

## Chapter 5 Developing Strategic Alternatives

### 5.1 Introduction

- 5.1.1 Alongside the examination of the environmental baseline, we undertook a programme to develop the strategic alternatives for the Derbyshire LTP3 strategy. This is of course an important stage for the SEA process, but it was an equally important process to develop the best way of delivering local transport in Derbyshire. This chapter describes the processes that we undertook to get to our three options for the LTP3 strategy.

### 5.2 Without the LTP Scenario

**The purpose of a Plan is to establish where we are now, where we would like to be, and how we get there.**

- 5.2.1 One situation that we are required to consider in SEA is the likely evolution of the environmental baseline without a plan. This is a desktop scenario because it should be noted that the county council has a statutory duty to produce a plan by March 2011 under the Transport Act 2000, as amended by the Local Transport Act 2008.
- 5.2.2 Of course this scenario is not unguided, because the county council has a number of statutory duties it has to meet, even if it did not have a plan, in looking after its transport networks and services. Therefore these have to form part of any option that we develop. We do not list these here, but an assessment we undertook in December 2009 at the start of the process to develop alternatives is included within Annex 3. The without the plan scenario also has to be based on current government policies. We examined this policy context during the scoping stage. This is too long a list to reproduce here, but a summary is given in Annex 3 to this report and the full assessment can be found in Annex 1 of the Derbyshire LTP3 SEA Scoping Report. The 'without the plan' scenario should assume that the current LTP2 programmes will be delivered. We have therefore assumed that both the Derbyshire LTP2 and Derby Joint LTP2 will complete as planned (i.e. complete in March 2011). This scenario should not assume any new strategies or measures, therefore we have not assumed the delivery of any strategies or measures that are in development or planned by others.

#### **Six themes that would be expected under the 'without a plan' scenario**

- 5.2.3 To understand what this would mean for the without the plan scenario, we held a group discussion in May 2010 with policy and environmental officers from the Authority in attendance. This group considered the information described in paragraph 5.2.2 and concluded that six themes would be expected under the 'without the plan' scenario, these are listed below (in no priority order):-

##### **New development**

The significance of new development across the county, particularly when considered at the housing market level, would suffer from a lack of transport planning input. Sustainable travel, accessibility planning, and potential funding sources could be compromised.

##### **Climate change/carbon reduction/Peak oil**

The profile of climate change is more prominent compared with the LTP2 planning period. Without the plan, less would be done to focus the transport planning framework towards carbon reduction (particularly mitigation).

##### **Social Exclusion**

With higher fuel prices expected, and the loss of commercial public transport services, together with a growing elderly population, there would be a poorer performance on tackling social exclusion in a co-ordinated way. Also, importantly, there would be a lack of support for the voluntary sector, and a lack of pooled knowledge about tackling the barriers to accessibility.

### Investment Planning

It was felt likely that investment planning would naturally ‘default’ towards highway maintenance. Also, there was a risk of ‘throwing money at problems,’ which may not necessarily be effective. There would be less of a focus on ‘doing more with less,’ and achieving value for money across the range of transport planning measures. There was a danger that transport services became budget driven in silos, without the overview that the Plan provides. Without a plan, opportunities for carbon, environmental and financial savings through the co-location of service providers and promotion of zero and low carbon travel may be lost. Within the context of economic constraints, investment planning is more important.

### Strategic forward planning/capacity for innovation and engagement

There would be no attempt at a forward look, and less engagement with people and practitioners about planning ahead. There would be a reactive approach to problems, and a limited capacity for innovation. There would be a lack of overall co-ordination/direction.

### Monitoring

The lack of systematic monitoring (whether external influences, local data analysis or performance monitoring) would mean that the effect of measures taken could not be evaluated and there would not be a proactive approach to transport planning. There would be a lack of meaningful targets/monitoring framework.

NB Also, without the Plan there would be no Strategic Environmental Assessment to inform whether we were continuing to travel in the right direction to achieve environmental, social and economic goals in the light of changing circumstances.

## Measures that can be used to address transport challenges

5.2.4 When looking at the ‘without the plan’ scenario, and our alternatives for the plan, it is clear that there will be some uncertainty as to the effects because it will depend on the method or intervention that is used. To provide an improved certainty, although accepting that there are different ways of delivering these too and to how many we would deliver; we developed a list of measures that could be used to address the transport challenges (see page 2-7) and implement the LTP strategy. This measures list, see Table 5.1 below, was developed from a list provided within LTP3 Guidance documentation and a list of policy instruments contained within the Department for Transport’s Webtag Unit 2.3. This measures list has been used to provide a clearer picture of what we would expect to undertake under each of our alternative options, including the ‘without the plan’ scenario.

**Table 4.1 Master list of measures and policy instruments that could be used to deliver LTP3 strategy**

Maintenance and design	Accessibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Routine maintenance of roads</li> <li>• Routine maintenance of pavements</li> <li>• Routine maintenance of rights of way and greenways</li> <li>• Flooding management</li> <li>• Maintenance of vegetation</li> <li>• Management of the transport asset to support local journeys</li> <li>• Improving the local streetscape through high quality design, use of local materials and multi-disciplinary approach</li> <li>• Removing unnecessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Managing special road verges (biodiversity)</li> <li>• Habitat protection for plants and wildlife</li> <li>• Reducing light pollution</li> <li>• Reducing street lighting carbon emissions</li> <li>• Minimising damage to the environment</li> <li>• Improving public satisfaction with maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joined up public transport information and branding</li> <li>• Volunteer car schemes</li> <li>• Community Transport Services</li> <li>• More demand responsive transport services e.g. dial-a-bus</li> <li>• Wheels to Work</li> <li>• Getting people to jobs and training</li> <li>• Bringing services to the people</li> <li>• Community rail</li> <li>• Home to School Transport</li> <li>• School Crossing Patrol Service</li> <li>• Making public transport physically accessible</li> <li>• Independent travel training</li> <li>• Improving access to public and green spaces</li> <li>• Equality Impact Assessments</li> </ul>
Vehicle fleets	Spatial planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental specification in contracted services</li> <li>• Use of alternative fuels e.g. plug in points for electric vehicles</li> <li>• Low Emission Zones</li> <li>• Sustainable freight distribution networks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Influencing spatial planning to reduce car use and enable more walking, cycling, public transport</li> <li>• Influencing spatial planning to minimise the impacts of road freight</li> </ul>

<b>Behavioural change</b>	<b>Public transport</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travel Plans for businesses and new developments, including monitoring</li> <li>• School Travel Plans, inc. monitoring</li> <li>• DCC to tackle commuting mileage</li> <li>• Road user charging</li> <li>• Personalised travel planning</li> <li>• Better promotion of existing opportunities for cycling and walking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Smart ticketing' improved technology for paying</li> <li>• More flexible ways of paying e.g. multi-operator ticketing scheme</li> <li>• Review of supported public transport network</li> <li>• Concessionary fare scheme</li> <li>• Discounted travel scheme – buses and trains</li> <li>• Improvements to public transport services</li> </ul>
<b>New infrastructure</b>	<b>Accounting/decision-making</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycling facilities</li> <li>• Walking networks</li> <li>• Green infrastructure – linking up habitats</li> <li>• Infrastructure linked with new housing</li> <li>• Major schemes – congestion and safety:</li> <li>• Major schemes – environmental:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best use of resource to reduce carbon footprint</li> <li>• Buy carbon credits to offset unavoidable carbon emissions</li> </ul>
	<b>Economy</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage the use of local facilities and local businesses</li> <li>• Support tourism growth for specific road users and locations</li> <li>• Support moving freight from road to rail</li> </ul>
<b>Network management</b>	<b>Road and community safety</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing events to reduce car use</li> <li>• Dealing with disruption on the roads</li> <li>• Co-ordination of street works</li> <li>• Parking controls</li> <li>• Keeping roads clear in bad weather</li> <li>• Keeping pavements clear in bad weather</li> <li>• Keeping lorries out of villages</li> <li>• Tackling bad parking in rural areas</li> <li>• Better direction and tourist signing</li> <li>• Providing travel information</li> <li>• Improved social contact e.g. reduced traffic levels/speeds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road safety education</li> <li>• Road safety training e.g. cycling and walking</li> <li>• Road safety publicity</li> <li>• Road safety engineering to reduce danger on the roads</li> <li>• Road surfaces that help reduce skidding</li> <li>• Road safety enforcement</li> <li>• Speed reduction schemes</li> <li>• Improved street lighting e.g. waiting areas and crossings</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation of road safety measures</li> </ul>

