

Contents

| Chapter | | Page |
|---------|---|------|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 4 |
| 2 | The Sustainability Appraisal Process..... | 4 |
| 3 | The Scope of this Report..... | 5 |
| 4 | Appraisal Timeline..... | 5 |
| 5 | Compliance with the SEA Directive / Regulations..... | 8 |
| 6 | Habitat Directive Assessment..... | 12 |
| 7 | Consultation..... | 13 |
| 8 | The Sustainability Appraisal Framework..... | 13 |
| 9 | Local Development Framework Objective Appraisals..... | 15 |
| 10 | Identification of Initial Proposals..... | 20 |
| 11 | Appraisal Methodology..... | 21 |
| 12 | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment..... | 23 |
| 13 | Uncertainties, Limitations and Assumptions..... | 25 |
| 14 | Sustainability Appraisal Matrices for the Development Sites Initial Proposals..... | 26 |
| 15 | Headlines from Matrices..... | 63 |
| 16 | Mitigation measures..... | 65 |
| 17 | Monitoring..... | 66 |
| 18 | Future Work / Next Steps..... | 67 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 – Key Sustainability Appraisal Stages..... | 6 |
| Table 2 – SEA Directive Requirements..... | 8 |
| Table 3 – Refined Sustainability Appraisal Objectives..... | 14 |
| Table 4 – LDF Objectives Appraisal Matrix..... | 16 |

Table 5 – Options Appraisal Matrices: Key..... 21
Table 6 – Sites with significant flood risk 23

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Glossary of Terms..... 69
Appendix 2 – SA Objectives Appraisal Matrix..... 75
Appendix 3 – Refined SA Framework..... 80

1. Introduction

This Report is the Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Sites Initial Proposals. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA), Local Planning Authorities are required to undertake a SA for all Local Development Documents (LDD's). The Development Sites Document when completed will indicate how specific sites in the Borough should be developed or protected. The Document will compliment the Development Strategy, which sets out the over arching vision, and the Development Management Document, which will guide decisions on planning applications in Ealing where locational or site specific provision have not been outlined either in the London Plan or any other development plan documents. When approved, the Development Sites Document will become a statutory Local Development Document forming part of the Local Development Framework for Ealing. This Suite of Development Plan Documents will ultimately replace Ealing's Unitary Development Plan.

2. The Sustainability Appraisal Process

In accordance with Section 5 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and EU Directive 2001/42/DC, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are required for Development Plan Documents (DPD's), produced as part of the Local Development Framework. Whilst the requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are separate and distinct, it is possible to satisfy both through a single appraisal process, in this case a Sustainability Appraisal.

The primary purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through the better integration of social, economic and environmental considerations into the preparation of plans. Sustainable development can be defined as "ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and in future generations". 'Securing the future – New UK Sustainable Development Strategy (2005)' sets out the following 4 key objectives, under the broad heading of sustainable development:

- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone
- Effective protection of the environment
- Prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

The SA is an iterative process allowing us to identify and report on the likely significant effects of the plan, and to illustrate the benefits and risks of different policy options, to enable a transparent decision making process. The SA process needs to be fully integrated into the planning system to ensure that conclusions from the appraisal inform planning decisions.

3. The Scope of this Report

In January 2006, the Council published a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for use alongside the preparation of Development Plan Documents (DPD's). The Scoping Report includes baseline information about Ealing and identifies key environmental and sustainability issues for the Borough. To provide a sound basis for analysis, the report also identified relevant plans and programmes along with key sustainability issues and problems. From these issues, objectives and indicators have been produced. The objectives form part of the appraisal framework against which LDF documents will be assessed. The report is generic and therefore suitable to aid the appraisal of most LDF documents. The Scoping Report, and in particular the SA framework, was refined following consultation with statutory consultees. The updated SA framework is set out in Appendix 3.

This report utilises the established framework, providing a sustainability commentary on the Development Sites Issues and Options, published for consultation in September 2007. It effectively represents an interim/progress report prior to completion of the full SA report at Submission stage (July 2012). It should also be noted that this report addresses the Development Sites document only, and separate commentary reports will be published as the Development Strategy and Development Management documents evolve.

4. Appraisal Timeline

The key stages in the SA of the Development Sites DPD are set out in table 2 below. This timetable follows government guidance as set out in 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (ODPM, 2006). It should be noted that this has been modified slightly to reflect the new stages introduced through changes to Planning Policy Statement 12 'Local Development Frameworks' and the Regulations.

Table 1 – Key Sustainability Appraisal Stages

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| | Stage A | Pre-production - Scoping |
| August 2005 | Stage A1 | Review other policies, plans and programmes, and sustainable development objectives |
| August 2005 | Stage A2 | Collecting Baseline information |
| October 2005 | Stage A3 | Identifying sustainability issues and problems |
| November 2005 | Stage A4 | Developing the SA framework |
| January 2006 | Stage A5 | Consulting on the scope of the SA. |
| | Stage B | Production - Options |
| March 2006 | Stage B1 | Testing the DPD objectives against the SA Framework |
| July 2007 | Stage B2 | Developing the DPD options |
| December 2007 | Stage B3 | Predicting the effects of the DPD based on Issues and Options |
| December 2007 | Stage B4 | Evaluating the effects of the DPD based on Issues and Options |
| December 2007 | Stage B5 | Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects |
| July 2010 | | Produce commentary of appraisal findings of the Issues and Options for internal consideration & informal consultation with stakeholders |
| July 2010 | Stage B6 | Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD. |
| August 2010 | | Developing the Initial Proposals, with consideration of findings from SA of Issues and Options |
| October 2010 | Stage B3 Part 2 – Initial Proposals | Predicting the effects of the DPD based on the Initial Proposals |
| October | Stage B4 | Evaluating the effects of the DPD based on the Initial Proposals |

| | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| 2010 | Part 2 – Initial Proposals | |
| October 2010 | Stage B5 Part 2 – Initial Proposals | Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects |
| | | Analysis of SA findings and recommendations |
| February 2012 | Stage B3 – Part 3 – draft subm | Predicting the effects of the DPD based on the Final Proposals document |
| February 2012 | Stage B3 – Part 3 – draft subm | Evaluating the effects of the DPD based on the Final Proposals document |
| February 2012 | Stage B3 – Part 3 – draft subm | Considering the ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects |
| | | |
| | Stage C | Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report |
| March 2012 | Stage C1 | Preparing the SA Report |
| | Stage D | Consulting on the Final Proposals document and SA Report |
| March 2012 | Stage D1 | Public participation on Final Proposals and the SA Report |
| June 2012 | Stage D2(i) | Appraising significant changes |
| February 2013 | Stage D2(ii) | Appraising significant changes resulting from representations (following Examination and receipt of Inspectors report) |
| February 2013 | Stage D3 | Making decisions and providing information |

| | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| May 2013 | | Prepare Sustainability Statement as part of Adoption Statement |
| | Stage E | Monitoring implementation of the plan |
| | Stage E1 | Finalising aims and methods for monitoring |
| | Stage E2 | Responding to adverse effects |

This report effectively summarises progress and findings for stage B3 – B5 (Part 2) of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The appraisal process has identified and recommended options as well as changes that could improve policy development and its potential impacts. The changes suggested are expected to be considered through drafting of the Development Sites Initial Proposals document. The appraisal of the Initial Proposals document will commence in Summer 2010.

5. Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations

Strategic Environmental Assessment is derived from European Directive 2001/42/EC and concentrates on the environmental aspects of a plan. As noted earlier in this report, Sustainability Appraisal is a requirement of Section 39(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and encompasses social and economic considerations, as well as the environmental factors considered by Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Whilst the requirement to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are separate and distinct, there is a considerable degree of overlap and it is possible to satisfy both through a single appraisal process, in this case a Sustainability Appraisal.

Table 2 ‘Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive Requirements’ indicates where the particular requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessments are addressed within the body of this document and in previous reporting.

Table 2 – SEA Directive Requirements

| SEA Directive Requirements | Where the requirements have been addressed |
|--|---|
| Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely | As part of this report. |

| | |
|---|---|
| significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Art. 5 and Annex I): | |
| a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes; | Section 'Introduction' above. |
| b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme; | Section 'Task A2: Review of Baseline Data' |
| c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected; | Section 'Task A2: Review of Baseline Data' |
| d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC; | Sections 'Task A1 & A2 and Appendices 1 & 2 |
| e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the ways those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation; | Section 'Task A1' & 'Appendix 1' |
| f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects could include secondary, cumulative, | This report, and through Commentary Reports accompanying each iteration of the DPD. |

| | |
|--|---|
| synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects); | |
| g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme; | This report, and through Commentary Reports accompanying each iteration of the DPD. |
| h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information; | This report, and through Commentary Reports accompanying each iteration of the DPD. |
| i) A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10; | See section 'Monitoring' |
| j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings. | Non Technical Executive Summary version of this report. |
| The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2). | This report. |
| <p>Consultation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the environmental (Art. 5.4). 2. Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SA Scoping Report, March 2009 2. Iterative SA Reporting Programme published for public consultation and sent to Statutory consultees, (including this report) 3. N/A |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2).</p> <p>3. Other EU Member states, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art. 7).</p> | |
| <p>Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision making (Art. 8)</p> | <p>Addressed in each iteration of the Development Plan Document.</p> |
| <p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Art. 7 shall be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan or programme as adopted; - A statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report pursuant to Article 5, the options expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Article 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and - The measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9 and 10). | <p>To be addressed at a later stage in the process.</p> |
| <p>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10)</p> | <p>To be addressed at a later stage in the process.</p> |

6. Habitat Directive Assessment

Alongside the SA process, a screening assessment must be undertaken to determine whether or not there is a need to undertake a Habitat Directive Assessment (HDA), also known as an Appropriate Assessment (AA). This is in accordance with Article 6(3) and (4) of the European Communities (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ('Habitat Directive'). The EU Habitat Directive and Birds Directive are implemented in the UK through the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 (as amended).

The Screening Assessment identifies whether the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on European designated conservation sites, either alone or cumulatively. Such designated sites include Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas for Conservation (SACs) and Ramsar sites (wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar convention). If it is unlikely that the plan or project will have a significant effect upon these sites, then there is no need to proceed to an AA.

If however it is considered likely that there will be significant effects on the designated sites, an AA must be undertaken. The AA will then determine whether or not the plan or project (either alone or cumulatively) will lead to an adverse impact on the site's integrity. Mitigation and alternative measures may be adopted if it is determined that the plan or project is likely to significantly impact upon the site.

There are no European sites that fall within the Ealing Borough boundary. However, recognising that the plans being prepared by the Council, may influence European sites in neighbouring boroughs, sites will be scoped into the study if they occur either wholly or partly within 10km of the borough boundary. In this regard the following sites will be considered:

- Ramsar site / Special Protection Area: South West London Waterbodies.
- Special Conservation Areas: Richmond Park & Wimbledon Common.

The Scoping Report for the Development Strategy Final Proposals found that there would be no significant impacts as a result of the Development Strategy. The full report was published for consultation in September 2010. An annex to the report will be published to screen other relevant DPD's at the Final Proposals stage.

7. Consultation

As required by the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive (Article 6(2)), the SA Scoping Report was referred to the four Consultation Bodies with environmental responsibilities namely, the Countryside Agency and English Nature (now both part of Natural England), English Heritage, and the Environment Agency, in January 2006.

Comments were received in response to this consultation. These responses resulted in a number of changes to the SA Framework for the Development Plan Documents. This input has been particularly useful in updating the baseline data and in refining the SA Objectives. Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency will be consulted on all forthcoming stages of the SA process.

This report accompanies the Development Sites Initial Proposals document. Ealing Council welcomes your views on any aspects of this report. In particular the following questions are asked:

- Are there any significant effects that were not identified?
- Has the sustainability appraisal process been carried out in a clear and understandable way?

Following public consultation, responses will be considered in informing later stages of the document.

8. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

The establishment of SA Objectives and criteria is central to the SA process. The SA Framework, based on these Objectives, provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, analysed and compared.

The SA Scoping Report for the Development Plan Documents, issued for consultation in January 2006, identified environmental, social and economic objectives contained in other relevant plans, policies and programmes, and baseline information on environmental, social and economic characteristics of the Borough. The review of plans and programmes of relevance to the Development Plan Documents and the collection of baseline information helps to identify the issues which the DPD's need to

address and enabled a robust appraisal of their significant effects. The Scoping Report also identified key sustainability issues affecting the borough and sets out the framework for the SA including objectives, criteria and indicators.

In particular, comments were received from statutory consultees, who identified new plans, policies and programmes and further sources of baseline data. Further updates were also made following the subsequent publication of the SA report for various Supplementary Planning Documents & the Scoping Report for the Development Management DPD, which broadly adopted the same SA Objectives.

The SA Objectives set out in Table 3 below were developed in response to the key sustainability issues identified through the scoping process, and were subsequently refined following consultation on the Strategy and Sites SA Scoping Report in January 2006. In particular, the SA Objective relating to open space and nature conservation was split into two separate objectives, as it was felt that these topics were distinct and broad enough to require consideration in their own right. In respect of SA Objective 11, a new reference was also added regarding the need to minimise flood risk. It was also requested that this objective be separated into two issues – ‘water quality’ and ‘water resources’. Whilst it was acknowledged that ‘water quality’, ‘water conservation’ and ‘flood risk’ are distinct issues, they each fall under the common heading of the water environment. For this reason these issues have been consolidated under a single objective. It was also considered appropriate to limit the objectives to a manageable number, in order to aid an already complex appraisal process and accord with Government guidance. Since the publication of the Scoping Report in January 2006 further updates to the baseline data and a review of the plans, policies and programmes were completed.

Table 3 – Refined Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

| Refined SA Objectives | | |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| No. | Objective | Type of Objective |
| 1 | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Social |
| 2 | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Social |
| 3 | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Environmental/Social |
| 4 | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Social |
| 5 | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Environmental |
| 6 | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Social |

| | | |
|----|--|-----------------|
| 7 | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Social |
| 8 | Protect and enhance open space | Environmental |
| 9 | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Environmental |
| 10 | Improve air quality | Environmental |
| 11 | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Environmental |
| 12 | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Environmental |
| 13 | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse / remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Environmental |
| 14 | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Environmental |
| 15 | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Environmental |
| 16 | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Economic |
| 17 | Support sustainable economic growth | Economic |
| 18 | Improve opportunities for education and training | Social/Economic |
| 19 | Promote cultural and community identity | Social |

9. Local Development Framework Objective Appraisals

To ensure the LDF objectives, which structure the content of the Development Management DPD, are in accordance with sustainability principles, the LDF objectives are tested against the SA objectives by way of compatibility matrices set out in table 4 below. Where compatibility issues or contradictions have been identified, consideration has been given to the need to refine the LDF objectives to minimise such conflicts.

The results in table 4 highlight that the compatibility test did identify some potential areas of conflict with the SA objectives. In particular, likely conflicts were identified between many of the environmental objectives (relating to air quality, open space, biodiversity, detrimental noise impacts, climate change and water resources, flooding, waste and sustainable transport) and LDF

objectives 4 and 9 ('Ensuring sufficient, high quality accommodation for all Ealing's residents' and 'Achieving and sustaining prosperity for communities and businesses across Ealing' respectively). The appraisal also identified a potential incompatibility between LDF Objective 9 and SA Objective 3 (Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage). Notwithstanding these areas of conflict, it was not considered necessary to refine the LDF objectives further at this stage. Where potential conflicts arose, consideration was given to ways in which these potential sources of conflict could be avoided or mitigated through the drafting of the Development Plan Documents.

The objectives of the Development Management Document have been tested against the sustainability objectives by means of a compatibility matrix to identify both potential synergies and inconsistencies. The matrix (Table 4) presents the results of considering each of the objectives against each of the sustainability objectives sequentially.

Table 4 – LDF Objectives Appraisal Matrix

| Key | |
|-----|-------------------|
| + | Compatible |
| x | Incompatible |
| ? | Possible conflict |
| 0 | No links |

| LDF Objective | Sustainability Appraisal Objective | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse / remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| 1 Promoting exemplary design which | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | + | ? | ? | + | 0 | + | 0 | + |

Table 4 - LDF Objectives Appraisal Matrix

| | | Sustainability Appraisal Objective | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| LDF Objective | | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse / remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| 1 | gives proper respect to Ealing's heritage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Maximising the benefits of Ealing's green space for people and wildlife | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | + |
| 3 | Encouraging a cleaner, greener environment for Ealing through careful use of energy and resources | ? | + | ? | 0 | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | 0 | + |
| 4 | Ensuring sufficient, high quality accommodation for all Ealing's residents | ? | + | ? | + | x | + | + | x | X | x | x | x | + | x | x | + | + | 0 | + |
| 5 | Creating sustainable, safe and convenient transport networks for people and freight, to and through Ealing | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Placing Ealing at the heart of West London's cultural, sports and leisure activity | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | ? | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7 | Designing out | + | + | ? | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | + |

Table 4 - LDF Objectives Appraisal Matrix

| | | Sustainability Appraisal Objective | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| LDF Objective | | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse / remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| | crime and making Ealing's environment safe, attractive and accessible for all | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Encouraging a healthy and independent population in Ealing | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | ? | ? | 0 | ? | ? | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + |
| 9 | Achieving and sustaining prosperity for communities and businesses across Ealing | + | + | x | 0 | x | 0 | + | x | X | x | x | x | + | x | ? | + | + | + | ? |
| 10 | Making Ealing a great place for young people and children to grow up | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |

Commentary on LDF Objectives Appraisal Matrix

| LDF Objective | | Comments |
|---------------|--|--|
| 1 | Promoting exemplary design which gives proper respect to Ealing's heritage | Good practice in sustainable design will help protect local character and the historic environment and provide economic, social and environmental benefits. Exemplary design should contribute to new/improved open space and consequently may help to increase biodiversity by providing additional habitat, however, improvements to recreational open space which result in a reduced area of natural habitat could harm the natural environment. Sustainable new developments, appropriately located, will help to minimise the environmental effects of increased development within the borough. The enhancement and reuse of existing buildings and previously used land is preferable in environmental terms to new build, |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | due to its increased resource efficiency, and this should be reflected in the design of sustainable new developments in the borough. |
| 2 | Maximising the benefits of Ealing's green space for people and wildlife | Improving accessibility to good quality open space provides health, well being and social benefits to the whole community. Protecting and enhancing recreational open space along with nature conservation areas to provide well connected Green Infrastructure will also provide natural habitat for biodiversity, flood mitigation, green routes to encourage walking and cycling, an educational resource, and an attractive environment to encourage economic prosperity and community identity. The design of open space must be carefully considered in order to minimise crime and the fear of crime. Conflicts may arise in the provision of new development for housing, business and community facilities, where these may impact on the area or quality of the borough's green space. |
| 3 | Encouraging a cleaner, greener environment for Ealing through careful use of energy and resources | Minimising resource use and increasing the reuse and recycling of resources are key to the sustainable development of the borough. Efficient use of resources is economically and environmentally sound, whilst promoting reuse and recycling at the domestic level also helps to enhance community identity through community schemes and education. Where it leads to increased development, improving accessibility to community facilities, jobs and housing may conflict with increasing resource efficiency. The historic environment may also be degraded by the adaptation of heritage buildings for other uses, if these uses are not appropriate and sympathetic to the historic fabric. |
| 4 | Ensuring sufficient, high quality accommodation for all Ealing's residents | The provision of sufficient, well located, appropriate, good quality and affordable housing stock for Ealing's growing population is essential to maintain healthy vibrant communities in the borough and provide a local workforce to sustain the borough's economic growth and minimise travel to and from work etc.. However, this is likely to require new build and may increase population, potentially conflicting with sustainability objectives relating to the protection of open space and the natural environment, and is likely to increase contributions to climate change, pollution and flood risk. There will also be increased requirements for essential community / health facilities, car use and pressure on all resources, although provision of housing close to transport hubs and places of work may help to reduce car use. |
| 5 | Creating sustainable, safe and convenient transport networks for people and freight, to and through Ealing | Measures to increase the use of sustainable modes of transport would have wide ranging economic, social and environmental benefits. Lower levels of pollution would help to reduce impacts on climate change and health and noise impacts would be reduced. The promotion of active forms of transport would also improve health, reduce congestion and potentially reduce the number of road traffic accidents. The provision of cycleways and footpaths would help to expand the borough's Green Infrastructure. Improved access between communities would also help to reduce social exclusion within the borough. |
| 6 | Placing Ealing at the heart of West London's cultural, sports and leisure activity | The provision of community facilities, accessible to everyone, would provide social and health benefits for the borough and the promotion of recreational facilities is likely to include open space provision, which may also provide natural habitat to increase biodiversity, and provide flood mitigation. The historic environment is also likely to be protected and its accessibility enhanced under this objective. The provision of community facilities close to people's homes would reduce the need to travel and associated negative impacts. Community facilities are also a vital educational resource. However, the provision of new facilities or enhancement of existing recreational areas may lead to an overall loss of green space. |
| 7 | Designing out crime and making Ealing's environment safe, attractive and accessible for all | Through 'designing out crime' in new developments, actual crime levels can be reduced, and the fear/perception of crime which impacts on many people's day-to-day lives, can be minimised. This will help to create cohesive communities throughout the borough and make places more accessible by public transport, cycle and on foot, resulting in fewer journeys by car and therefore reducing the associated negative impacts of car travel. Crime detracts from the attractiveness and economic prosperity of an area, and is associated with economic decline. Reducing crime should therefore contribute to a healthy economy for the borough. Measures to reduce crime may impact on the historic environment, and in this regard sensitive design would be needed to ensure that the historic fabric is not harmed. |
| 8 | Encouraging a healthy and independent population in Ealing | Social inclusion is key in creating sustainable communities. By improving accessibility to essential services, health and other social inequalities would be reduced, with positive impacts on the community as a whole, including improved health, independence, education and employment prospects, reduced crime levels and increased community cohesion. However, this objective may lead to development with associated negative impacts on environmental sustainability. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 9 | Achieving and sustaining prosperity for communities and businesses across Ealing | Maintaining economic growth and prosperity is essential for the sustainable future of Ealing. To achieve this, there must be development appropriate to the needs of existing businesses in the borough, and to attract new businesses. Appropriate employment and other business related development in town centres would have social benefits, as it would help to meet local needs, including through the use of legal agreements, reduce the need to travel for local services, and also ensure economic growth. However, it may have negative impacts, particularly on environmental sustainability due to increased use of resources and transport requirements. There may also be negative effects on the historic environment as existing buildings may be unsuitable for business use and need to be replaced. |
| 10 | Making Ealing a great place for young people and children to grow up | Maximising opportunities for children and young people and creating a suitably safe and attractive environment would have social benefits in promoting inclusion, and improving health, education and employment prospects. Improved facilities of this nature are likely to include the protection and enhancement of the historic and natural environment as important cultural and educational resources. Providing local facilities would reduce the need to travel and encourage walking and cycling. This objective is also likely to lead to reduced levels of crime and antisocial behaviour. However, it could lead to development with the associated negative impacts already discussed. |

10. Identification of Initial Proposals

One of the key requirements of an SA is the identification and consideration of reasonable alternatives to a proposed plan or policy, to enable a comparison of the sustainability impacts of the proposed options for the Strategy. Article 5.1 of the SEA Directive requires that reasonable alternatives are identified, described and evaluated.

Following completion of the SA of the original Issues and Options, and informed by the results of this process, the Council has moved forward in developing Initial Proposals. Whilst many sites have clear emerging proposals (some of which are already subject to planning applications), for several sites, the options are still open at this stage. Where this is the case, the appraisal process can provide an indication as to the most sustainable uses to bring forward. Preferred site uses developed by the SA process will be based on the best way of achieving the Council's overarching sustainability objectives, and coordinating with the Vision and approach in the Development Strategy DPD. Whilst this commentary report will provide indicators as to the most sustainable uses for sites, as well as appraising existing proposals, it provides guidance rather than binding recommendations. There will be several streams of evidence that go forward to inform site use in the future; the SA will be one of these.

11. Appraisal Methodology

The Appraisal of the Development Sites Initial Proposals against the Council’s Sustainability Framework has been conducted using matrices, whereby the impact of the Proposal against the Council’s objectives is scored using the system detailed in Table 5 below.

Table 5 – Options Appraisal Matrices: Key

| Key | |
|-----|----------------|
| ++ | Major Positive |
| + | Minor Positive |
| | No impact |
| - | Minor Negative |
| -- | Major Negative |
| ? | Uncertain |

The matrices are accompanied by a commentary drawing out the key messages from the appraisal, along with a schedule of suggested changes that might mitigate any uncertainties or negative effects, or conversely that might build upon any strengths that have been identified.

The options appraisal matrices set out the results of the appraisal of the initial proposals against each of the 19 SA objectives. The results are presented by initial proposal, and conclusions are drawn as to the overall sustainability of the

individual initial proposal presented with consideration of possible long, short term and some cumulative effects. As part of this process, consideration has also been given to the need for mitigation of negative effects. Mitigation can take a wide range of forms including:

- Changes to the DPD as a whole, including bringing forward new options/initial proposals, or adding or deleting options
- Refining policies in order to improve the likelihood of beneficial effects and to minimise adverse effects
- Technical measures to be applied during the implementation stage

Following the matrices, the findings from the tables are consolidated into a series of headlines. The suggested changes are then drawn together in Recommendations to be taken forward as the DPD progresses. It should be noted however that whilst the SA process does inform the decision making process, it is not the sole decision making tool, and there will be many other factors which also need to be considered in choosing between options and preparing the document.

Workshop sessions were held with members of the Planning Policy Team in appraising each site within the Document. This has strengthened robustness of the appraisal process by encouraging peer discussion and professional scrutiny of site proposals.

Note that these assessments are made, assuming that developments accord with Planning Policy at the local, regional and national level. Nonetheless it is somewhat difficult to judge the effects of a development upon the Councils SA Objectives until the full details of that scheme have been brought forward, either within a Local Development Document, Masterplan or through a Planning Application.

12. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

Since the publication of the 2007 consultation on the Strategy and Sites, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been prepared for the borough in line with PPS25. This document identifies the level of risk from all sources of flooding in the borough including fluvial, tidal, groundwater, overland flows, sewer flooding etc. The data collected as part of the SFRA has been key to the appraisal of site options in the Development Sites document and has allowed a sequential test to be undertaken for options that are particularly vulnerable to flood risk because of the locality in areas of high flood risk probability. The requirement to undertake a sequential test is established in PPS25. PPS25 indicates that the sequential test should be applied when allocating land for development. This is therefore particularly relevant to the preparation of the site allocations DPD. The test is applied to demonstrate that there are no reasonably available sites in areas with a lower probability of flooding that would be appropriate to the type of development or land use proposed. In Ealing the application of the sequential test has been undertaken as part of the wider SA process. Fortunately a large proportion of Ealing is located within zone 1 (low probability) in terms of fluvial (river) flood risk, with only the River Brent being the significant source of fluvial flood risk in the borough (which itself is already protected through various open space designations). Accordingly, the number of sites which are identified in the sites DPD which fall within zones 2 or 3/3b are small. The table below summarises the findings of the sequential test for each of the sites. The findings of which will inform the development of the final proposals for these sites.

Table 6 - Sites with significant flood risk

| | Sites Identified for Potential Future Development | Flood Zones (Appendix C of this Volume for Flood Zones overview mapping) | Actual Risk <i>The risk that has been estimated based on a qualitative assessment of the performance capability of the existing flood defences</i> <i>(see Volume 2, Appendix D)</i> | Residual Risk <i>Flood risks resulting from an event more severe than for which particular flood defences have been designed to provide protection.</i> <i>(see Volume 2, Appendix D)</i> | Other sources of flood risk <i>(see Figures ii and iii, Appendix D of this Volume for summary mapping, and Volume 2 for more detailed mapping)</i> | Additional comments |
|-------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| GRE05 | <p>Greenford Depot, Greenford Road</p> <p>The site has been identified for development in line with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed use with employment / environmental / waste / recycling (to remain as Council's (and contractors') principal depot for recycling and reuse. Should accommodate proposals by the West London Waste Authority Subject to review following ELR | <p>The Site is currently located in EA Flood Zone 1, however the site does straddle the boundary of a 1 in 20year functional floodplain</p> <p>The site is adjacent to EA Flood Warning Area</p> | <p>Section of site border straddles area identified as 1 in 100 year risk with 20% climate change.</p> | <p>Small isolated pocket on the site adjacent to depot is identified as Residual Risk – 1 in 1000 year undefended.</p> | <p>No risk of sewer flooding identified.</p> <p>Western boundary of site is recorded as being at high groundwater risk. The northern half of the site at Medium risk of groundwater flooding. The remainder of the site is recorded as being at low risk of groundwater flooding.</p> | <p>If and when appropriate, an FRA should be carried out. It may be that certain developments should not be permitted on the site.</p> |
| ACT06 | <p>Colonial Drive / 2 Bollo Lane</p> <p>The site has been identified for development in line with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential led mixed use with employment Should not prejudice the proposed pedestrian footbridge directly to the north of the site to link Chiswick Park to Bollo Lane Subject to review following the ELR | <p>Small portion of site to east, bordering Gunnersbury Triangle Nature Reserve, crosses into EA Flood Zone 2/3</p> | <p>None identified</p> | <p>None identified</p> | <p>Site is within an area where 4 properties were flooded by foul water sewers, 2 properties by surface water sewers and 8 properties from combined sources (1997 – 2007).</p> <p>Site includes medium and high risk areas for groundwater flooding.</p> | <p>If and when appropriate, an FRA should be carried out. It may be that certain developments should not be permitted on the site.</p> |

| | Sites Identified for Potential Future Development | Flood Zones (Appendix C of this Volume for Flood Zones overview mapping) | Actual Risk <i>The risk that has been estimated based on a qualitative assessment of the performance capability of the existing flood defences</i> <i>(see Volume 2, Appendix D)</i> | Residual Risk <i>Flood risks resulting from an event more severe than for which particular flood defences have been designed to provide protection.</i> <i>(see Volume 2, Appendix D)</i> | Other sources of flood risk <i>(see Figures ii and iii, Appendix D of this Volume for summary mapping, and Volume 2 for more detailed mapping)</i> | Additional comments |
|-------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| GRE07 | <p>Former GSK Sports Ground</p> <p>The site has been identified for development in line with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and sports • Improvements are needed for pedestrian access to the west of the site, from the A40 underpass, the parade at Oldfield Lane North, as well as traffic calming measures and improved cycle access over the canal. | <p>Eastern pocket of the site includes land designated as EA Flood Zone 2, also with Historic Flooding</p> <p>The site is within EA Flood Warning Area</p> | None identified | None identified | <p>No risk of sewer flooding identified.</p> <p>Site is largely low groundwater risk, with a small area to the east of the site medium risk, and two pockets straddling high risk areas.</p> | If and when appropriate, an FRA should be carried out. It may be that certain developments should not be permitted on the site. |
| HAN02 | <p>Hanwell Locks</p> <p>The site has been identified for development in line with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed use residential and employment • Subject to review following ELR | <p>Site includes land designated as EA Flood Zones 2 and 3. A section of the site adjacent to the river bank is also a part of the 1 in 20 year functional floodplain</p> <p>The site is within EA Flood Warning Area</p> | Site includes areas of actual risk – 1 in 100 year defended along with 1 in 100 year with 20% climate change. | Portion of site includes area of residual risk – 1 in 1000 year undefended. | <p>No risk of sewer flooding identified.</p> <p>Site includes areas of high medium and low groundwater risk.</p> | If and when appropriate, an FRA should be carried out. It may be that certain developments should not be permitted on the site. |
| PER01 | <p>Perivale Park Sports Village</p> <p>The site has been identified for development in line with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports Village incorporating athletics field and existing pitches with new golf range and junior golf development centre with replacement 50m Gurnell Pool. | <p>Site includes large areas of flood risk including EA Zones 2 and 3, and 1 in 20 year functional floodplain.</p> <p>The site is within EA Flood Warning Area</p> | Site includes areas of actual risk – 1 in 100 year defended along with 1 in 100 year with 20% climate change. | Site includes area of residual risk – 1 in 1000 year undefended. | <p>No risk of sewer flooding identified.</p> <p>Site is largely high groundwater risk.</p> | If and when appropriate, an FRA should be carried out. It may be that certain developments should not be permitted on the site. |

13. Uncertainties, Limitations and Assumptions

The Sustainability Appraisal process provides a useful tool in identifying issues and suggesting possible forms of mitigation. It tests the performance and robustness of policies against the Council's Sustainability Objectives. However there are a number of uncertainties and limitations that exist in the Sustainability Appraisal process, which are summarised below:

- In a number of cases, indicators have been identified despite there being no baseline data currently available with which to establish trends or measure effects. It was not always possible to predict effects on the basis of qualitative data.
- When appraising options, there is a risk that officers may make their own assumptions about the possible effects arising from a particular option. However, consultation on the SA Report is seen as adding value in allowing 'experts' and interested stakeholders to review the effects identified.
- Difficulties have been identified in respect of predicting the impact of the Strategy in the long term, which has further complicated the process of accurately appraising the sustainability of the proposals.
- Difficulties associated with and distinguishing between and separating out the influence of the Development Plan Document from other external factors. For example whilst the predicted trends for a particular baseline indicator may suggest that the situation is worsening overtime, possibly because of various factors beyond the control of the DPD, the DPD itself may still have a positive influence.
- Some uncertainty is present as a result of the lack of specificity of several of the Initial Proposals.

14. Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Sites Initial Proposals

Document Structure, Methodology and Approach

To ensure that the Councils Sustainability Objectives are appropriately considered through the site appraisal process, the economic, social and environmental opportunities or constraints relating to each site could be elaborated. This SA report attempts to address these areas in appraising each site and it is recommended that this element of the analysis be taken forward for presentation in the subsequent iteration of the document.

Expand checklist / options explored to incorporate broader range of criteria e.g. heritage issues and also SA objectives.

Appraisal of Specific Sites

The matrices analyse the sustainability of the Development Sites Initial Proposals. The full list of Headlines and Recommendations drawn from the matrices can be found in the following chapters.

Note that the 'extra' sites (pre-fix 'X' on the site code) have not been appraised, as at this stage proposals have not yet been developed for the sites.

Acton

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|----------------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| ACT01 | + | +/? | + | Expanded school provision Possibility for CHP Energy | Flood Zone 1 | Potential for onsite renewable / sustainable energy should be explored. (E.g. CHP)? Open Space |
| | High affordable housing figure will deliver higher building standards. High allotment demand. | Phasing of development may cause some displacement in community. New school would be very positive and could help to meet existing shortfalls in provision. | Mixed-use town centre development will be key in contributing towards economic sustainability of the Borough. | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|----------------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| ACT02 | + | + | + | Leisure, retail facilities would be gained through proposed scheme. Loss of car park. | Flood Zone 1 | Tree screen / relationship with burial ground. Heritage issues (conservation). |
| | Improvements to street scene and shop frontages are required. SA Objective 13 should be impacted upon positively by development. Conservation area to South West (requires design consideration in relation to tall buildings). | Increase in residential units. Mixed use would have a variety of positive impacts but would require sensitive design in order to minimise issues around noise. | Centre – high street frontage – viability to retain. Positive impacts on objectives 16 and 17. | | | |
| ACT03 | +/? | + | + | Loss of employment land, although education and other proposals may re-balance. | Flood Zone 1, | Constraints to North and East of site. Locally listed building on site. |
| | Noise and vibration issues from railway. Optimise use and design of high street frontage. Interaction of spatial policy. Buffer required? | 200 Residential units to be developed. Proposal scores strongly against objectives 6, 13, 15 and 17. | Excellent transport links adjacent to Station. | | | |
| ACT04 | +/? | + | + | Swimming bath and community facilities may be moved around (will this have implications?) Mixed use residential and office | Flood Zone 1 | Site forms part of an SPD on Acton Town Centre. See July Cabinet Report; (is there an associated equalities impact assessment available?) |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | High street frontage. The baths are a locally listed heritage asset. (Of which the internal space is integral to the character of the building). Development that proceeds should be sensitive to this. | Residential, pool and community facilities. Proposed school would have positive local impacts, and should make use of pool and other facilities, which are developed as part of a scheme. | Office development would have positive economic impacts | should be positive for developing the local community and economic prosperity. English Heritage should be consulted throughout the course of this scheme. | | |
| ACT05 | ?-/ | + | + | Gain in retail services. | Flood Zone 1 | Unclear relationship with existing centre. Consultation delayed at present. |
| | High intensity of development and minimum open space provision. Development will require sensitive relationship with the road. (I.e. Noise) | Residential development is positive for the Councils Social SA Objectives | Retail and Office contributes positively to economic objectives. | | | |
| ACT06 | +/? | ?-/ | + | Will there be loss of employment land? Residential units gained; however can a suitable environment be created for | Small portion of site to east, bordering Gunnersbury Triangle Nature | Subject to ELR recommendations |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Noise and vibration from railway lines. Nature reserve is adjacent. | Isolated site, with access issues. | As a major employment location, the site should contribute to the sustainable economic development of the Borough. | people to live in? Pedestrian foot bridge links communities. | Reserve, crosses into EA Flood Zone 2/3 | |
| ACT07 | ? | +/? | + | Boundary? (Wider development) | Flood Zone 1 | Enhancement as a centre 'hub'. There is the possibility for building its transportation function. |
| | Noise and vibration issues from railway. Air Quality? Green Corridor SINC Sites should be protected. Should reduce vehicular dependency. | Some of site to be given over to residential. Sustainable location. Accessibility issues to Station from road? | Cross Rail could bring redevelopment funding and positive impacts on economic development. | | | |
| ACT08 | ? | +/? | ? | Loss of employment site, gain in housing. | Flood Zone 1 | Residential would require noise mitigation. Site proposals are subject to review in light of ELR recommendations. |
| | Residential development should be sensitive to potential noise and vibration issues. Air Quality? However positive in encouraging alternative transport modes. | Accessibility of site? Further residential provision is positive. | Will the loss of a UDP employment site be detrimental on the local economy? | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|----------------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| ACT09 | ?/- | + | ? | Housing development is proposed. | Flood Zone 1 | Negative environmental effects from waste facilities would require sensitive design. |
| | SA Indicators may be impacted upon negatively if unsuitable waste transfer processes are in too closer proximity to proposed residential development. (Particularly SA Objectives 5 & 10) | Residential development would be positive on some of the councils social objectives. | The retention of waste transfer facilities | | | |
| ACT10 | ? | ? | ?/+ | Aim to develop child play and public accessible open space. (As there is identified deficiency in this area). | Flood Zone 1 | Western Avenue Sites 'A-M' are appraised as a whole. Links to open space and Green Infrastructure; the Green Corridor could be enhanced through development schemes. This might mitigate some of the negative environmental effects associated with the proximity to the highway. |
| | Noise and vibration issues as sites straddle the Western Avenue. Air Quality issues (SA Objective 10). Safety concerns, especially for the young, elderly and less physically able. | Development would increase housing provision. | It is proposed that the Southern Gateway sites be used primarily for commercial development. | | | |
| ACT11 | ? | ? | + | Proposed scheme would entail the loss of a community centre (will there be a local | Flood Zone 1 | If demand still exists for a community centre then new development should allow for a degree of community use on site if this is |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA (EA) Flood Zone | Comments, Mitigation measures, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|----------------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Minor potential noise issues for residents from intensification of school site. | The proposed scheme would have mixed impacts upon the Councils Social SA Objectives, if the community centre were to be lost. | Minor positive; development may create jobs. | replacement?) and the gain of a local primary school. | | possible. |

Ealing

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL01 | +/? | ? | +/? | New development will provide low rent business enterprise start up units. A gym, energy centre and café will also be provided. Green space improvements are unclear? | Flood Zone 1 | Design issues require sensitivity, particularly in relation to the interface between tall buildings and surrounding residential streets. |
| | Design issues School on site. Redevelopment should address poor environment in order to meet SA Objectives. | Social impacts of population dispersion could be negative. Current issues around crime and prostitution need to be addressed. Importance of design. Mixed tenure attempt to create a more mixed community. | Potentially positive impacts in improving attractiveness of the area, and in providing enterprise units for residents. | | | |
| EAL02 | ? | +/? | +/? | Planned development would deliver an increase in housing units. | Flood Zone 1 | Low PTAL; this could be addressed to improve the sustainability of any new development. