

## OF DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OPTIONS

<p><b>Option B – combined housing</b></p>	<p><b>Option C – Plan, monitor and manage</b></p>	<p><b>Option D – not reviewing the structure plan and waiting for RPG</b></p>	<p><b>Option E – identifying a strategy now of bringing forward a substantial concentration of development</b></p>
<p>on capacity and certainty over probability of... to provide greenfield sites... ent costs... ship with... rge proportion... areas and as... – therefore... r services in... usly developed... ocations allows... t sustainable... ordance with... re to intensify... nefits to the... ements to the... nt from... previously... ildings.</p>	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive relationships with accessibility due to large proportion of housing to be built in or on the edge of urban areas.</li> <li>• Development expected to increase support for services in existing settlements</li> <li>• Landscape benefits as most development within urban areas</li> <li>• Pressure removed from previously undeveloped land of biodiversity value (though some brown field sites are of biodiversity importance).</li> <li>• Potential improvements to the built environment from redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings.</li> <li>• Positive impact of deletion of strategic greenfield housing allocations.</li> <li>• Potential to promote opportunities for sustainable movements of people by allocating previously developed land within existing towns</li> </ul>	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could perform better in relation to economic growth, housing provision and affordability objectives than Options A and C, but could mean allocating greenfield land that is not needed in the period to 2011. This would have adverse consequences for environmental resources, including landscape, biodiversity and soil objectives.</li> <li>• Similarities with option C, with main difference between the two being that option C proposes to de-allocate greenfield allocations.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Positive</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong relationship with option B.</li> </ul>

<p>and C on previously implications on and biodiversity. would involve which precedes and RPG14 – could development in with long term</p>	<p>around 2011 with potential problems for affordability and general housing market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More limited opportunities to secure affordable housing due to reliance on previously developed sources.</li> <li>• Possible adverse impacts on the character of historic settlements as a result of intensification of urban areas.</li> <li>• Deficiencies in housing supply post 2011 could have adverse impacts on the economy.</li> </ul>	<p>possibly prematurely, because of the potential supply of brownfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could perform better in relation to economic growth, housing provision and affordability objectives than Options A and C, but could mean allocating greenfield land that is not needed in the period to 2011. This would have adverse consequences for environmental resources, including landscape, biodiversity and soil objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option could involve a range of different locations for greenfield development. In the case of west of Stevenage the appraisal recognises County Council concerns of the worsening noise environment, that is may not be possible to construct the second phase of development without impinging on landscape and other environmental constraints and therefore raises concerns about objectives for economies of scale,</li> <li>• Concern over problems in determining the spatial strategy prematurely, before RPG14 is finalised.</li> <li>• Identifying greenfield locations now could result in land allocations in places that were not the most sustainable or which did not support the regional spatial strategy. Because of brownfield capacity, greenfield sites are likely to be phased in post 2011 and so could therefore be reviewed and possibly changed in light of RPG14. However this could result in wasted effort and the requirement to prepare a strategy in 2006 similar to Option C.</li> </ul>
<p>1 – therefore on improving disadvantaged</p>	<p><b>Uncertainty</b> Distribution uncertain – therefore difficult to assess on improving economic prospects in disadvantaged areas.</p>		