5.2.5 At the same discussion group in May 2010, we went through each of the measures and considered what would happen if we did not have a plan. This identified which of the measures we were likely to do more of, which we do about the same, which we would expect to do less of and which we would not do at all. This comparison was done against the Authority having some form of plan where this is defined as per the definition at the start of this section. The results of this assessment are given in the box below:-

### Summary of without the plan by 2026

#### More

We would do more routine maintenance of the highway, flooding management, reducing light pollution and reducing carbon emissions through street lighting. Dealing with disruption on the roads will be greater, as will the need for parking controls. There will be infrastructure linked with new housing provision and smart ticketing on public transport (i.e. using technology for paying).

#### About the same

There will be improved public satisfaction with maintenance and practical responses will have been made to the demands of changing vegetation as a consequence of climate change (e.g. as a result of longer growing seasons). Developments will have been made in line with external influences such as electric plug in points or Low Emission Zones. The key strands of network management would continue – co-ordination of street works, winter maintenance and lorry routeing. Major schemes relating to tackling congestion and safety concerns would be pursued. The School Crossing Patrol service would continue, and buses made more accessible to comply with Disability Discrimination Act requirements. Equality Impact Assessments would continue as part of the corporate programme. Road safety engineering and enforcement measures would continue.

#### About the same or less

It is less clear how major schemes with an environmental basis would emerge, whilst support of the public transport network would remain under review. Support of moving freight from road to rail would continue, as would Community Rail initiatives.

### Less

There would be less routine maintenance of pavements, rights of way and Greenways. Improvement of the local streetscape would be limited as would minimising damage to the environment and removing unnecessary infrastructure. Road safety education, training and publicity services, and community safety measures, would be less likely to be pursued. Most aspects of influencing behavioural change through travel planning will have been lost, as would opportunities for sustainable freight distribution networks and environmental specification for bus contracts. Influence on spatial planning would be much reduced, and opportunities to improve social contact overlooked. The best use of resources to reduce carbon emissions would not have been researched or enacted. New walking and cycling networks, and green infrastructure would be less in evidence, with poorer health outcomes. Improvements to public transport services from the customers' point of view would be poorer, with little or no progress on more flexible ticketing (e.g. multi-operator ticketing schemes), discounted and concessionary fare schemes. Many measures relating to improving accessibility for local people would not be pursued - Community Transport services, volunteer car schemes, Wheels to Work, getting people to jobs and training, bringing services to the people and independent travel training.

### Not at all

It is felt unlikely that road user charging will be implemented within the timescale of the plan, and that focussing maintenance on local journeys would be unlikely without the plan, as maintenance tends to focus on the busiest roads.

## What effect would the 'without the plan' scenario have on our environmental baseline?

- 5.2.6 At the same meeting in May, the draft SEA Scoping Report was at a stage where we were aware of most of the environmental issues we would need to consider. Therefore at this meeting we were able to make an assessment of the likely evolution of these environmental issues if we did not have a plan. The results of this assessment are given in the table below, the overall summary of the effect is given in the purple box.

**Consideration of the without the plan scenario over the fifteen year period shows that there would be an overall poorer performance for carbon reduction measures, environmental protection, social inclusion, behavioural change and good health outcomes (personal and public)**

