,4,5 and 6. It however performs better against those SA objectives linked to using resources efficiently, protecting soil and protecting biodiversity and landscape than the other Options (apart from Option 7). Overall it is the best performing Growth		Options 2-5 all perform similarly in terms of the SA assessment. Offering a slightly higher growth than Option 1 results in a better performance against SA objectives linked to population structure, community cohesion and delivering affordable housing. As a result of higher growth however these options perform less well against SA objectives linked to using resources		Options 2-5 all perform similarly in terms of the SA assessment. Offering a slightly higher growth than Option 1 results in a better performance against SA objectives linked to population structure, community cohesion and delivering affordable housing. As a result of higher growth however these options perform less well against SA objectives linked to using resources		Options 2-5 all perform similarly in terms of the SA assessment. Offering a slightly higher growth than Option 1 results in a better performance against SA objectives linked to population structure, community cohesion and delivering affordable housing. As a result of higher growth however these options perform less well against SA objectives linked to using resources efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape. They perform slightly less well overall than Option		Options 2-5 all perform similarly in terms of the SA assessment. Offering a slightly higher growth than Option 1 results in a better performance against SA objectives linked to population structure, community cohesion and delivering affordable housing. As a result of higher growth however these options perform less well against SA objectives linked to using resources efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape. They perform slightly less well overall than		This growth option performs best against SA objectives around population structure, community cohesion, delivering affordable housing and supporting the local economy. It is the worst performing however against SA objectives linked to using resources efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape. Overall it performs less well than Options 1-5.		This Growth option performs very poorly against SA objectives linked to population structure, community cohesion and delivering housing and affordable housing. It performs well against the SA objective linked to using resources efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape but its overall potential impacts on the housing market and population structure are so negative that it cannot be considered seriously as a Growth Option for the LDP.

SA Objectives		**Option 1: WG-2014 (Rebased) Scenario** **196 dwellings a year**		**Option 2: Population Growth 10yr Scenario (based on 10 yr migration trends)** **340 dwellings a year**		**Option 3: Population Growth Long Term Scenario (based on 15 yr migration trends)** **408 dwellings a year**		**Option 4: Dwelling led – 5 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 5 years)** **443 dwellings a year**		**Option 5: Dwelling led – 10 year scenario (based on average build rates over last 10 years)** **416 dwellings a year**		**Option 6: Dwelling led – (Current LDP scenario)** **570 dwellings a year**		**Option 7: Zero migration scenario** **6 dwellings a year**
		Option when considered against the SA objectives in totality.		efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape. They perform slightly less well overall than Option 1 when considered in totality.		efficiently, protecting soil, biodiversity and landscape. They perform slightly less well overall than Option 1 when considered in totality.		1 when considered in totality.		Option 1 when considered in totality.				

Sustainability Appraisal of Spatial Housing Options
The Spatial Options were appraised using the key:

+ Potential positive effects
- Potential negative effects
? Uncertain/unclear what effects.
0 No relationship with the SA Objective

