

Forest Heath District Council

Local Development Framework

Core strategy and development policies

Sustainability appraisal of the issues and
options

Author: Mark Woolhouse
July 2005

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (SA) STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (SEA) PROCESS	3
1.2 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	4
1.3 AIM OF THIS REPORT	4
1.4 THE BASIS FOR THE APPRAISAL	4
2. THE LDF	4
2.1 REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY - HIGH LEVEL OBJECTIVES.....	4
3. METHODOLOGY	5
3.1 HIGH LEVEL OBJECTIVE QUESTIONS	6
4. MATRIX 1	8
4.1 MATRIX 1 EVALUATION TABLE.....	49
4.2 APPRAISAL SUMMARY OF OPTIONS.....	51
4.3 MATRIX 1 RESULTS	52
5. MATRIX 2	53
5.1 METHODOLOGY.....	53
5.2 MATRIX 2	54
5.3 MATRIX 2 RESULTS	72
6. CONCLUSIONS AND CLOSING REMARKS	72

1. Introduction

This is the report of the sustainability appraisal (SA) incorporating the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the issues and options for core strategy and development policies in the Forest Heath District. The process has been lead by the Council's Sustainability Development Officer in Environmental Services, Mark Woolhouse, with assistance from four officers in Corporate and Community Development who formed a sustainability appraisal working group.

1.1 The SA/SEA process

European Directive 2001/42/EC requires SEA of a wide range of plans and programmes. The objective of the SEA Directive is to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans with a view to promoting sustainable development. Current guidance on SA/SEA recommends integration of the two where possible in order to simplify the final environmental report that accompanies the LDF in the consultation process. This report therefore meets the requirements of both the SEA Directive as applied through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 for sustainability appraisal, section 39 of which requires local development documents to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

The key stages of the sustainability appraisal LDF process are listed below:

Stage A - Setting the context, collecting baseline information, identifying sustainability issues, developing objectives and indicators, testing the objectives of the Development Plan Document (DPD)/ Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) against the objectives of the SA, production of a Scoping Report for consultation

Stage B - Appraising the issue and options of the DPD/ SPD, consulting on the SA of the emerging options

Stage C - Predicting and assessing the effects of the DPD/ SPD, developing proposals for monitoring, preparing the SA report for full consultation

Stage D - Consulting on the SA report and the DPD/ SPD, appraising significant changes to the DPD/ SPD

Stage E - Monitoring the significant effects of the DPD/ SPD and responding to adverse effects.

This current version of the appraisal forms part of the pre submission consultation stage B.

1.2 Sustainable development

At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. The Government has recently published *Securing The Future 2005* a new strategy to integrate the principles of sustainable development into all aspects of business and life for us all to ensure the quality of life of future generations is not compromised. The strategy has four priorities for immediate action:

- **Sustainable Consumption and Production**
- **Climate Change and Energy**
- **Natural Resource Protection and Environmental Enhancement**
- **Sustainable Communities**

1.3 Aim of this report

The aim of this report is to summarise the likely significant sustainability effects of implementation of the draft options and issues put forward in the accompanying issues and options report and to highlight areas of tension, recommendations for reducing any significant adverse effects and enhancing any significant positive effects identified during the appraisal process.

1.4 The basis for the appraisal

The appraisal has been carried out using internal professional judgement, on the basis of the information contained within the initial scoping report and additional baseline information along with the information contained in the accompanying issues and options report. The national guidance for carrying out sustainability appraisal is in draft form and it is anticipated that this initial SA will evolve during the formulation of the LDF in line with subsequent Government guidance.

2. The Local Development Framework (LDF)

The LDF is the local spatial strategy for the Forest Heath District. It sets a framework for spatial and land use planning across the District to 2021, including the managed provision of the 6,400 new homes as put forward in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Local development frameworks and other planning documents must demonstrate conformity to the draft RSS that has the aim to:

"Sustain and improve the quality of life for all people who live in, work in, or visit the region, by developing a more sustainable, prosperous and outward-looking region, while respecting its diversity and enhancing its assets."

2.1 High Level Objectives Regional Spatial Strategy, East of England Regional Assembly, 2004

The RSS was tested against 10 high level objectives (see below) for development in the region and it is these high level objectives that have been adopted to test the core strategy development policies, issues and options for Forest Heath:

- 1) to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth**
- 2) to deliver more sustainable use of land**
- 3) to deliver more sustainable location patterns**
- 4) to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets**
- 5) to reduce consumption of fossil fuels**
- 6) to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas**
- 7) to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible; re-use finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible**
- 8) to minimise production of by-products or wastes, aiming for closed systems where possible**
- 9) to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life**
- 10) to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living.**

In turn the LDF is required to be consistent with national planning policy and other regional strategies such as the sustainable development framework for the East of England. Maintaining this consistency in the local context was a key consideration in the development of the methodology adopted to appraise the vision options, additional options and issues contained within the Issues and Options Report.

3. Methodology

The methodology used to appraise the vision options identified in the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) was adapted from the approach used for the appraisal of the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). This approach was adopted to allow consistency to be demonstrated between the development of the LDF and the RSS as previously discussed.

Each option is assigned a score (see key Matrix 1) for each question under the high level objectives. Answers ranging from a strong positive effect to a strong negative effect for each of the detailed questions are then recorded with explanatory / mitigatory comments. It should be noted that vision options in Matrix 1 are treated as the main development options for the District and as such are subject to a more detailed assessment (see detailed questions below) than the subsequent issues and options in appraisal Matrix 2 (see Matrix 2 methodology).

The objective of the appraisal of vision options is to identify options which support or contradict to a greater or lesser extent the aim of delivering sustainable development, so that options may be selected and refined to allow the most beneficial development policies to be adopted.

The detailed objective questions used to test the vision options are listed below.

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 1 achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

- 1.1 Generate new jobs for people in the region?
- 1.2 Encourage inward investment?
- 1.3 Diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?
- 1.4 Encourage innovation?
- 1.5 Increase manufacturing?
- 1.6 Encourage new business start-ups?
- 1.7 Support and encourage the growth of rural business?
- 1.8 Provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?
- 1.9 Ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?
- 1.10 Reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 2 (a) deliver more sustainable use of land

- 2.1 Develop brownfield land/ reduce vacant buildings and vacant land?
- 2.2 Create attractive environment in built up areas?
- 2.3 Increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?
- 2.4 Provide opportunities for people to come into contact with and appreciate wildlife and wild places?
- 2.5 Minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?

2 (b) deliver more sustainable location patterns

- 2.6 Reduce the need to travel to work?
- 2.7 Reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling and the use of buses, trains?
- 2.8 Reduce need for air travel?
- 2.9 Reduce traffic congestion?
- 2.10 Reduce road freight movements?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 3 protect and maintain vulnerable regional assets (natural, built and historic environment)

- 3.1 Reduce any sources of pollution?
- 3.2 Protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?
- 3.3 Protect and enhance the region's landscapes?
- 3.4 Maintain/enhance built and historic character?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 4 reduce greenhouse gas emissions

- 4.1 Minimise need for energy?
- 4.2 Increase energy efficiency?
- 4.3 Increase renewable share of energy?
- 4.4 Reduce need for car and road based freight transport?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to... 5 share access to services and benefits of prosperity fairly

- 5.1 Reduce disparities in income levels?
- 5.2 Provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?
- 5.3 Contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?
- 5.4 Create opportunities for unemployed, especially long term disabled
- 5.5 Increase access to decent and affordable housing?
- 5.6 Encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?
- 5.7 Retain village services?
- 5.8 Help low income groups, especially children in low income families?
- 5.9 Reduce crime rates?
- 5.10 Promote healthy lifestyles?
- 5.11 Reduce health inequalities?
- 5.12 Improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?
- 5.13 Support development of voluntary sector?
- 5.14 Encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?
- 5.15 Encourage development of social enterprises?
- 5.16 Encourage community involvement in service design and provision?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 6 use natural resources efficiently, reuse, use recycled where possible

- 6.1 Minimise the demand for raw materials?
- 6.2 Reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change? Limit water consumption to levels supportable by natural processes and storage systems, taking into account the impact of climate change? Maintain water environment whilst meeting demand from development?
- 6.3 Encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside; maintain soil quality?
- 6.4 Reduce minerals extracted and imported?
- 6.5 Encourage energy efficiency?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 7 cut waste

- 7.1 Reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?
Minimise production of waste?

Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to 8 avoid exploiting global environment

- 8.1 Use materials from sustainable sources?
- 8.2 Encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?
- 8.3 Increase farmers' markets, local trading schemes?

**Objective Question: Will this policy or proposal help to...
9 revitalise town centres to promote return to sustainable urban living**

- 9.1 Encourage more shops, better services in town centres?
- 9.2 Encourage more people to live in town centres?
- 9.3 Improve access to green space? Improve the quality and quantity of publicly accessible green space?
- 9.4 Reduce noise?
- 9.5 Reduce fear of crime?
- 9.6 Encourage a feeling of more community spirit?
- 9.7 Support the economy of market towns?

4. Matrix 1

The appraisal of vision options are presented in Matrix 1 below followed by an evaluation of results to allow indicative comparisons to be drawn. This will allow for refinement of options towards selection of the preferred options which best achieve the objective of sustainable development in the District. These preferred options will be presented for consultation during Stage D of the SA process (on page 3)

Matrix 1. Sustainability appraisal of development vision options

Policy: Environment led vision

Initial appraisal by Mark Woolhouse 6/05

"Option overview Environment led vision:

The rural character of our District means that any additional major development will increase our dependency on cars (already above average) and exceed the capacity of our own sustainable water resources. Such development would probably require greenfield sites, as there is insufficient brownfield land in the District to meet national and regional development targets.

This vision constrains the scale, type and location of developments (particularly housing) in order to preserve our natural and built environment. This vision is the closest to maintaining the existing character of the District.

Development would be restricted to appropriate sites within the three main towns in accordance with the Regional Plan. The character of towns, neighbourhoods and buildings would be preserved wherever possible. Housing growth would be capped to the requirements of the existing Suffolk Structure Plan (5,200 new dwellings by 2021, equivalent to 260 per annum). This is 1,200 less than the total required by the Regional Plan but is still more than the actual building rate in the District since 2001. Less overall housing growth may mean less affordable houses being built, although this may be compensated by the current programme of providing 100% affordable housing on former Council owned sites.

Because it conflicts with the housing targets set in the Regional Plan this vision will require substantial justification."

Key to scores

- ++ Strong / important positive effect
- + Positive effect
- ? Mixed and / or uncertain effect
- . No significant effect
- Negative effect
- Strong / important negative effect

Question: Will this policy or proposal help to ...	Score	Comments
--	-------	----------

Environment vision appraised by:

High level objective: to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

1.1 generate new jobs for people in the region?	+	Limited employment creation over time
1.2 encourage inward investment?	+	Mainly in additional facilities
1.3 diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?	?	Dependent upon the type of employment development
1.4 encourage innovation?	+	Limited effects
1.5 increase manufacturing?	.	
1.6 encourage new business start-ups?	+ although not necessarily	Positive effects upon business start up locally
1.7 support and encourage the growth of rural business?	.	
1.8 provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?	+	Limited positive effect in providing satisfying employment
1.9 ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?	.	
1.10 reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?	-	Additional development increases vulnerability

Environment vision appraised by:**High level objective: to deliver more sustainable use of land**

2.1 develop brownfield land / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land? due to its rural nature. Some	+	May help make use of some existing brownfield sites although the district has limited sites of this type derelict land and vacant buildings may also be utilised
2.2 create attractive environment in built up areas?	+	Potentially depends how delivered.
2.3 increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered.
2.4 minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?	-	Potential increased risk due to increases in surface water runoff

High level objective: to deliver more sustainable location patterns

2.5 reduce distances people need to travel to work?	? dwelling	Dependent upon location of employment and chosen
2.6 reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling, and use of buses and trains?	+ commuting	Development restricted to the three main towns therefore could limit
2.7 reduce need for air travel?	.	
2.8 reduce traffic congestion? traffic flow	+ therefore could reduce	Development restricted to the three main towns
2.9 reduce road freight movements?	.	

Environment vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets**

3.1 reduce any sources of pollution?	-	Increased pollution associated with additional dwellings and related infrastructure
3.2 protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?	?	Mixed outcome, positive in that development limited to three towns. Negative impact with increased greenhouse gas emissions
3.3 protect and enhance the region's landscapes?	+	Development restricted to the three main towns therefore regional landscape maintained and potentially enhanced
3.4 maintain /enhance	+	Potentially enhanced built and historic character?

Environment vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to reduce consumption of fossil fuels**

4.1 minimise need for energy?	?	Unsustainable amounts of energy use associated with built environment. Positive effects could be achieved through less commuting
4.2 increase energy efficiency?	-	All developments built to current minimum standards require increased energy demand. Although could contribute to improved aggregated energy efficiency rating
4.3 increase renewable share of energy?	?	Positive effect could be achieved although dependent upon being insisted upon during planning
4.4 reduce need for car and road based freight transport?	.	

Environment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.1 reduce disparities in income levels?	.	
5.2 provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?	+	As development would be limited to the most self sufficient towns where provision is highest
5.3 contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?	+	Dependent upon targeted regeneration
5.4 create opportunities for unemployed, especially long term / disabled	+	Through construction and market stimulation
5.5 increase access to decent and affordable housing?	+	All new dwellings built to decent homes standard. Affordable housing built as a proportion of new build and 100% affordable housing development as planned
5.6 encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?	+	As development would be limited to the most self sufficient towns
5.7 retain village services?	.	
5.8 help low income groups / families especially children in low income families	?	Dependent upon individual schemes
5.9 reduce crime rates?	+	Could be influenced by design and more widely by other schemes
5.10 promote healthy lifestyles?	+	Through less reliance upon vehicular transport

5.11 reduce health inequalities?	?	Dependent upon individual schemes
5.12 improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?	?	Potential for positive outcome although dependent upon consideration in individual schemes
5.13 support development of voluntary sector?	?	Potential for positive outcome although dependent upon consideration in individual schemes
5.14 encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?	?	Potential for positive outcome although dependent upon consideration in individual schemes
5.15 encourage development of social enterprises?	?	Potential for positive outcome although dependent upon consideration in individual schemes
5.16 encourage community involvement in service design and provision?	+	Through community involvement and consultation

Environment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, re use finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible

6.1 minimise the demand for raw materials?	+	Dependent upon going beyond minimum standards for construction and more sustainable lifestyles being adopted
6.2 reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change?	+	Dependent upon going beyond minimum standards for construction and more sustainable lifestyles being adopted

6.3 encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	+	Part of an environmental vision although on the fringe of local authority sphere of influence
6.4 reduce minerals extracted and imported?	+	Dependent upon going beyond minimum standards for construction
6.5 encourage energy efficiency?	+	Part of an environmental vision although dependent upon going beyond minimum standards for construction

Environment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to minimise production of by-products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible

7.1 reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?	-	Increased waste created due to increased development and use
---	---	--

Environment vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life

8.1 use materials from sustainable sources?	?	Dependent upon going beyond minimum standards for construction and more sustainable lifestyles being adopted under the environment led vision
8.2 encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?	?	Could be positive effect although unclear
8.3 increase farmers' markets, local trading schemes?	?	Could be positive effect although unclear

Environment vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living**

9.1 encourage more shops and better services in town centres?	+	Higher population in the three main towns may drive market forces to provide more shops and services
9.2 encourage more people to live in town centres?	+	As development restricted to the three main towns
9.3 improve access to green space?	?	Dependent upon planning conditions etc
9.4 reduce noise?	.	
9.5 reduce fear of crime?	?	Dependent upon how this area of work is delivered through planning policy and other crosscutting policies
9.6 encourage a feeling of more community spirit?	+	Through community cohesion and social inclusion
9.7 support the economy of market towns?	+	As development restricted to the three main towns

Matrix 1: Sustainability appraisal of development vision options

Policy: Transport and infrastructure led vision

Initial appraisal by Mark Woolhouse 6/05

"Transport and infrastructure led vision

Forest Heath sits at the geographical heart of our region and straddles regional, national and international transport corridors including the Ipswich-Cambridge rail link, the A11 and A14.