SEA Issues	Impact – 😊positive, 😞negative or 😐same
<b>Landscape and Townscape</b>	
Designated landscape and townscape of Peak District National Park	😞 poorer environmental protection
Visual intrusion by transport infrastructure	😞 not taking out unnecessary infrastructure
Less darker areas due to light pollution from illuminated transport infrastructure	😊 being addressed through carbon reduction measures
Localised damage from parking at busy tourist locations	😐 problems would still be addressed as they arise
Localised damage from use of motorised vehicles in the countryside	😞 less rights of way and greenway maintenance
Localised erosion damage from walking, cycling and horse riding	😞 poorer rights of way network infrastructure
Less tranquil areas due to traffic noise and light pollution	😊 light pollution would be less
Landscapes and townscapes act as a tourist attraction of which many people travel by car to visit	😞 less impetus for sustainable travel habits
<b>Biodiversity &amp; Soils</b>	
Condition of designated wildlife sites	😞 poorer environmental protection
Severance of habitats and role of transport network in providing green corridors	😞 poorer environmental protection
Recreational disturbance	😞 less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Road casualties (protected species)	😞 less focus on environmental mitigation

Light pollution	☺ to ☺ likely to be positive, but not necessarily in the right locations
Soil erosion	☹ less rights of way and greenway maintenance
Construction and maintenance of county council transport networks	☺ procedures already in place and should continue
Biodiversity acting as a tourist attraction which many people travel by car to visit	☹ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
General biodiversity issues	☹ less focus on environmental mitigation
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	
Visual intrusion by transport infrastructure	☹ e.g. conservation areas at risk
Material usage and poor design can lead to visual intrusion of transport infrastructure	☹ not using specialist advisors
Collision damage to Swarkestone Bridge and Causeway	☹ unlikely to be pursued as a major project – only as emergency repair measures
Localised damage from use of motorised vehicles in the countryside	☹ less rights of way and greenway maintenance
<b>Climatic Factors</b>	
CO2 emissions	☹ less impetus for pursuing ways to reduce the need to travel and sustainable travel habits
Flooding	☺ flooding management would still happen, but could be more proactive in the context of the plan
Vegetation	☺ likely to be dealt with in the same way
Peat Soils	☹ Moors for the Future etc. There could be more damage if there is less rights of way and greenway network
<b>Water</b>	
Surface water quality	☺ Likely to be the same without the plan, or improve, due to the impact of the Flood and Water Management Act
<b>Population, health &amp; noise</b>	
Population growth/ housing provision/ transport usage.	☹ Would be more reactive and not built in with plan development
Increasing elderly population	☹ ☹ This is a particular concern in terms of social exclusion, independent living, social care and Quality of Life for Derbyshire's population
Limiting long term illness/ mental and physical disability	☹ As above
Physical exercise and obesity	☹ less investment in walking and cycling networks and less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Road casualties	☺ likely to reduce, but at a slower rate – activity would continue without the plan, so effect would be about the same
Community severance	☹ less impetus for sustainable travel habits
Air quality	☺ likely to improve overall anyway, with improved vehicle technology and the effect of increasing costs of fuel
Noise	☺ would still be dealt with where possible
<b>Material Assets</b>	
Transport asset	☺ greater investment in highway maintenance ☹ less investment in pavements and rights of way maintenance
Use of materials and reuse	☹ less emphasis on sustainable procurement of highway materials and re-use and recycling
Use of fuels/ oil	☺ likely to improve with energy efficiency (but could be offset by growth in traffic)
Use of energy	☺ invest to save budget – already tackling use of electricity



## 5.3 Option Development

- 5.3.1 It is therefore clear that having plan that sought to tackle all or some of the potential worsening of environmental issues would be beneficial for the environment. The way to do this is to develop different options for delivering the plan to help identify potential significant negative effects and to deal with these or at least not make any worse, where possible, during the development of the Plan.

### Context for developing our reasonable options

- 5.3.2 Using guidance and common sense means that many alternatives to the way we could deliver the plan can be rapidly eliminated on financial, technical, social or environmental grounds. The following examination of the context that we had to develop our options within shows that there is in fact not a great deal of room for manoeuvre for developing options. Therefore this context gives quite firm guidelines within which we have to deliver transport services.

### Legal considerations

- 5.3.3 Realistically, there is not a great deal of room for manoeuvre in which transport services we deliver, as we are bound by a range of statutory duties and requirements. However, some of these still give us a choice in the way we meet these duties and deliver transport services. These duties cover highway maintenance, winter maintenance, rights of way improvement, network management duty, new roads and street works, bus strategy and information, sustainable travel to school and school transport services, road safety, air quality, integration with spatial planning, community safety and sustainable development. A list of these is given in Annex 3. All of this work already helps to deliver the transport goals.
- 5.3.4 Environmental requirements are becoming increasingly challenging, with additions to the duty to have regard to the purposes of the Peak District National Park. Biodiversity, climate change, Habitats Regulation Assessment, flooding and water management are all new requirements since the current Local Transport Plan.