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option		**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus		**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option	
	+ - 0 ?	Commentary/ explanation	+ - 0 ?	Commentary/ explanation	+ - 0 ?	Commentary/ explanation
1. Develop & maintain a balanced population structure.	0	It would be difficult to argue that this spatial option approach would have some, if any, impact on the current ageing population structure in Pembrokeshire.	0	It would be difficult to argue this spatial option approach would have some, if any, impact on the current ageing population structure in Pembrokeshire.	0	It would be difficult to argue this spatial option approach would have some, if any, impact on the current ageing population structure in Pembrokeshire.
2. Promote & improve human health & well being through a healthy lifestyle, access to healthcare & recreation opportunities & a clean & healthy environment.	+ - +	As this option focuses more development on the main towns (Hub Towns) with services, it provides development in locations with better access to healthcare, leisure and formal recreation opportunities than the other options. Those already living in rural areas may be adversely affected by this option due to the need to continue to travel further to healthcare and formal leisure and recreation facilities. The potential for a clean and healthy environment is similar with all options, however without sensitive planning and provision this may not be the case.	- - +	As this option distributes 10% less development to the main towns (Hub towns) than option 1 (60% instead of 70%), and more development to the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages, more development will be located away from the healthcare leisure and recreation opportunities of the Main towns when compared to Option 1However the focus is still broadly on locating development to areas with services. Those already living in rural areas may be adversely affected by this option due to the need to travel further to healthcare and formal leisure and recreation facilities. The potential for a clean and healthy environment is similar with all options. However, option 2 may be more likely to provide better access to recreational and healthcare facilities.	- - +	As this option distributes 20% less development to the main towns (Hub Towns) than option 1 (50% instead of 70%), and increases the scale of development within the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages the proportion of new development further away from leisure, formal recreation and health care facilities would be greater. Those already living in rural areas may be adversely affected by this option due to the need to travel further to healthcare and formal leisure recreation facilities. The potential for a clean and healthy environment is similar with all options. However, option 3 may be more likely to provide better access to informal recreational facilities and open space.
3. Improve education opportunities to enhance the skills & knowledge base	0	The LDP is a strategic document and will not directly improve education opportunities.	0	The LDP is a strategic document and will not directly improve education opportunities.	0	The LDP is a strategic document and will not directly improve education opportunities.
4. Minimise the need to travel & encourage sustainable modes of transport	+ - -	An overall positive effect is likely as an urban focus in areas with a higher number of services means that car use is less likely to be necessary as a greater choice of transport modes will be available across a range of journeys. May lead to congestion problems in the areas where development is concentrated.	+	An overall positive effect is likely (although to a slightly lesser extent than in option 1) as development is still focused on primarily urban areas, and to settlements with a minimum number of services More development in the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages is likely to increase the number of journeys by car.	- - -	Greater dispersal of development particularly to rural settlements is likely to increase unsustainable use of cars and generally increase the need to travel to services, etc. Increased need to travel to hub towns may lead to congestion problems entering and within the towns.

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option		**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus		**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option	
			-	May lead to congestion problems in the areas where development is concentrated.		
5. Provide a range of high quality housing including affordable housing to meet local needs.	+ - +	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing. The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen. Affordable housing concentrated in urban areas would mean less in the rural areas. Would take account of a high amount of the affordable housing backlog.	+ + +	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing. In addition, the element of three potential policy areas would allow for local issues to be more sensitively dealt with. The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen. This option has the potential to increase the provision of affordable housing at the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages. Would take account of a high amount of the affordable housing backlog.	+ + +	This option would allow for the provision of a range of housing including affordable housing, proportional to where it is needed. The amount of housing and level of affordable housing provision generated would depend upon the level of growth option chosen. This option has the best potential to increase the provision of affordable housing at the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages. Would take account of a high amount of the affordable housing backlog.
6. Build safe, vibrant & cohesive communities which have improved access to key service & facilities.	+ - - - 	This option would contribute to maintaining safe, vibrant and cohesive communities, with good access to services in urban areas and settlements with a certain level of service provision. This option would not contribute to the vibrancy of settlements with a low level of service provision, often in more rural areas. Noise disturbance could increase in the main towns. Increased development may increase crime.	+ + - - 	This option would contribute to maintaining safe, vibrant and cohesive communities, with good access to services in urban areas and settlements with a certain level of service provision. This option would contribute more development to the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages than option 1, therefore potentially protecting and enhancing their vibrancy. Noise disturbance could increase in the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages. Increased development may increase crime.	+ + - - 	This option would contribute to maintaining and creating a wider number of safe, vibrant and cohesive communities than options 1 and 2. This option could increase development at the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages and help to retain existing services protecting and enhancing their vibrancy and future sustainability. Increased development may increase crime in areas where there was very little previously. Noise disturbance could increase in the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages.
7. Protect & enhance the role of the Welsh language & culture.	+ + 	All three options would allow for the protection and enhancement of the Welsh language and culture. A higher proportion of development could dilute the Welsh language and culture within the Main towns, but is less likely to dilute culture within Service Villages and Centres –strong policies would be needed to mitigate against this.	+ + 	All three options would allow for the protection and enhancement of the Welsh language and culture. A locally distinct policy approach will mean local circumstances can be taken into account when allocating development.	+ - 	All three options would allow for the protection and enhancement of the Welsh language and culture. A higher proportion of development in the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages could dilute the Welsh language and culture –strong policies would be needed to mitigate against this.

