



**South Hams  
District Council**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL / STRATEGIC  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT of  
SOUTH HAMS CORE STRATEGY  
(PREFERRED OPTIONS)**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

**APPENDIX IV**

**June 2005**

Prepared by

*enfusion*



**APPENDIX IV  
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF CORE STRATEGY OPTIONS**

- A4.1 This document sets out the results of the Sustainability Appraisal of options for the Spatial Strategy of the South Hams Core Strategy.
- A4.2 For each set of options, a summary of the reasons for the identification of the options considered is provided, as well as reasons not to consider certain options where relevant. A comparison of the likely social, environmental and economic effects of implementing those options is then provided in the matrices. Where adverse effects are identified, potential mitigation measures have been considered where possible. For each set of options considered, a preferred option (with an outline of reasons) for the progression of sustainability is set out in the bottom row of each matrix. Symbols used in the matrices are to be interpreted as follows:

++	Likely to contribute considerably to the achievement of the sustainability objective
+	Likely to contribute somewhat to the achievement of the sustainability objective
-	Likely to conflict somewhat with the achievement of the sustainability objective
--	Likely to conflict considerably with the achievement of the sustainability objective
●	Negligible effect on the achievement of the sustainability objective
0	No identifiable relationship with the sustainability objective
?	Level of effect on the achievement of the sustainability objective unclear

- A4.3 The recommended options resulting from the SA are summarised below, along with an indication of which options are being progressed by South Hams in the Core Strategy.

**Settlement Designation**

**Principle of planning on the basis of designated hierarchy of settlements**

- A4.4 South Hams has long worked with an established settlement hierarchy which informs the appropriate role of settlements in the District. This hierarchy of Area Centres and Local Centres has been developed in accordance with Structure Plan policy.
- A4.5 Options for the Core Strategy:
1. Continue to work with a hierarchy of settlements for the planning of the district
  2. Plan the district in the absence of the settlement hierarchy

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects		Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	++	-	Option 1 would assist in the retention of the appropriate range of dwellings, employment, services and facilities in particular settlements to promote community viability Option 2 would provide a less coherent context to guide the roles of settlements, particularly in the long-term when more ad hoc location of development could cumulatively erode the balance of communities
<b>Access</b>	++	-	By retaining Area Centres and to a lesser extent Local Centres as nodes for the provision of services, facilities, employment land and dwellings, Option 1 retains and enhances the potential to access jobs and services by foot, bicycle or public transport Option 2 could result in dispersion of jobs, education, services and cultural and leisure facilities which would cumulatively erode the potential for access by means other than the private car, with consequences for equitability in access
<b>Housing</b>	•	•	
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	+	-	Option 1, by concentrating development according to the settlement hierarchy, should ensure the scale of development is appropriate to the existing built form.
<b>Health</b>	•	•	
<b>Employment</b>	+	-	Option 1 should encourage the provision of jobs accessible to residents, whereas Option 2 could have the opposite effect
<b>Economic Growth</b>	+	-	Option 1 should help secure provision of businesses needs (services, infrastructure, workforce) in proximity to businesses located in Area Centres and Local Centres
<b>Landscape</b>	+	-	Option 1 should help confine most new development within existing settlements, thereby limiting the extent of development in the open countryside
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	•	•	
<b>Biodiversity</b>	•	•	
<b>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>	•	•	
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	+	-	
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	-	

<b>Waste</b>	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	•	•	
<b>Recommendations</b>			
<p>Option 1 is clearly the preferred option. Continuing to work with the existing settlement hierarchy will ensure the retention of a coherent context from which to plan the distribution of new development, in order to retain and enhance appropriate roles for settlements. This will provide a strategic framework within which to promote balanced communities and reduce the need to travel by private car.</p>			

## Settlement Designation

### Designation of particular settlements

A4.6 Within South Hams' established settlement hierarchy, there are four Area Centres and five Local Centres, as follows:

#### Area Centres

- Dartmouth
- Ivybridge
- Kingsbridge
- Totnes

#### Local Centres

- Chillington / Stokenham
- Modbury
- Salcombe
- Woolwell
- Yealmpton

A4.7 Within Option 1 (continue to work with a hierarchy of settlements for the planning of the district), different combinations of settlements classified as Area Centres and Local Centres were not considered in any detail. The four towns designated as area centres have long served as focal points for their surrounding rural areas in terms of providing key facilities and local services. In terms of scale and function there are no feasible alternative or additional existing settlements which warrant the designation of Area Centre. Similarly for the Local Centres, the existing five centres fall naturally within the appropriate size and functional range. A few other larger villages were briefly considered for designation as Local Centres. However, their proximity to settlements designated as Area Centres means that residents access many services and facilities from the Area Centres, such that the viability of services in the villages themselves is limited (Dartington being very close to Totnes, Kingswear close to Dartmouth, and Marldon and Stoke Gabriel being close to Torbay).

A4.8 South Hams District Council is required by the Devon Structure Plan (and as part of the Plymouth Sub-Region) to accommodate a new community at

Sherford. An Area Action Plan for the implementation of this new community is being prepared. The merits of allocating Sherford as an Area Centre, a Local Centre, or neither were considered, as follows:

A4.9 Options for the Core Strategy:

1. Allocate Sherford new community as an Area Centre
2. Allocate Sherford new community as a Local Centre
3. Do not allocate Sherford as an Area Centre or Local Centre

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects			Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	++	-	--	Sherford new community is intended to function effectively in terms of providing community facilities and infrastructure in phase with housing development. This will be essential to ensure community viability and balance. The proposed population of the community is such that Sherford will be comparable in size to the other Area Centres in South Hams and should provide for employment and facilities accordingly. Designation as Area Centre (Option 1) will help provide an appropriate context from which to plan this role for the new settlement. It is considered that Options 2 and 3 would fall significantly short of promoting the appropriate range of facilities for the size of the community proposed, and could lead to an imbalanced community. Designating Sherford an Area Centre from the outset should promote an appropriate balance of jobs/homes/services/infrastructure both in the short, medium and long terms.
<b>Access</b>	++	-	--	Option 1, in helping securing a range of employment and facilities within the settlement appropriate to the scale of dwelling provision, will promote availability of jobs and services accessible by foot, bicycle or public transport. Options 2 and 3 could lead to inadequate provision of services with a need for residents of Sherford to leave the settlement more often to access their needs
<b>Housing</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Health</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Employment</b>	+	•	-	Option 1 should encourage the provision of jobs

				accessible to residents of Sherford
<b>Economic Growth</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Landscape</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Biodiversity</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	+	-	-	
<b>Air Quality</b>	+	-	-	
<b>Waste</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<p>Option 1 is clearly the preferred option for the progression of a genuinely sustainable new community at Sherford. Designation as an Area Centre will provide an appropriate context from which to plan the appropriate range of employment, services, facilities and infrastructure in phase with the provision of housing. This should help ensure the new settlement is sensitively integrated within its setting, and allow it to evolve as a balanced community where residents have equitable and easy access to jobs and services by means other than the car.</p> <p>Were the provision of appropriate services, facilities and infrastructure to lag behind the provision of dwellings, this could lead to entrenched pattern of much less sustainable living, where residents commute outside of the community on a regular basis to access jobs and services. Once established, such a pattern could be difficult to reverse, making it more difficult to 'retrofit' viable services at a later date.</p>				

## **Housing Land Provision**

### **Extent of Provision**

A4.10 Devon Structure Plan requires the provision of a significant amount of new housing in the South Hams part of the Plymouth PUA, including a new community at Sherford of at least 4000 dwellings. The principle of accommodating this new community has been decided at the Structure Plan level. The number of dwellings to be provided has also been a matter for strategic determination as part of the Structure Planning process, and continues to be considered as part of the planning of the Plymouth Sub-Region. Consequently is not appropriate for South Hams to consider alternative levels of provision at the new community.

A4.11 In the rest of the South Hams (outside the Plymouth PUA) the Structure Plan requires the provision of 3,850 dwellings during the plan period, only about 400 of which would require the allocation of new housing land. In preparing their Core Strategy, South Hams District Council has considered options regarding the accommodation of dwellings for ‘the rest of’ South Hams, as follows.

A4.12 Options for the Core Strategy:

1. Under-provision
2. Meet closely the Structure Plan requirement
3. Over-provision

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects			Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	--	•	+	The existing shortage of affordable housing in the South Hams is already having implications for securing balanced communities within the district. The people most severely affected by this shortage are a particular sector of the community (in particular, local, first-time buyers) who are unable to compete in the housing market, but whose presence within the communities is essential to the retention of living communities. This sector of the community is considered to represent a particularly sensitive receptor. Under-provision of housing (Option 1) would significantly exacerbate the problem. Meeting the requirement (Option 2) would go some way to securing additional dwellings but is considered insufficient to reverse existing imbalances, whereas exceeding the requirement (Option 3) is more likely to begin to redress the problem.
<b>Access</b>	-	•	+	Exceeding the SP allocation (Option 3) should result in a somewhat larger overall population in the South Hams, thereby increasing the viability (and accessibility, if appropriately planned) of local services.
<b>Housing</b>	--	-	+ / ++	Meeting the SP allocation (Option 2) would go some way towards meeting the need for affordable housing but would seriously under-address the scale of the problem. If 400 dwellings were provided for, even if the council managed to secure affordable houses at a level of 66%, this would deliver only about 265 affordable homes. There are currently about 1,800 households on the Council’s Housing Register. There is little doubt that under-provision, and to a

				<p>lesser extent meeting the allocation, will result in a spiralling inadequacy of affordable housing to allow local people to remain with their communities. Option 3, by exceeding the housing allocation has the potential to begin to address the existing shortage. The extent to which this is possible would clearly depend on the extent to which the housing allocation was exceeded.</p>
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	?	?	?	<p>The extent of housing to be accommodated does not have clear implications for the quality of the built environment at this strategic stage, since so much will depend on the quality of individual developments secured.</p>
<b>Health</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Employment</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Economic Growth</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Landscape</b>	+?	•?	-?	<p>The extent of housing to be accommodated might have implications for landscape character and value. More housing might be considered to result in more incremental intrusion into the countryside, albeit on the edge of existing settlements. However, much can be done to prevent adverse impacts upon the landscape, and to secure enhancements, through sensitive design</p>
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Biodiversity</b>	+?	•?	-?	<p>The extent of housing to be accommodated might have implications for biodiversity. More housing might be considered to result in more incremental intrusion upon existing habitats. However, much can be done to prevent adverse impacts upon biodiversity, and to secure enhancements, through sensitive design</p>
<b>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Air Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Waste</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	?	?	?	<p>The extent of housing to be accommodated does not have clear implications for the water environment at this strategic stage, since so much will depend on</p>

				the sensitive siting and inclusion of innovative water conservation and sustainable drainage measures in new developments
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<p>The outcome of this appraisal would indicate that for sustainability reasons, the Council should feel encouraged to allocate additional dwellings in the South Hams over and above the Structure Plan allocation. Shortage of affordable housing is an acute problem facing South Hams (with significant implications for the quality of life of residents unable to compete on the housing market, and the retention of viable, balanced communities), and it would seem that only by exceeding the allocation can the Council start to redress the existing shortage.</p> <p>Clearly, the more dwellings to be accommodated, the more potential for adverse impacts upon landscape and biodiversity. However, it is not possible to predict the impacts upon such issues at this stage, along with others such as the historic environment and the water environment. The potential for such impacts should not be considered prohibitive since it should be possible to provide adequate mitigation, as well as enhancement, through the LDF.</p>				

### Housing Land Provision Distribution

A4.13 South Hams District Council also considered options regarding the distribution of allocated dwellings, as follows:

A4.14 Options for the Core Strategy:

1. Concentration in a limited number of settlements
2. Dispersion according to need, but within existing settlements
3. Wide dispersion according to need, not limited to existing settlements

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects			Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	-	+	-	<p>The need for dwellings is not limited to a particular part of the district or just to the larger towns. Concentrating new housing development in a limited number of locations (Option 1) could result in an excess of dwellings over services required in those locations, whilst failing to meet the housing needs of the community in others.</p> <p>A strategy of dispersion according to need (Options 2 and 3) would ensure a better balance between demand and supply, in accordance with population characteristics and fluctuations in particular settlements. However, the wide dispersion promoted by Option 3 could result in isolation of residents in new dwellings from existing communities, as well as eroding the viability of existing residential and service nodes.</p>
<b>Access</b>	+	++	-	Concentrating new development within existing settlements (Options 1 and 2) would enhance the

				viability of services within walking distance of residents or accessible by public transport in these locations. This potential benefit would be more equitably spread should Option 2 be pursued. Option 3 would result in isolation of residents from jobs and services and increase the need to travel by car.
<b>Housing</b>	-	+	+	Provision of dwellings in a limited number of locations (Option 1) does not address need for housing where it occurs. Whilst it is not necessarily a sustainable approach to match demand for open market housing with supply (since this can lead to erosion of the character of particularly desirable locations, or additional development in the open countryside), it is important to take account of the extent of affordable housing shortage in particular locations, and seek to supply homes accordingly. So long as need is defined with particular regard to the need for affordable housing, Options 2 and 3 would provide a more equitable approach by ensuring a better balance between housing demand and supply.
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	?	?	?	
<b>Health</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Employment</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Economic Growth</b>	-	+	-	Option 2 is considered likely to result in the most appropriate distribution of the workforce. Option 1 could result in an over-supply of labour in some locations and an under-supply in others, whereas Option 3 could result in the workforce being less able to access jobs by means other than the car – thereby limiting the range of potential employee available to businesses.
<b>Landscape</b>	?	+	-	Option 3 would be likely to result in an incremental erosion of the quality and character of the open countryside in the South Hams.
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	?	+	?	Concentrating new dwellings within existing settlements (Option 2) should encourage the use of previously developed land – and the dispersion of dwellings should maximise the availability of previously developed land
<b>Biodiversity</b>	?	?	-	Option 3 would be likely to result in an incremental encroachment into valued wildlife habitats. The impact of Options 1 or 2 cannot be predicted at this stage, since they depend to a great extent on siting and sensitivity of design.
<b>Historic Environment</b>	?	?	-	It is considered likely that Option 3 would result in an incremental encroachment upon sites or

<b>and Cultural Heritage</b>				landscapes valued for their historic significance. The impact of Options 1 or 2 cannot be predicted at this stage, since they depend to a great extent on siting and sensitivity of design.
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	•	•	-	Option 3 would most likely result in an increase in trips by car owing to the dispersion of residents
<b>Air Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Waste</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	?	?	-	The dispersed approach promoted by Option 3 might result in an incremental increase in run-off with possible implications for flooding. The potential for increased run-off could also be argued to apply to Options 1 and 2, but a greater dispersal of dwellings (Option 3) could decrease the potential to secure on-site sustainable drainage measures or compensatory flood storage.
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<p>Option 2 - Dispersion according to need, but within existing settlements – is the preferred approach. It is considered that this option would achieve a balance between matching supply and demand for housing (and it is recommended that demand is defined according to the extent of affordable rather than open market housing need), whilst preventing the incremental encroachment upon habitats, landscapes, the historic environment as well as the water environment which could result from a dispersed approach. Restricting the majority of new dwellings to existing settlements should also promote viable, balanced communities. It is recommended that the dispersion of new dwellings within existing settlements is compatible with the settlement hierarchy.</p>				

### **Employment Land Provision Extent of Provision**

A4.15 The strategic context for provision of employment land is set by the Devon Structure Plan which establishes that South Hams will need to accommodate 105 hectares of new employment land during 2001-2016. Of this total, 80 hectares must be in the South Hams part of the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA) (immediately adjoining Plymouth), leaving 25 hectares to be distributed in the rest of the district.

A4.16 Of the 80 hectares to be provided in the South Hams part of the Plymouth PUA, approximately half has already been committed - mainly at Langage. This lies to the north of the A38 on the eastern edge of Plympton and is designated a Strategic Employment Site. Subtracting employment land already developed since 2001 or land that has been granted planning permission but has not yet been developed, this leaves 39 hectares of new employment land to be provided within the South Hams part of the Plymouth PUA during the remainder of the plan period. The Council's preferred approach is to accommodate much of the outstanding balance of employment land around the A38 Deep Lane junction, at Langage and Sherford. This

would effectively group the Langage and Sherford employment proposals resulting in a significant strategic employment site proposal. **CHECK – were alternative locations considered? Need reasons if not**

A4.17 Similarly, subtracting employment land already developed since 2001 or land that has been granted planning permission but has not yet been developed, this leaves 13.9 hectares of new employment land to be accommodated elsewhere in the district during the remainder of the plan period. In preparing their Core Strategy, South Hams District Council has considered options regarding the accommodation of employment land for ‘the rest of’ South Hams, as follows.

A4.18 Options for the Core Strategy:

1. Under-provision
2. Meet closely the Structure Plan requirement
3. Over-provision

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects			Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	-	+	++	Under-provision of employment land (Option 1) is likely to result in a deficit of jobs for local people – and might necessitate certain sectors of the community leaving the local area or commuting out of the district to access employment elsewhere. This could result in imbalanced communities and/or, in the longer term, the development of a ‘dormitory’ function for towns and villages in the South Hams. Option 2 should secure some additional employment for local people, but Option 3 is the preferred approach for securing balanced communities, since this would be more proactive in providing more sites for business within communities, enhancing their viability.
<b>Access</b>	-	?	?	The overall extent of employment land to be accommodated in the district is insufficient to determine the accessibility of the resulting jobs for residents, since this depends on its location. However, under-provision is likely to result in less accessible jobs, with the need for out-commuting to access employment elsewhere
<b>Housing</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	?	?	?	
<b>Health</b>	•	•	•	

<b>Employment</b>	--	+	++	Providing less employment land than allocated in the SP (Option 1) is likely to result in a deficit of jobs for local people. Option 2 should secure jobs for local people, whilst Option 3 is considered likely to result in a greater potential balance between jobs and residents by addressing an existing problem of availability of jobs outside of the tourist season. The choice between Options 2 and 3 should also be made in conjunction with South Ham's decision regarding the extent of housing to be accommodated, since additional housing is likely to result in an associated increase in the working population.
<b>Economic Growth</b>	--	+	++	Failing to provide sufficient employment land in the district (Option 1) could result in the medium and longer term in a spiral of economic decline for South Hams. For example, likely out-commuting associated with Option 1 could result in reduced viability for local shops and services as a result of a lack of working population in the district, particularly outside of the tourist season. Option 2 and to a greater extent Option 3, by providing sufficient or additional employment land should encourage economic growth.
<b>Landscape</b>	-? (esp. long term)	+?	-? (esp. short term)	The extent of employment land to be accommodated might have implications for landscape character and value. More employment might be considered to result in more incremental intrusion into the countryside. However, much can be done to prevent adverse impacts upon the landscape, and to secure enhancements, through sensitive design. Furthermore, in the longer term, securing adequate employment land should help ensure greater prosperity for South Hams, and an associated ability to attract high quality development which respects local landscape character
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Biodiversity</b>	-? (esp. long term)	+?	-? (esp. short term)	The extent of employment land to be accommodated might have implications for biodiversity. More employment land might be considered to result in more incremental intrusion upon existing habitats. However, much can be done to prevent adverse impacts upon biodiversity, and to secure enhancements, through sensitive design. Furthermore, in the longer term, securing adequate employment land should help ensure greater prosperity for South Hams, and an associated ability to attract high quality development which respects and enhances valued species and habitats
<b>Historic</b>	-? (esp. long)	+?	-? (esp. short)	The extent of employment land to be accommodated

<b>Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>	term)		term)	might have implications for the historic environment. More employment land might be considered to result in more incremental intrusion upon sites or landscapes valued for their historic significance. However, much depends on sensitive siting and design. Furthermore, in the longer term, securing adequate employment land should help ensure greater prosperity for South Hams, and an associated ability to attract high quality development which respects and enhances the historic environment.
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	-	?	?	A deficit of jobs within South Hams is likely to result in a greater number and distance of car journeys
<b>Air Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Waste</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	-? (esp. long term)	+?	-? (esp. short term)	A greater extent of employment land (Option 3) could result in an incremental increase in run-off with possible implications for flooding. However, in the longer term, securing adequate employment land should help ensure greater prosperity for South Hams, and an associated ability to attract high quality development which incorporates innovative water conservation and sustainable drainage measures
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<p>The preferred approach for sustainability requires a balance between increasing the employment opportunities (including diversity of opportunities) currently available with protection of the district from excessive new development that could erode the high quality of the environment. It is considered that a low level of provision would not only decrease employment opportunities, impede economic growth, threaten the viability of communities and increase out-commuting, but could also result in the incremental erosion of the quality of the environment and new development, with less resources available for protection and enhancement.</p> <p>In the light of these considerations, it is recommended that if housing provision in excess of the SP allocation is to be pursued, then the extent of employment land allocated should reflect this, and somewhat exceed the SP allocation. This is not to suggest an approach of securing as much employment land as possible. Rather, employment land provision should be closely related to need. Possible adverse effects on the local environment will need to be carefully mitigated – and whilst it is not the role of the spatial strategy to set out requirements relating to design, this should be ensured through other elements of the LDF.</p>				

### Employment Land Provision Distribution

A4.19 South Hams District Council has also considered the distribution of employment land for allocation, outside of the Principal Urban Area.

A4.20 Options for the Core Strategy:

1. Concentration in a limited number of settlements
2. Dispersion according to need, but within existing settlements
3. Wide dispersion, not limited to existing settlements

Comparative assessment of likely sustainability effects:

SA Objective	Predicted effects			Nature of Effect(s)
	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	
<b>Balanced Communities</b>	-?	+	-	To promote balanced communities, it is desirable to situate employment land where it is most needed, ie where there is an existing or foreseen deficit in jobs in proximity to residents. As such, Option 2 is the preferred approach. Should this need be found to be concentrated in particular settlements, however, then dispersion according to need might correspond to an extent with Option 1 – concentration in a limited number of settlements. Option 3 would not contribute towards the delivery of jobs accessible to residents, or jobs within existing communities to protect and enhance their viability
<b>Access</b>	+?	+	-	To secure equitable access to jobs for residents of South Hams, it is important to ensure they are available within walking distance or by public transport, and not just by car. Option 1 might be acceptable depending on the accessibility of the sites by public transport. Option 2 should also progress this objective by securing jobs in close proximity to residents (ie according to need), and within existing settlements which comprise existing accessible nodes
<b>Housing</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Quality of the Built Environment</b>	?	?	?	
<b>Health</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Employment</b>	-	+	-	Option 2 is considered to provide the most sustainable approach to secure a range of employment opportunities – since the option could accommodate sites of various sizes, appropriate to the particular settlement and its position within the settlement hierarchy. Options 1 and 3 would most likely result in too narrow a range of sites for new employment premises.
<b>Economic Growth</b>	?	+	-?	Option 2 is the most responsive to need for employment land – and is consequently most likely

				to foster economic growth where the potential exists to do so. By locating employment land within existing settlements, Options 1 and 2 could contribute to the vitality of Area and Local Centres
<b>Landscape</b>	?	+	-	Option 3 would be likely to result in an incremental erosion of the quality and character of the open countryside in the South Hams.
<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	?	+	?	Concentrating employment land within existing settlements and dispersing it according to need (Option 2) should encourage the use of previously developed land
<b>Biodiversity</b>	?	?	-	Option 3 would be likely to result in an incremental encroachment into valued wildlife habitats. The impact of Options 1 or 2 cannot be predicted at this stage, since they depend to a great extent on siting and sensitivity of design.
<b>Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage</b>	?	?	-	It is considered likely that Option 3 would result in an incremental encroachment upon sites or landscapes valued for their historic significance. The impact of Options 1 or 2 cannot be predicted at this stage, since they depend to a great extent on siting and sensitivity of design.
<b>Minerals</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Energy</b>	•	•	-	Option 3 would most likely result in an increase in trips by car owing to the dispersion of employment
<b>Air Quality</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Waste</b>	•	•	•	
<b>Water</b>	?	?	-	The dispersed approach promoted by Option 3 might result in an incremental increase in run-off with possible implications for flooding. The potential for increased run-off could also be argued to apply to Options 1 and 2, but a greater dispersal of employment land (Option 3) could decrease the potential to secure on-site sustainable drainage measures or compensatory flood storage.
<b>Recommendations</b>				
<p>Option 2 is the preferred approach. However, this does not preclude significant employment nodes being allocated in appropriate locations should the need be there. For example, the majority of employment land could be located within Area Centres (according to need), with smaller sites allocated in Local Centres as well as villages if appropriate sites and access arrangements are available.</p>				