### Resource considerations

- 5.3.5 Within the context for developing reasonable options we have to consider the level of resources available. There is currently much uncertainty in overall levels of funding for LTP3 as this is still to be determined as part of the Government's spending review at the end of October 2010. What is certain though is that resources are likely to be less than during the LTP2 period, at least in the short to medium term.
- 5.3.6 We are also unlikely to be able to raise significant revenues ourselves from other sources. An option could be based upon revenue-raising through a road pricing project. This option was considered unreasonable due to it being unpopular locally as identified during our 'Local Transport Futures' consultation; it is not currently being pursued at a national level which would make a scheme difficult to progress; and the timescales for developing such a proposal would take into the long-term (of the LTP3 timescale) to progress and establish. Therefore, realistically the only revenue raising schemes would be through small-scale initiatives such as on-street parking or developer contributions which would not significantly change the amount of resources available.
- 5.3.7 A financial option we have available to us, is to borrow more money to implement more. Over half of our current capital allocations are in the form of supported borrowing i.e. the Government gives us permission to borrow funds and helps us to pay the interest. We therefore have to use our own publicly-raised funds to pay for the interest on borrowing over time. In the current financial climate, it is extremely unlikely that we would be able to raise Council Taxes to cover additional borrowing or reallocate existing funds to cover increases in debt payments. We therefore consider further borrowing as an unreasonable option.
- 5.3.8 It is unlikely that there will be significant resources available for a large programme of new infrastructure. Funding for such schemes is a separate funding stream, but this is also subject to the Governments spending review. In recent years, funding of schemes has been difficult in a period of what has been considered a high level of financial contributions to transport. Therefore, it is unrealistic to consider options that would contain a significant programme of new infrastructure.

## Social and political acceptance

5.3.9 We have already referred to social and political acceptance as being an important part of our options in being considered reasonable. As already examined in the without the plan scenario our options should be based upon current government policies. We also have local policies set by the County Council which should be considered for options to be reasonable. The Council Plan sets out this:-

### Leading the Way

- Giving local people better choice and more of a say
- Achieving more in partnership
- Working with local communities to help them flourish
- Doing things better and being open to doing things differently

### Good use of public money

- Services that provide excellent value for money
- Strong and effective financial management
- Well managed assets
- A valued workforce

### Raising aspirations

- Giving children in Derbyshire the best start in life
- Providing an excellent education for all
- Helping local people achieve their full potential
- Encouraging healthy, active and rewarding lifestyles

### High quality personalised services that meet individual needs

- Giving people the choice and flexibility to live independent lives
- Safeguarding and providing excellent support to those who need it most

### Places where people want to be

- Confident and safe communities
- Making places easier to reach
- A resilient economy
- Rich, diverse and protected environments
- A county of cultural opportunity

## Our Options – long term outlook (2026)

5.3.10 The horizon for our Plan options is 2026. This presents us with the task of considering a 15 year time horizon for our options.

5.3.10 The process to develop our options within the above context is described in more detail in Annex 3 to this report. In summary, the first stage was to revisit the options we developed for assessment and development of the second Derbyshire LTP. We eliminated this approach for LTP3 because it required a high level of certainty over the resources available and that since LTP2, the coverage of issues had widened. Therefore a different approach was required.

5.3.11 Our first attempts at developing options was to develop a matrix framework which considered different resource scenarios against differing levels of ambition. This methodology was eliminated following a meeting of the LTP3 steering group which found the concept difficult to understand, particularly the reasoning for why sustainability was prioritised over a shift to demand management. Therefore this was not considered a reasonable way forward.