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option		**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus		**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option	
8. Provide a range of good quality employment opportunities accessible to all sections of the population.	? +	The strategic housing options do not include employment options. This option focuses housing in main towns and would make strategic employment opportunities accessible to increasing Hub town populations.	? +	The strategic housing options do not include employment options. This option would disperse more housing to the Rural Town, Service Centres, and Villages than option 1 where existing employment opportunities may be lower, however, criteria based policies would also allow further dispersal of a range of employment opportunities to a wide range of settlements, including live work units. This should ensure that employment opportunities were accessible to all sections of the population.	? +	The strategic housing options do not include employment options. Criteria based policies would also allow further dispersal of a range of employment opportunities to a wide range of settlements, including live work units. This should ensure that employment opportunities were accessible to all sections of the population.
9. Support a sustainable & diverse local economy.	+	All three options would support a sustainable and diverse economy.	+	All three options would support a sustainable and diverse economy.	+	All three options would support a sustainable and diverse economy.
10. Prepare for & reduce the impact of Pembrokeshire's contribution to climate change.	+	All three options would be able to incorporate policies on renewable energy and other such approaches to reduce the impact of Pembrokeshire's contribution to climate change. In terms of the impact of travel however, option 1 would encourage the least travel.	+	All three options would be able to incorporate policies on renewable energy and other such approaches to reduce the impact of Pembrokeshire's contribution to climate change. In terms of the impact of travel however, option 2 would encourage more travel than option 1.	+	All three options would be able to incorporate policies on renewable energy and other such approaches to reduce the impact of Pembrokeshire's contribution to climate change. In terms of the impact of travel however, option 3 would necessitate a greater need to travel.
11. Maintain & improve air quality.	+ -	This option would concentrate most new development in the main towns (Hub towns) with services which may reduce the need to travel for those people in urban areas, and therefore air pollution. On a micro scale this option might increase poor air quality in the main towns.	- +	This option would distribute more development to the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages than option 1. This might result in increased travel and overall general worsening of air quality; However it may reduce pollution hotspots in the towns.	- +	This option would distribute most development to the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages than options 1 and 2. This might result in increased travel and overall general worsening of air quality. This option could reduce pollution hotspots in the towns.
12. Minimise the generation of waste & pollution.	+ +	Generation of waste would be the same regardless of spatial location; however an increased concentration of development in the Main towns could put increased pressure on waste water treatment works, sewage infrastructure, etc.but would potentially require investment in fewer locations and be a more sustainable and economical option for waste collection. Concentrating development in Hub (Main) towns would minimise the spread of light pollution into areas of Pembrokeshire which are undeveloped and have minimal impact on night sky.	- -	Generation of waste would be the same regardless of spatial location; however an increased concentration of development in the Service Centres and Service villages could put increased pressure on waste water treatment works, sewage infrastructure, etc. at a greater number of infrastructure locations and is less sustainable in relation to the collection of waste. Greater development in the Rural town, Service Centres and Service Villages could increase the spread of light pollution into areas of Pembrokeshire which are undeveloped and have minimal impact on night sky.	- -	Generation of waste would be the same regardless of spatial location; however an increased concentration of development in the Service Centres and Service villages could put increased pressure on waste water treatment works, sewage infrastructure, waste collection etc. at a greater number of infrastructure locations and is least sustainable in relation to the collection of waste. Greater development in the Rural town, Service Centres and Service Villages could increase the spread of light pollution into areas of Pembrokeshire which are undeveloped and have minimal impact on night sky.