As the national economy grows, deficiencies within our strategic road and rail network will be exaggerated by increasing freight and passenger movements. Any congestion and accident black spots will result in damage to the environment and quality of life as rat runs develop and getting around the District takes more time.

The major improvements that have been identified in the past few years include: dualling the A11, upgrading the Fiveways roundabout, providing additional rail trackbed between Bury St Edmunds and Kentford and providing an all movements junction between the A11 and A14. Some of these improvements are unlikely to be funded solely by central Government.

This vision seeks to facilitate these improvements through part funding that comes from allowing major residential and industrial developments within the District.

The cost of these improvements would require developments on the scale of a new town (5,000 - 10,000 new dwellings).

This would be greatly in excess of the targets for housing growth in the Regional Plan. Greenfield development would be inevitable and the District would become populated more densely."

Key to scores

- ++ Strong / important positive effect
- + Positive effect
- ? Mixed and / or uncertain effect
- . No significant effect
- Negative effect
- Strong / important negative effect

Question: Will this policy or proposal help to ...	Score	Comments
--	-------	----------

Transport vision appraised by:**High level objective: to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth**

1.1 generate new jobs for people in the region?	+	Employment creation through new development both commercial and residential
1.2 encourage inward investment?	+	Additional commercial facilities and infrastructure funded by government and private commerce
1.3 diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?	+	New businesses could be created
1.4 encourage innovation?	+	Limited increased opportunity
1.5 increase manufacturing?	?	Short term opportunities may be created
1.6 encourage new business start-ups?	+	Positive effects upon business start-up although not necessarily locally
1.7 support and encourage the growth of rural business?	?	Dependent upon outside factors
1.8 provide a satisfying job or satisfying occupation for everyone who wants one?	+	Limited positive effect in providing employment
1.9 ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?	+	Relies upon equity of distribution
1.10 reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?	-	Additional development increases vulnerability

Transport vision appraised by:**High level objective: to deliver more sustainable use of land**

2.1 develop brownfield land / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land?	+	May help make use of some existing brownfield sites although the District has limited sites of this type due to its rural nature. Some derelict land and vacant buildings may also be utilised
2.2 create attractive environment in built up areas?	+	Depends how delivered through the planning system
2.3 increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered
2.4 minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?	-	Potential increased risk due to increases in surface water runoff and other effects of development

High level objective: to deliver more sustainable location patterns

2.5 reduce distances people need to travel to work?	-	Increases commuting due to out of town greenfield development
2.6 reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling, and use of buses and trains?	-	Encourages car reliance
2.7 reduce need for air travel?	.	
2.8 reduce traffic congestion?	?	Partially eases congestion on major routes although routes would become more congested in towns with increased flow. Also rat runs used more in village locations
2.9 reduce road freight movements?	-	Due to increased convenience and dependency

Transport vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets**

3.1 reduce any sources of pollution?	-	Increased emissions from transport (aggregated)
3.2 protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?	-	Greenfield development
3.3 protect and enhance the region's landscapes?	-	Large scale disruption through civil engineering projects
3.4 maintain /enhance built and historic character?	?	Dependent upon location and sympathetic design

Transport vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to reduce consumption of fossil fuels**

4.1 minimise need for energy?	-	Encourages greater car dependency and commuter miles
4.2 increase energy efficiency?	.	
4.3 increase renewable share of energy?	-	Fossil fuel dependent
4.4 reduce need for car and road based freight transport?	-	Encourages greater car dependency

Transport vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.1 reduce disparities in income levels?	•	
5.2 provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?	-	Additional facilities not likely to be easily accessible by most socially disadvantaged
5.3 contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?	•	
5.4 create opportunities for unemployed, especially long term / disabled?	?	Some job creation mainly construction industry
5.5 increase access to decent and affordable housing?	•	
5.6 encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?	-	Car dependency perpetuated and commuter miles. Non local provision
5.7 retain village services?	-	Encourage out of town development
5.8 help low income groups / families especially children in low income families	•	
5.9 reduce crime rates?	•	
5.10 promote healthy lifestyles?	•	
5.11 reduce health inequalities?	•	
5.12 improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?	•	
5.13 support development of voluntary sector?	•	
5.14 encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?	•	
5.15 encourage development of social enterprises?	•	
5.16 encourage community involvement in service design and provision?	•	

Transport vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, reuse finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible.

6.1 minimise the demand for raw materials?	- -	Large amount of natural resources utilised in road development
6.2 reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change?	•	
6.3 encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	•	
6.4 reduce minerals extracted and imported?	- -	Large amount of natural minerals utilised in road development
6.5 encourage energy efficiency?	•	

Transport vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to minimise production of by-products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible

7.1 reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?	-	Waste created through large scale civil engineering / construction
---	---	--

Transport vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life**

8.1 use materials from sustainable sources?	- -	Encourages reliance on non renewable fuel sources (car use) and use of significant quantities of non sustainable construction materials
8.2 encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?	.	
8.3 increase farmers' markets, local trading schemes?	.	

Transport vision appraised by:**High-level objective : to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living**

9.1 encourage more shops and better services in town centres?	?	May encourage people to travel to town centres through ease of access. However may lead to reliance on out of town shopping
9.2 encourage more people to live in town centres?	.	
9.3 improve access to green space?	.	
9.4 reduce noise?	.	
9.5 reduce fear of crime?	.	
9.6 encourage a feeling of more community spirit?	.	
9.7 support the economy of market towns?	+	May increase visitor numbers and other associated economic stimulators to market towns

Matrix 1: Sustainability appraisal of development vision options

Policy: Housing led vision

Initial appraisal by Mark Woolhouse 6/05

"Housing led vision

This vision is focused on relieving pressure on housing demand by broadening the location, number and type of new dwellings in the District.

The Regional Plan has set a target for housing growth of 6,400 by 2021 (equivalent to an average of 320 new dwellings per annum). Business development in the District would be encouraged in line with the Regional Plan, but the rate of housing growth would be independent of employment demand.

There is a demand for more affordable dwellings in towns and villages across the District. There is also a need for a greater diversity of housing types to cater for new families, first time buyers and older residents. The Regional Plan indicates that at least 30% of all new dwellings should be affordable. There is a current programme in Forest Heath of providing 100% affordable housing on former Council owned sites, which will make a substantial contribution towards achieving the Regional % target.

The Regional Plan requires also that this development would be spread between the three main towns and some larger villages."

Key to scores

- ++ Strong / important positive effect
- + Positive effect
- ? Mixed and / or uncertain effect
- . No significant effect
- Negative effect
- Strong / important negative effect

Question: Will this policy or proposal help to...	Score	Comments
---	-------	----------

Housing vision appraised by:

High level objective: to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

1.1 generate new jobs for people in the region?	+	Limited employment creation over time through construction and associated infrastructure
1.2 encourage inward investment?	+	In additional infrastructure, facilities and housing
1.3 diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?	.	
1.4 encourage innovation?	+	Limited effects
1.5 increase manufacturing?	.	
1.6 encourage new business start-ups?	+	May have positive effects upon business start-up
1.7 support and encourage the growth of rural business?	.	
1.8 provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?	+	Limited positive effect in providing satisfying employment
1.9 ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?	.	
1.10 reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?	-	Additional development increases vulnerability

Housing vision appraised by:**High level objective: to deliver more sustainable use of land**

2.1 develop brownfield land / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land?	+	May help make use of some existing brownfield sites although the District has limited sites of this type due to its rural nature. Some derelict land and vacant buildings may also be utilised
2.2 create attractive environment in built up areas?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
2.3 increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
2.4 minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?	-	Potential increased risk due to increases in surface water runoff

High level objective: to deliver more sustainable location patterns

2.5 reduce distances people need to travel to work?	?	Dependent upon location of development. Most positive outcome with increased housing provision in largest conurbations
2.6 reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling and use of buses and trains?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime and integrated sustainable transport options
2.7 reduce need for air travel?	.	
2.8 reduce traffic congestion?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime and integrated sustainable transport options
2.9 reduce road freight movements?	.	

Housing vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets**

3.1 reduce any sources of pollution?	-	Additional pollution created associated with increased local population and housing
3.2 protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?	?	Protection and habitat creation possible although depends how delivered through planning regime
3.3 protect and enhance the region's landscapes?	?	Depends how delivered through planning regime
3.4 maintain /enhance built and historic character?	?	Depends how delivered through planning regime

Housing vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to reduce consumption of fossil fuels**

4.1 minimise need for energy?	+	Housing built to minimum standards would increase average energy efficiency levels. High standards of sustainable construction beyond the minimum could achieve better outcomes, although overall energy use would still increase unsustainably unless other policies on demand management and energy production are in place
4.2 increase energy efficiency?	?	Potentially positive effect although only aggregated with current housing stock
4.3 increase renewable share of energy?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime and policy integrating renewables in new developments
4.4 reduce need for car and road based freight transport?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime and integrated sustainable transport options

Housing vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas.

5.1 reduce disparities in income levels?	?	Affordable housing provision will serve to address this issue although open market development will not
5.2 provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.3 contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.4 create opportunities for unemployed, especially long term / disabled	?	Some job creation mainly construction industry and services associated with more dwellings
5.5 increase access to decent and affordable housing?	++	Major part of vision
5.6 encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.7 retain village services?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime

Housing vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.8 help low income groups/ families especially children in low income families	?	Affordable housing provision will serve to address this issue although open market development will not
5.9 reduce crime rates?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.10 promote healthy lifestyles?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.11 reduce health inequalities?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
5.12 improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?	.	
5.13 support development of voluntary sector?	.	
5.14 encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?	.	
5.15 encourage development of social enterprises?	.	
5.16 encourage community involvement in service design and provision?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how community delivered through planning regime

Housing vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible; re-use finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible

6.1 minimise the demand for raw materials?	-	Significant raw materials required for new build dwellings of which most would normally be unsustainable unless specified under planning regime
6.2 reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change?	-	Increased water demand due to increased population and dwellings. Could be minimised through integration of water efficiency policies into LDF
6.3 encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	.	
6.4 reduce minerals extracted and imported?	-	Significant raw mineral materials required for new build dwellings. Could be minimised through sustainable construction criteria integrated into LDF
6.5 encourage energy efficiency?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime

Housing vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to minimise production of by products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible

7.1 reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?	-	Increased waste generated due to increased population in district and construction process. Could be minimised through integration of efficiency policies into LDF
---	---	--

Housing vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life

8.1 use materials from sustainable sources?	?	Could be minimised through integration of sustainable construction techniques into LDF
8.2 encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?	.	
8.3 increase farmers markets, local trading schemes?	.	

Housing vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living**

9.1 encourage more shops and better services in town centres?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
9.2 encourage more people to live in town centres?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how development distributed in district. Best if development limited to existing towns
9.3 improve access to green space?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
9.4 reduce noise?	.	
9.5 reduce fear of crime?	.	
9.6 encourage a feeling of more community spirit?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through design
9.7 support the economy of market towns?	+	Potentially positive effect although depends how development distributed in district

Matrix 1: Sustainability appraisal of development vision options

Policy: Culture led vision

Initial appraisal by Mark Woolhouse 6/05

"Culture led vision

This vision could seek to create a regional centre for sports and leisure activity within the District.

Culture covers a broad spectrum. Until public consultation identifies other focuses for culture we have appraised only Watermark, an emerging leisure based option.

Watermark is a mixed use proposal to integrate a collection of sports and leisure facilities with a new settlement between Red Lodge and Kentford. The 215 ha green field site would be developed over several years and would include a rowing/water sports lake, a multi-purpose arena, tennis and golf facilities, employment (office) development, together with 4,000 - 5,000 new dwellings, plus retail and community facilities. Improvements in transportation infrastructure to serve the site are also proposed.

The proposed sport and leisure facilities are estimated to attract around 1,200,000 visitors per year, with 90% travelling by car. It is estimated that 75% of trips will be via a new junction off the A14, and 25% from the A11 through Red Lodge.

This proposal would limit additional development elsewhere in the District if housing growth was not to exceed the target of 6,400 set in the Regional Plan. It is also in conflict with the requirements in the Regional Plan to restrict housing growth to existing settlements."

Key to scores

++ Strong / important positive effect

+ Positive effect

? Mixed and/or uncertain effect

. No significant effect

- Negative effect

-- Strong / important negative effect

Culture vision appraised by;**High level objective: to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth**

Question: Will this policy or proposal help to...	score	Comments
1.1 generate new jobs for people in the region?	++	Employment creation over time in construction, office, retail and leisure sector
1.2 encourage inward investment?	+	Mainly for additional facilities of a commercial nature
1.3 diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?	+	Construction, office, retail and leisure sectors would be boosted
1.4 encourage innovation?	?	Limited effects
1.5 increase manufacturing?	.	
1.6 encourage new business start-ups?	+	Positive effects upon business start up although not necessarily locally
1.7 support and encourage the growth of rural business?	.	
1.8 provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?	+	Positive effect in providing satisfying employment across several sectors
1.9 ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?	.	
1.10 reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?	--	Additional development increases vulnerability through potentially unsustainable water use and increased surface water runoff

Culture vision appraised by:**High level objective: to deliver more sustainable use of land**

2.1 develop brownfield land / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land?	- -	Greenfield development in direct contradiction to regional spatial strategy
2.2 create attractive environment in built up areas?	.	
2.3 increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?	+	Potentially positive effect with access to rowing, water sports tennis and golf facilities and arena
2.4 minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?	-	Potential increased risk due to land use change

High level objective : to deliver more sustainable location patterns

2.5 reduce distances people need to travel to work?	-	Out of town development although may be helped by preferential housing available for site employees
2.6 reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling and use of buses and trains?	- -	Out of town development on greenfield site; 90% of journeys reported to be car based
2.7 reduce need for air travel?	.	
2.8 reduce traffic congestion?	- -	1,200,000 visitors estimated per year to be visiting site with 90% of journeys by car could cause significant added congestion
2.9 reduce road freight movements?	-	Only access to site by road

Culture vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets**

3.1 reduce any sources of pollution?	-	Significant pollution risk associated with 4,000 to 5,000 new dwellings and infrastructure improvements
3.2 protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?	- -	Greenfield development that may permanently remove significant area of local habitat
3.3 protect and enhance the region's landscapes?	- -	Greenfield development that would permanently change the local landscape
3.4 maintain /enhance built and historic character?	-	Unlikely to be in keeping with built and historic character

Culture vision appraised by:**High-level objective : to reduce consumption of fossil fuels**

4.1 minimise need for energy?	-	Significant increase in energy use
4.2 increase energy efficiency?	.	
4.3 increase renewable share of energy?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how much installed capacity delivered through design
4.4 reduce need for car and road based freight transport?	- -	Out of town development on greenfield site; 90% of journeys reported to be car based