## Options based on transport goals

5.3.12 The public and stakeholder consultations conducted during 2009 showed that different emphasises to the different transport goals were sought by different groups. It showed that different outcomes of the plan would be influenced by which combination of goals we gave emphasis to. The transport goals are:-

- Tackling climate change
- Supporting economic growth
- Promoting equality of opportunity
- Contributing to better safety, security and health
- Improving quality of life and a healthy natural environment

5.3.13 Experience in undertaking LTP2 has shown that a mixture of different priorities is always likely to offer more benefits individually and cumulatively (although potentially negative effects too) than an option that 'majored' on one goal.

- 5.3.14 Our consultations about the transport goals again provided the basis for one of our options. The results of the Derbyshire consultations showed that three transport goals were generally of a higher importance and could be grouped together to form an option where we placed emphasis on these three goals:-
- Supporting economic growth
  - Better safety, security and health
  - Quality of life and a healthy natural environment
- 5.3.15 It was clear that this option conflicted to some degree with the Department for Transport's biggest challenge in 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' which focused on:-
- Tackling climate change
  - Supporting economic growth
- 5.3.16 Giving emphasis to these two goals gave us our second option. These two options ensured that four of the transport goals would be appraised through the SEA process, however the remaining goal of promoting equality of opportunity would not be considered. We made the decision to use this remaining goal as an option following our Equality Impact Assessment which highlighted that during consultations etc, hard to reach groups such as people with mental or physical disability or ethnic minorities were less likely to make their views known. Examining the environmental baseline at the scoping stage also highlighted that rural accessibility was important. Therefore appraising an option about this goal would ensure that the equality of opportunity would be considered and the effects understood.
- 5.3.17 Therefore the three alternatives we developed are:-

#### Option 1

This alternative would seek a combination of measures which place an emphasis on the following goals, based on the results of Derbyshire consultations carried out last year:

- **supporting economic growth**
- **better safety, security and health**
- **quality of life and healthy natural environment.**

By 2026, this option would show that we had worked on creating more opportunities for social contact and access to the natural environment to improve community well-being, an improved journey experience, enhancing the street scene in towns and villages, and a protected and enhanced natural and historic environment.

It would show that a clear link between transport planning and local sustainable economic development has helped the economy of Derbyshire in towns and villages.

It would result in safer roads, links with community safety planning for different areas of the county, and more active travel habits, particularly cycling and walking, leading to improved health.

#### Option 2

This option would seek a combination of measures which put an emphasis on the following goals:

- **tackling climate change**
- **supporting economic growth.**

This combination was described as the biggest challenge in the Department for Transport's 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System.'

By 2026, this option would result in 'smarter' travel choices, with an emphasis on using public transport, cycling and walking, reduced use of the private car, and 'greener' vehicles, with an overall reduced carbon footprint for travel in Derbyshire.

It would show that a clear link between transport planning and local sustainable economic development has helped the economy of Derbyshire in towns and villages.

#### Option 3

This option would seek a combination of measures which put an emphasis on the following goal:

- **promoting equality of opportunity**

Although this goal was not a popular choice in the consultations, it is one which is particularly relevant to Derbyshire. This goal helps disadvantaged people to access services, and is relevant to Derbyshire in terms of rural accessibility, and also in the more deprived urban areas of the county.

By 2026, this option would ensure that investment relates to the varying nature of problems in both urban and rural areas, with the aim of reducing inequalities relating to transport.



- 5.2.18 In May 2010, we undertook a consultation to check what our stakeholders thought about these draft options and we also undertook a consultation with the public to see what goals they would like us to give emphasis to. The public consultation showed that the majority of people would want us to focus on all the goals, but that Option 1 was quite popular, Option 2 was mid-range and Option 3 not so popular. This was replicated in the stakeholder consultation.
- 5.2.19 It is clear from both tables that we could develop many different options based upon many different mixtures of transport goals. It is tempting to select some of the more 'popular' mixtures of goals to take forward into the appraisal stage. However, because each of the goals are being tested under one or more of the options, it is clear that we are not going to miss any effects through appraisal and therefore would not be an effective use of resources in undertaking the assessment. By remaining with the three options, we also are examining options across a range of popularity i.e. a popular option, and mid-range option and a least popular option. As referred to above this ensures that we have not left out of the appraisal stage, any transport goals that may be favoured by or relevant to, a small sector of society.
- 5.2.20 These three options were therefore used at the appraisal stage.