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option		**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus		**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option	
13. Encourage the efficient production, use, re-use & recycling of resources.	+	Growth with an urban emphasis will encourage economies of scale, resulting from larger development sites and the potential for higher density of development.	+	Growth which retains an urban focus would be a more 'efficient' use of resources as economies of scale can be realised.	-	More growth to the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages could be less 'efficient' in terms of resource use as urban economies of scale are likely to be weaker.
	0	Re-use and recycling of resources would be the same regardless of spatial location.	0	Re-use and recycling of resources would be the same regardless of spatial location.	0	Re-use & recycling of resources would be the same regardless of spatial location.
14. Maintain & protect the quality of inland & coastal water.	-	The location of housing and other development is unlikely to affect the quality of waters if development is undertaken responsibly. However an increased concentration of development in the towns would put increased pressure on water resources, increasing problems of over abstraction of ground water aquifers, etc. Focusing development in urban areas also increases surface water runoff and pollution problems associated with this.	-	The location of housing and other development is unlikely to affect the quality of waters if development is undertaken responsibly. However an increased concentration of development in the towns would put increased pressure on water resources, increasing problems of over abstraction of ground water aquifers, etc. Focusing development in urban areas also increases surface water runoff and pollution problems, although to a lesser extent than option1.	+	The location of housing and other development is unlikely to affect the quality of waters if development is undertaken responsibly and having regard to the respective plans for catchment management, and water company plans.
15. Reduce the impacts of flooding & sea level rise.	?	Development will be directed where flood consequences have been assessed and are acceptable.	?	Development will be directed where flood consequences have been assessed and are acceptable.	?	Development will be directed where flood consequences have been assessed and are acceptable.
	-	Housing growth could involve building on greenfield land with associated loss of land permeability, greater surface water run off and consequently a higher risk of flash flooding across all 3 options.	-	Housing growth would involve building on greenfield land with associated loss of land permeability, greater surface water run off and consequently a higher risk of flash flooding across all 3 options	-	Housing growth would involve building on greenfield land with associated loss of land permeability. Further developing coastal haven towns such as Fishguard, Pembroke and Pembroke Dock may incur increased development costs through the building of sea defences should sea levels rise in the future across all 3 options.
	-	Further developing coastal towns such as Fishguard, Pembroke and Pembroke Dock may incur increased development costs through the building of sea defences should sea levels rise in the future.	-	Further developing coastal towns such as Fishguard, Pembroke and Pembroke Dock may incur increased development costs through the building of sea defences should sea levels rise in the future.	+	More dispersed development would be less likely to increase the risk of urban run-off and flash flooding.
16. Use land efficiently & minimise contamination.	?	Contamination would be a by-product of specific development, not of a strategic decision, and should be controlled through conditions. Any existing contamination of brownfield sites would need to be removed, resulting in an improvement to land quality although this is may be at a financial cost.	?	Contamination would be a by-product of specific development, not of a strategic decision, and should be controlled through conditions. Any existing contamination of brownfield sites would need to be removed, resulting in an improvement to land quality although this is may be at a financial cost.	?	Contamination would be a by-product of specific development, not of a strategic decision, and should be controlled through conditions. Any existing contamination of brownfield sites would need to be removed, resulting in an improvement to land quality although this is may be at a financial cost.
	+	Efficient use of land can be implemented with all three options with appropriate housing density policies.	+	Efficient use of land can be implemented with all three options with appropriate housing density policies.	+	Efficient use of land can be implemented with all three options with appropriate housing density policies.
			+	Higher levels of greenfield development than Option 1 are likely with this option.	-	This option is most likely to require more greenfield development.