Culture vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.1 reduce disparities in income levels?	•	
5.2 provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?	•	
5.3 contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?	•	
5.4 create opportunities for unemployed especially long term / disabled	+	Employment creation over time in construction, office, retail and leisure sectors although needs to be inclusive of target group
5.5 increase access to decent and affordable housing?	•	As affordable housing is set at 30% minimum of any new development
5.6 encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?	-	Would detract from development elsewhere in the district. Non equitable distribution of social development and associated benefits
5.7 retain village services?	-	May detract from local services in favour of centralised out of village facilities for the mobile
5.8 help low income groups/ families especially children in low income families	•	
5.9 reduce crime rates?	•	
5.10 promote healthy lifestyles?	+	Through positive promotion of sporting activities
5.11 reduce health inequalities?	•	

5.12 improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?	•	
5.13 support development of voluntary sector?	•	
5.14 encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?	•	
5.15 encourage development of social enterprises?	•	
5.16 encourage community involvement in service design and provision	?	Would be reliant upon effective community participation

Culture vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible re-use finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible

6.1 minimise the demand for raw materials?	- -	Large scale development would use more raw materials
6.2 reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change?	- -	Provision of water sports lake and associated housing up to 5000 units against a backdrop of insufficient water supply
6.3 encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	•	
6.4 reduce minerals extracted and imported?	-	Large scale development reliant upon large quantities of mineral based materials
6.5 encourage energy efficiency?	•	

Culture vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to minimise production of by products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible

7.1 reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?	-	Increased waste generated in the district from construction and use of development
---	---	--

Culture vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life

8.1 use materials from sustainable sources?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how integrated into sustainable construction policy and delivered through planning regime
8.2 encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?	.	
8.3 increase farmers markets, local trading schemes?	.	

High-level objective: to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living

9.1 encourage more shops and better services in town centres?	-	Due to emphasis upon out of town development
9.2 encourage more people to live in town centres?	- -	Due to emphasis upon out of town development
9.3 improve access to green space?	?	May give access to those living in dwellings as located in greenfield area, also delivered through provision of green space under planning regime

Culture vision appraised by:**High-level objective: to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living**

9.4 reduce noise?	?	May cause noise issues in greenfield area
9.5 reduce fear of crime?	.	
9.6 encourage a feeling of more community spirit?	.	
9.7 support the economy of market towns?	?	May bring people to neighbouring market towns?

Matrix 1: Sustainability appraisal of development vision options

Policy: Employment led vision

Initial appraisal by Mark Woolhouse 6/05

"Employment led vision

This vision seeks to encourage business development as the top priority in the District.

There are opportunities to capitalise on our proximity to Cambridge (e.g. a science/technology park), our strategic position on major transportation routes (e.g. storage and distribution facilities) or the presence of the military airbase facilities at Mildenhall and Lakenheath.

Other possibilities include an equine centre to develop the horse racing industry further, stimulating our existing light industrial base or capitalising on the beauty of our rural setting by developing facilities and attractions for tourists. The choice will influence the location of development and the type of jobs created, however, the emphasis will be to move away from a low wage economy.

The Regional Plan requires that new dwellings are built in response to economic growth, i.e. to ensure there are sufficient employees with the right skills available for local businesses. The total amount of housing planned would be the 6,400 specified in the Regional Plan. However, the rate of housing growth would be strictly in step with and determined by employment growth by means of phasing controls on the release of housing land and the commencement of residential development.

There are some further considerations in delivering this vision.

The Regional Plan sets a job growth target for western Suffolk, but no specific target for Forest Heath, so an appropriate District target needs to be developed.

If there is less business growth than the required target, the amount of new housing allowed to be built by 2021 would likely to be less than the 6,400 planned for.

Any large land allocation for business purposes would probably include some greenfield development"

Key to scores

- ++ Strong / important positive effect
- + Positive effect
- ? Mixed and / or uncertain effect
- . No significant effect
- Negative effect
- Strong / important negative effect

Question: Will this policy ... or proposal help to	Score	Comments
--	-------	----------

Employment vision appraised by:

High level objective: to achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

1.1 generate new jobs for people in the region?	++	Significant employment creation over time with potential across a range of sectors. Implications would need to be considered further
1.2 encourage inward investment?	+	Mainly in additional commercial facilities and infrastructure
1.3 diversify the economy, increase resilience to external shocks?	+	Dependent upon number of sector options developed as outlined in core strategy document
1.4 encourage innovation?	+	Through sectoral support
1.5 increase manufacturing?	?	Potential positive secondary effects on manufacturing industry although not specifically mentioned in potential sectors for development
1.6 encourage new business start-ups?	+	Positive effects upon business start up, although not necessarily all within District boundaries therefore would require regional appraisal
1.7 support and encourage the growth of rural business?	?	Dependent upon sectors supported and may require up skilling of rural workforce
1.8 provide a satisfying job or occupation for everyone who wants one?	+	Positive effect in providing satisfying employment. Increased potential satisfaction with greater diversity of jobs created

1.9 ensure everyone can afford a good standard of living?	+	Dependent upon equitable share in increased wealth as a result of increased employment
1.10 reduce vulnerability to climate change, exploit any benefits?	-	Additional development increases vulnerability although may be marginal

Employment vision appraised by:

High level objective: to deliver more sustainable use of land

2.1 develop brownfield land / reduce vacant buildings and derelict land?	+	May help make use of some existing brownfield sites although the district has limited sites of this type due to its rural nature. Some derelict land and vacant buildings may also be utilised
2.2 create attractive environment in built up areas?	?	Potentially positive outcome depends how delivered through planning regime
2.3 increase access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks)?	?	Potentially positive effect although depends how delivered through planning regime
2.4 minimise risk of flooding taking account of climate change?	-	Potential increased risk due to increases in surface water run-off of business development

High level objective: to deliver more sustainable location patterns

2.5 reduce distances people need to travel to work?	?	Dependent upon location of employment in proximity to work force. The closer the proximity the better
---	---	---

2.6 reduce car reliance, encourage walking, cycling and the use of buses and trains?	?	Dependent upon location of employment in proximity to work force
2.7 reduce need for air travel?	.	
2.8 reduce traffic congestion?	?	Dependent upon location of employment and traffic planning considerations
2.9 reduce road freight movements?	?	Dependent upon location of employment and traffic planning considerations

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to protect and maintain our most vulnerable regional assets

3.1 reduce any sources of pollution?	?	Dependent upon location and particular impacts from business sector
3.2 protect and enhance habitats and wildlife taking account of climate change?	?	Dependent upon location and particular impacts from business sector
3.3 protect and enhance the region's landscapes?	?	Dependent upon location and particular impacts to be managed by planning regime
3.4 maintain /enhance built and historic character?	?	Dependent upon location and particular impacts to be managed by planning regime

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to reduce consumption of fossil fuels

4.1 minimise need for energy?	-	New development requires increases in energy consumption. Minimise through strategic consideration of energy issues
4.2 increase energy efficiency?	.	

4.3 increase renewable share of energy?	?	Could be integrated into development model for positive outcome
4.4 reduce need for car and road based freight transport?	?	Dependent upon location and provision of public and freight transport

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.1 reduce disparities in income levels?	?	Dependent upon sectors supported and may require up-skilling of rural workforce to allow access by those who are socially disadvantaged
5.2 provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities for all?	?	Dependent upon sectors supported and the range of opportunities created
5.3 contribute to local regeneration, help deprived areas?	+	Dependent upon integration of associated development into deprived areas for regeneration
5.4 create opportunities for unemployed especially long term / disabled?	+	Dependent upon inclusive employment opportunities being created and may require support such as up skilling to achieve objective
5.5 increase access to decent and affordable housing?	.	
5.6 encourage the provision of more locally based services and facilities?	?	Dependent upon sectors encouraged and developed

High-level objective : to achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas

5.7 retain village services?	?	Dependent upon supporting current provisions and not detracting from existing services with new non local provision
5.8 help low income groups / families, especially children in low income families	?	Objective relies upon targeted support for this particular group
5.9 reduce crime rates?	.	
5.10 promote healthy lifestyles?	.	
5.11 reduce health inequalities?	.	
5.12 improve ethnic / cultural mutual understanding?	.	
5.13 support development of voluntary sector?	.	
5.14 encourage entrepreneurial activity in disadvantaged areas?	+	May require intervention and support to create opportunities specifically in disadvantaged areas
5.15 encourage development of social enterprises?	.	
5.16 encourage community involvement in service design and provision?	.	

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to use natural resources, finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, re-use finite resources and recycled alternatives wherever possible

6.1 minimise the demand for raw materials?	-	Dependent upon business sectors supported although demand due to housing is significant for 6,400 units
6.2 reduce water use, maintain water security despite climate change?	-	Dependent upon business sectors supported although demand due to housing is significant for 6,400 units
6.3 encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	?	Uncertain
6.4 reduce minerals extracted and imported?	-	Mineral use is significant in the construction of 6,400 housing units
6.5 encourage energy efficiency?	?	Dependent upon sectoral support

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to minimise production of by products or wastes, aiming for 'closed systems' where possible

7.1 reduce waste generated, reuse / recycle / use recycled?	-	Significant excess household waste generated
---	---	--

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective: to avoid using the global environment to underwrite our own unsustainable way of life

8.1 use materials from sustainable sources?	?	Dependent upon sustainable construction integrated into LDF and/or business support for positive outcome
---	---	--

8.2 encourage local produce to be consumed in the region?	?	Could be encouraged to achieve a positive effect
8.3 increase farmers' markets, local trading schemes?	?	Could be encouraged to achieve a positive effect

Employment vision appraised by:

High-level objective : to revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living

9.1 encourage more shops and better services in town centres?	+	Potentially positive effect if increased employment located in or around town centres
9.2 encourage more people to live in town centres?	?	Possible through regeneration projects
9.3 improve access to green space?	.	
9.4 reduce noise?	?	Dependent upon sectoral support could be negative outcome from business activity
9.5 reduce fear of crime?	.	
9.6 encourage a feeling of more community spirit?	.	
9.7 support the economy of market towns?	?	Potentially positive effect if increased employment located in or around town centres

4.1 Matrix 1: Evaluation table of results

Vision Options

Q.	Environment	Transport and infrastructure	Housing	Culture	Employment
1.1	+	+	+	++	++
1.2	+	+	+	+	+
1.3	?	+	.	+	+
1.4	+	+	+	?	+
1.5	.	?	.	.	?
1.6	+	+	+	+	+
1.7	.	?	.	.	?
1.8	+	+	+	+	+
1.9	.	+	.	.	+
1.10	-	--	-	-	-

2.1	+	+	+	--	+
2.2	+	+	+	.	?
2.3	+	+	+	+	?
2.4	-	-	-	-	-
2.5	?	-	?	-	?
2.6	+	-	?	--	?
2.7
2.8	+	?	?	--	?
2.9	.	-	.	-	?

3.1	-	-	-	-	?
3.2	?	-	?	--	?
3.3	+	-	?	--	?
3.4	+	?	?	-	?

4.1	?	-	+	-	-
4.2	-	.	?	.	.
4.3	?	-	?	?	?
4.4	.	-	?	--	?

5.1	.	.	?	.	?
5.2	+	-	?	.	?
5.3	+	.	?	.	+
5.4	+	?	?	+	+
5.5	+	.	++	.	.
5.6	+	-	?	-	?
5.7	.	-	?	-	?
5.8	?	.	?	.	?
5.9	+	.	?	.	.
5.10	+	.	?	+	.
5.11	?	.	?	.	.
5.12	?
5.13	?
5.14	?	.	.	.	+
5.15	?
5.16	+	.	?	?	.
6.1	+	--	-	--	-
6.2	+	.	-	--	-
6.3	+	.	.	.	?
6.4	+	-	-	-	-
6.5	+	.	+	.	?
7.1	-	--	-	+	-
8.1	?	--	?	?	?
8.2	?	.	.	.	?
8.3	?	.	.	.	?
9.1	+	?	?	-	+
9.2	+	.	?	--	?
9.3	?	.	?	?	.
9.4	.	.	.	?	?
9.5	?
9.6	+	.	?	.	.
9.7	+	+	+	?	?

4.2 Appraisal summary of vision options

Vision option	Environment	Transport and infrastructure	Housing	Culture	Employment
Strong/ important positive effect ++	0	0	1	1	1
Positive effect +	29	11	11	8	11
Mixed and/or uncertain effect ?	16	6	25	7	27
No significant effect .	9	24	15	23	13
Negative effect -	5	15	6	12	7
Strong / important negative effect --	0	3	1	9	0
Indicative overall rank, 1 being most in line with sustainable development, 5 being least	1st	4th	3rd	5th	2nd

4.3 Matrix 1: Results

Caution should be exercised when comparing the results in the table on page 51, in that equal importance should be placed upon each high level objective in the pursuit of true sustainable development. However, this does not reflect relative importance of issues in differing areas with local distinctions. Therefore a numeric comparison of the results is not to be solely relied upon in decision making. Moreover the emphasis is on the individual to interpret the results to achieve the most sustainable policy outcome. As the preferred option for development is sought in line with the requirements of LDF production the initial sustainability appraisal of development visions will be expanded upon to report more extensively on areas of mitigation towards sustainable development.

The most sustainable vision option identified by the appraisal is the environment led vision, which is based upon the current level of growth in the District. This vision is unlikely to meet the figure for housing growth as put forward by the RSS and is unlikely to be a preferred option in its current form unless additional housing allocation is accommodated. The vision has a target of 5,200 new homes by 2021 compared to 6,400 in the RSS. It is the most effective vision at maintaining the character and distinctiveness of the District with little or no greenfield development. The vision seeks to address several key aspects of sustainable development by restricting the scale, type and location of development, thereby seeking to tackle issues such as high car dependency, climate change and creating opportunities for positive urban regeneration in the three main towns of Newmarket, Brandon and Mildenhall.

The housing led option is the second ranking option and follows the RSS housing target figure. However the rate of housing growth is independent of employment demand and therefore goes against the objective of the RSS. This may have a significant negative effect upon commuting and additional traffic in the District. Development is spread between the three main towns and larger villages who may help urban regeneration. Some pressure on greenfield land may result in some unsustainable greenfield locations for housing provision.

The employment led vision of growth is ranked third and may not deliver the number of additional houses planned unless significant job creation takes place to warrant additional dwellings. No specific job growth target exists for the District so allocation may prove difficult. Large scale economic development of this type is likely to impact upon the character of the District. Areas of greenfield land may be required, putting additional pressure on preserving the character of the District.

Both the transport and culture visions ranked fourth and fifth involve excessive inappropriate development of between 5,000 and 10,000 and between 4,000 and 5,000 new dwellings constructed to form a new town. This would require significant areas of greenfield land. In addition this would permanently change the character of the District and is not in keeping with the objectives of the RSS. These options may lessen positive regeneration opportunities for additional community facilities within the three main towns of Newmarket, Brandon and Mildenhall. Both these visions would have a negative impact upon commuter miles with limited public accessibility especially by the most deprived members of the community.

5. Matrix 2

5.1 Introduction

Appraises the remaining issues and options to identify which options are most sustainable and in line with the RSS. This information is intended to aid decision -making during the presubmission consultation stage B.

5.2. Methodology

As with Matrix 1. The high level objectives used to appraise the RSS have been adopted to give an aggregated outcome and ranking of the possible outcomes based upon the issues and options presented in the accompanying report. The options are scored from 1 (most in line with sustainable development) upwards for each subsequent option getting less and less likely to achieve RSS objectives and hence the aim of sustainable development. A commentary in the third column gives reasons for the order of ranking. The matrix shows at a glance which options are in conformity with the LDF aims.

Matrix 2: Sustainability appraisal of issues and options outcomes	Ranked against plan objectives where 1 is most desirable, 2 less so, 5 least. ? = equal ranking/uncertain	Comment
SPATIAL STRATEGY		
Q2. Where should the MAIN development in the District be?		
Newmarket	4	Too concentrated
Spread between Brandon, Mildenhall and Newmarket	2	Omits larger/sustainable villages
Spread between the three market towns and sustainable villages	1	Most in line with RSS objective
Spread between the three market towns and all villages	3	Many villages are unsustainable locations for development
Within a single new settlement	5	Least in line with RSS objective
Q3. Should planning permission for residential development on greenfield sites be refused if the 60% target for brownfield development is not being met?		
Yes	1	More sustainable use of land/location
No	2	Not in line with RSS and national targets

Q4. Should small villages continue to have development boundaries?	Ranking	Comment
Yes, they should have development boundaries	2	May allow unsustainable development in village locations
No, they should be seen as part of the countryside	1	Delivers more sustainable location patterns

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		
Q5. Should major housing development be job led?		
Yes, development should be linked to jobs	1	In line with RSS objective of job led growth
No, development should be left to market forces	2	May not deliver RSS objective of job led growth

Q6. Should office based jobs be promoted (managerial, professional and administrative)?		
Yes, office jobs should be promoted	1	Addresses current deficiency of office/managerial work in the District and low wage economy
No, the job type should be left to market forces	2	May not increase prosperity of workforce in District

	Ranking	Comment
Q7. Should the main employment development be in Newmarket, Mildenhall and Brandon?		
Yes, employment development should be restricted to the main three towns	1	Most sustainable option although does not exclude sustainable villages
No, employment development should be spread across the District	2	May include unsustainable locations
Q8. Should national or regional distribution depots be permitted on the A14/A11 road corridors within the District?		
Yes	2	Likely to involve visually intrusive, significant green field development to the detriment of the countryside
No	1	Prosperity not increased greatly due to low levels of employment creation and likely to involve development of greenfield land
Q9. Should home working be promoted?		
Yes	1	Provides most sustainable location pattern, limiting vehicular commuting
No	2	May promote unsustainable lifestyle patterns

Q10. Should industrial / office sites be redeveloped for residential, retail and leisure use?	Ranking	Comment
RESIDENTIAL		
Yes	?	Potential conflict with the RSS employment led growth objective. Dependent upon pending employment land review
No	?	Potential conflict with the RSS employment led growth objective. Dependent upon pending employment land review
RETAIL		
Yes	2	Majority of sites are on edge of town therefore conflicts with RSS objective to revitalise town centres and deliver more sustainable location patterns
No	1	Majority of sites are on edge of town therefore conflicts with RSS objective to revitalise town centres and deliver more sustainable location patterns
CULTURE		
Yes	2	Majority of sites are on edge of town therefore conflicts with RSS objective to revitalise town centres and deliver more sustainable location patterns
No	1	Majority of sites are on edge of town therefore conflicts with RSS objective to revitalise town centres and deliver more sustainable location patterns

Q11. Should new retail development be allocated in Brandon, Mildenhall and Newmarket?	Ranking	Comment
BRANDON		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use
MILDENHALL		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use
NEWMARKET		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use

Q12. Should new cultural development be allocated in Brandon, Mildenhall and Newmarket	Ranking	Comment
BRANDON		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use
MILDENHALL		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use
NEWMARKET		
Yes	1	Likely to revitalise town centres and provide a positive contribution to more sustainable location patterns in line with RSS
No	2	May hinder urban renewal and a shift to more sustainable location patterns/land use

Q13. Should the siting and number of telecommunications masts be restricted?	Ranking	Comment
SITING		
Yes	1	Takes a precautionary approach to visual and health effects
No	2	Neglects visual and health issues
NUMBER		
Yes	1	Minimises visual intrusion
No	2	May allow visual intrusion
HOUSING		
Q14. The draft regional plan says that there should be 6,400 new dwellings in the District by 2021. Is this figure:		
Too high	2	Not in line with RSS objective and would limit provision of housing in the District
About right	1	In line with RSS objective
Too low	3	Not in line with RSS objective and of excess housing in the District and associated damage to the environment
Q15. Should developers be given detailed guidance on housing type and mix (eg, housing for disabled, older people etc)?		
Yes	1	Ensures adequate housing for all sectors of the community
No	2	May not ensure the above

	Ranking	Comment
<p>Q16. Should housing development be within the national guidelines of 30-50 dwellings per hectare?</p> <p>Yes, housing development should be within 30-50 dwellings per hectare</p>	1	More sustainable use of land and location pattern
<p>No, some sites are outside the range due to their special character</p>	2	Not in line with RSS however could help to protect some areas of local distinctiveness in rural environment
<p>Q17. The draft regional plan says 30% of new housing should be affordable. Is this figure:</p> <p>Too high</p> <p>About right</p> <p>Too low</p>	2	Not in line with RSS and may not result in adequate provision of affordable housing
<p>About right</p>	1	Most in line with RSS objective but dependent upon result of pending housing needs survey
<p>Too low</p>	3	Not in line with RSS and may discourage housing growth in general
<p>Q18. Should people employed in the horse racing industry be recognised as key workers in Forest Heath?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	2	<p>The horse racing industry is important for Forest Heath, employees often have problems finding affordable housing. However employees do not come under the definition of key workers in line with the national and regional definition of key public sector workers</p> <p>1</p> <p>In line with the national and regional definition of key public sector workers</p>

	Ranking	Comment
<p>Q19. How should the location of housing for United States Air Force Europe personnel be determined?</p>		
<p>Specific sites should be allocated</p>	1	<p>Allowing most control to achieve RSS objectives</p>
<p>Specific towns / villages should be identified</p>	2	<p>Allowing some control to achieve RSS objectives</p>
<p>Proposals for development anywhere in the District should be assessed against a criteria based policy</p>	3	<p>Would allow control if a robust criteria based policy was in place although would allow for development anywhere in the District which met the criteria. This development may be unsustainable</p>
<p>Q20. Should low impact dwellings be allowed in the countryside?</p>		
<p>Yes</p>	1	<p>In line with sustainable lifestyles and sustainable development</p>
<p>No</p>	2	<p>May exclude people/communities from living in a sustainable way in the rural environment if they so wish</p>

TRANSPORT	Ranking	Comment
<p>Q21. Should strategic improvements to the national/regional transport network within the District be funded by development on the scale of a new town?</p>		
<p>Yes</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A new town in the District would be built on greenfield land and would be contrary to RSS objectives. Improvements to national and regional transport should be funded by national or regional government accordingly</p>
<p>No, development should only fund improvements to local transport</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>More in line with RSS objectives</p>
<p>Q22. The District has above average car dependency. Which of the following options do you think would best reduce the need to travel by car?</p>		
<p>Controlling the scale of development</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>May result in not achieving RSS growth requirements</p>
<p>Controlling the location of development</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>In line with RSS objectives towards more sustainable location patterns, reduction of the consumption of fossil fuels and more sustainable use of land. Leads to policy of development in the three main towns and self-sufficient villages</p>

Q23. Is there a need for a bypass around Mildenhall/Brandon?	Ranking	Comment
MILDENHALL		
Yes	?	May improve town centre environment. Traffic counts on A1101 suggest a decrease in traffic. Further traffic analysis is required to establish the need for a bypass
No	?	Traffic counts on A1101 suggest a decrease in traffic. Further traffic analysis is required to establish the need for a bypass
BRANDON		
Yes	1	Would improve the town centre environment, traffic levels on the A1065 have increased and there is significant congestion. Situation may improve once A11 to Thetford is dualled
No	2	Situation may improve once A11 to Thetford is dualled but no definite start date has been identified

Q24. Should the preferred routes for Mildenhall/Brandon bypasses be reviewed (routes as devised in the early 1990s and shown in the current Local Plan)?		
Yes	?	Dependent upon up to date environmental impact assessment of alternatives
No	?	Dependent upon up to date environmental impact assessment of alternatives

Q25. Does overnight lorry parking in the District need to be controlled?	Ranking	Comment
Yes	1	May help to address existing problems with lorry parking in the District
No	2	May not address existing problems with lorry parking in the District

ENVIRONMENT

Q26. Which of the following is more important to the Brecks landscape?		
Agricultural land and commercial woodland	2	Significant areas of heathland have been converted to agriculture and commercial woodland use over the last 100 years
Heathland, mainly for wildlife	1	Preservation and creation of heathland is an important objective of the RSS and Forest Heath can make a significant contribution to achieving the regional target

Q27. Are there any important wildlife corridors in Forest Heath that need to be identified?

No options to rank	Not Applicable	Identification of wildlife corridors is an RSS policy and there is significant wildlife interest within the District
--------------------	-----------------------	--

Q28. Should the established use of horse racing land / buildings in Newmarket be protected in order to preserve the unique character and economy of the town?	Ranking	Comment
Yes	1	Protection of the special character of the regional market towns is an RSS objective. Newmarket has a unique economy of which 20% is based around the horse racing industry, which should be protected
No	2	Market forces threaten the special character of Newmarket's horse racing industry
Q29. Please suggest sites, which you think, would be suitable for the location of renewable energy developments. To do this		Background information: We need to cut our emissions of greenhouse gases (mostly carbon dioxide and methane) by between 60 and 80% to stabilise our climate at a safe level for us all to lead a normal life. we need to cut our reliance upon fossil fuels such as petrol, diesel, oil and natural gas. One of the main ways we must do this is to use clean renewable energy provided from the sun, wind, the ground, fuel crops and other technologies

<p>Q30. Given that there are competing demands for water resources, please choose the options below that you think should be given the HIGHEST and LOWEST priority.</p>	<p>Ranking</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Residents of new dwellings</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Background information: Given that the District has not got enough sustainable water resource to meet current demand, local wildlife and existing business/residents/agriculture/leisure should have priority over demand from new development to be sustainable in line with the RSS. Moreover the emphasis should be to use water at a level we can maintain</p>
<p>Industry / business</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Existing residential requirement of water needs to be maintained provided it is used efficiently. Additional water should be made available for new residential use but not if this has an adverse effect upon wildlife/natural habitats or agricultural use. Residential use is given priority over industrial/business or leisure use as this is a fundamental human need</p>
<p>Industry / business</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Existing industrial/business use of water needs to be maintained for current levels of productivity provided it is used efficiently. Additional water should be made available for new industrial/business use but not if this has an adverse effect upon wildlife/natural habitats or agriculture or residents. Provision of water for industry/ business use is important to achieve the RSS objective of job led growth</p>

<p>Q30 continued. Given that there are competing demands for water resources, please choose the options below that you think should be given the HIGHEST and LOWEST priority</p>	<p>Ranking</p>	<p>Comment</p>
<p>Agriculture</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Existing agricultural use of water needs to be maintained for current levels of productivity provided it is used efficiently. Additional water should be made available for new agricultural use but not if this has an adverse effect upon wildlife/natural habitats. Agricultural use is important to provide adequate amounts of food/crops</p>
<p>Leisure</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Existing leisure use of water needs to be maintained for current levels of provision provided it is used efficiently. Additional water should be made available for new leisure use but not if this has an adverse effect upon wildlife/natural habitats or agriculture or residents. This is the least important use of water of the competing demands as it is not a biological need nor is it a need for development in line with the RSS</p>
<p>Wildlife</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Given this lack of water resource existing wildlife requires priority of water supply to protect and maintain our most vulnerable assets in line with RSS objectives</p>

CULTURE		Ranking	Comment
Q31. Should additional sports and leisure facilities (or improvements to existing ones) be focused on a regional facility or local ones within the District?			
Focused on a regional facility		2	Not in line with RSS due to unsustainable location patterns, unfair access to services/facilities, increased need for transport, increased use of fossil fuels
Focused on local facilities		1	In line with RSS objective to deliver more sustainable location patterns and use of land. Also revitalising town centres and equitable sharing of benefits across the District
Q32. Should additional arts / cultural venues and facilities be built within the District?			
Yes, additional venues and facilities should be built		?	Likely to vary between towns and villages
No, greater use should be made of town and village halls etc		?	Likely to vary between towns and villages

Q33. Should the existing network of public rights of way (footpaths, cycle paths, bridle paths etc) and recreational facilities in the countryside be extended / improved?	Ranking	Comment
PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY		
Yes, extended / improved	1	In line with RSS through increased access to green space/countryside, encourages walking/cycling and less reliance upon vehicular transportation
No, the existing network should be maintained	2	Maintains current provision with no improvements to address some existing shortcomings
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES		
Yes, extended / improved	1	In line with RSS through increased access to green space/countryside, encourages walking/cycling and may lead to less reliance upon vehicular transportation, increased facilities towards sustainable communities
No, the existing network should be maintained	2	Maintains current provision with no improvements as above
Q34. Should housing developers be required to contribute towards new health facilities and services, in addition to other community services?		
Yes	1	Could increase provision of health facilities and services in light of a lack of available funding
No	2	Not likely to increase provision of health facilities and services

Q35. Which of the following associations would best enable the District to work with others in order to seek funding for infrastructure / community improvements?	Ranking	Comment
Suffolk wide	?	Varies according to geographic area of responsibility of the different infrastructure/service provision
Western Suffolk Local Strategic Partnership	?	Varies according to geographic area of responsibility of the different infrastructure/service provision
Cambridge Sub Region	?	Varies according to geographic area of responsibility of the different infrastructure/service provision
None, Forest Heath develops its own approach	?	Varies according to geographic area of responsibility of the different infrastructure/service provision

5.3 Matrix 2: Results

It is clear that the decisions made regarding the issues and options appraised in Matrix 2 can have a significant bearing on the likelihood of the LDF achieving its aim of delivering sustainable development in line with the RSS and national policy. Detailed comments about implications of the possible outcomes are outside the scope of this initial sustainability appraisal and it is down to the individual or organisation to interpret the results in the context of the pre submission consultation. However, as the options are refined and core development policy is shaped more in depth sustainability appraisal will be carried out which will be presented for public consultation.

6. Conclusions and Closing Remarks

It will be extremely difficult to implement the high level objectives of the RSS and achieve conformity in a way that meets all its policy objectives because of the level of delivery of housing, employment and infrastructure called for in the RSS ie, 6,400 new dwellings. This development may help to achieve some of the economic and social goals for the District. However it is also likely to lead to a number of significant adverse impacts on the environment, even if additional environmental policy safeguards are put in place.

Given the limited number of brownfield sites in the District there is likely to be considerable loss of greenfield land to development with possible adverse effects on biodiversity and landscape character. The emphasis for development should be based upon the sequential test to deliver development in the most sustainable locations. However some greenfield sites are located within current development boundaries and may prove to be appropriate locations for development. High demand and insufficient water supply is a major problem as is water management. At present 21% of the District is in flood plain and some areas are at risk from flooding as rivers are operating at capacity during times of heavy rainfall. This problem is likely to worsen over time with additional climate change. Breckland is a recognised environmentally sensitive area (ESA) and requires protection along with other areas of ecological worth of which the District has many. The District has unsustainable movement patterns and a high level of car dependency. Additionally, developments can be inconsistent with local landscape character and robust policy is required in this regard.

The scale and pace of growth envisaged is likely to be environmentally damaging unless planning controls are combined with other measures to ensure that new development achieves a significant improvement in resource intensity. Including limiting the causes and impacts of climate change, water demand, road traffic generation and loss of wildlife habitat.

The larger the volume of development the harder it will be to avoid increased flood risk, erosion of the quality and distinctiveness of settlements and the built environment and landscape.

There are opportunities for joined up policies which reflect the complexity of ecological, social and economic problems such as linking climate change with water scarcity, flood defence, waste, land allocation, sustainable energy generation and use, economic development opportunities (there is potential for wind energy and also biofuel crops amongst others), affordable community energy, building standards etc.

The sustainability of the development proposed in the District will often depend on detailed factors such as location, form and design of development. Application of policies in the LDF (eg, biodiversity, energy efficiency, waste management, etc) will be critical in determining performance in the District.