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option		**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus		**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option	
	+	This option is however more likely to bring forward brownfield land.				
17. Safeguard soil quality & quantity.	0	All three options would guard against development in unsuitable locations and avoid development of best agricultural land or mitigate its impact.	0	All three options would guard against development in unsuitable locations and avoid development of best agricultural land or mitigate its impact.	0	All three options would guard against development in unsuitable locations and avoid development of best agricultural land or mitigate its impact.
18. Protect, enhance & value biodiversity.	0	Biodiversity can be as important in urban and rural locations – all options should be inherently compatible with this SA Objective.	0	Biodiversity can be as important in urban and rural locations – all options should be inherently compatible with this SA Objective.	0	Biodiversity can be as important in urban and rural locations – all options should be inherently compatible with this SA Objective.
19. Protect & enhance the landscape & geological heritage.	+ + +	The impact on landscape will be most affected by level of growth option, as this SA Objective relates to both urban and rural landscapes equally. The impact of a development is minimised, and can add value to the landscape, if sited and designed appropriately. Re-use of urban brownfield sites could have a positive visual impact on urban landscape. Much geology in main towns has been disturbed or lost through previous development. This option is likely to reduce the potential for damage to important geological sites.	+ + +	The impact on landscape will be most affected by level of growth option, as this SA Objective relates to both urban and rural landscapes equally. The impact of a development is minimised, and can add value to the landscape, if sited and designed appropriately. Re-use of urban brownfield sites could have a positive visual impact on urban landscape Much geology in main towns has been disturbed or lost through previous development. This option is likely to reduce the potential for damage to important geological sites.	+ - -	The impact on landscape will be most affected by level of growth option, as this SA Objective relates to both urban and rural landscapes equally. The impact of development on the rural areas may have effect on the landscape, however if sited and designed appropriately this should be minimised. More development away from the main towns would increase the potential for development at green field sites where landscape impact or geological disturbance is greater.
20. Encourage quality, locally distinct design that complements the built heritage.	+	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially positively impact upon locally distinct designs that complement the built heritage.	+	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially positively impact upon locally distinct designs that complement the built heritage.	+	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially positively impact upon locally distinct designs that complement the built heritage.
21. Protect, enhance & value the built heritage & historic environment.	+ +	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially protect, enhance and value the built heritage and historic environment. Potentially, this SA Objective would be most strongly supported in settlements with conservation areas and existing listed buildings.	+ +	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially protect, enhance and value the built heritage and historic environment. Potentially, this SA Objective would be most strongly supported in settlements with conservation areas and existing listed buildings.	+ +	The Pembrokeshire vernacular design is strongly apparent in urban and rural areas alike; therefore all three options could potentially protect, enhance and value the built heritage and historic environment. Potentially, this SA Objective would be most strongly supported in settlements with conservation areas and existing listed buildings.
SUMMARY		Option 1 strongly favours urban development within the Hub Towns which has the advantage of being a more efficient use of land and resources. Concentrating new development in urban areas alongside existing populations will		This Option proposes an approach that more closely reflects the existing urban-rural population split (approximately 54%-46%). This Option provides scope for area-sensitive approaches to affordable housing need, and the Welsh language which should lead to beneficial		Option 3 proposes a balanced approach of 50% urban and 50% rural development split (to Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages). This is likely to result in a greater distribution of development

SA Objective	**Option 1:** 70:30 Urban Focus Option	**Option 2:** 60:40 Service Based Focus	**Option 3:** 50:50 Rural Community Focus Option
	minimise many people's need to travel but may lead to greater congestion in and around these urban areas. Pollution, noise and waste generation would intensify around urban areas, and disproportional pressures placed on communications and utility infrastructure. Waste collection will however be more economical. An evaluation of the overall potential positive, negative, no relation and uncertain effects indicate that Option 1 would contribute well to the SA objectives, have few negative impacts and fewer uncertain outcomes than Option 2 or Option 3.	results. The majority of development would still be directed to the urban areas, though to a lesser extent than Option 1 as a greater level of development would be located at settlements with a minimum level of services and which would likely result in more journeys by car to the Hub Towns, Overall, this option would direct less of the overall growth to the Main (Hub) towns and increase the need to travel for access to leisure, healthcare and recreational facilities. Whilst people are likely to have access to sustainable transport options, this would increase the number of journeys by car and congestion within Hub towns. It does however allow for more development in the Rural Town, Service Centres and service villages, potentially helping to support local existing services An evaluation of the overall potential effects, positive and negative, shows that Option 2 has marginally more negative outcomes for the SA objectives.	Whilst development in the Rural Town, Service Centres and Service Villages would mean that a minimum level of access to service provision would be available to new residents, this option could well help to support existing services and would allow for access to local services for both rural and urban populations. This means greater support for rural communities and which would result in a relative increase in rural populations . Overall, this option would likely see increased journeys by car. The overall qualitative evaluation indicates that Option 3 scores less well than either option 1 or 2 in relation to positive outcomes for SA objectives, and is likely to have a greater number of negative outcomes.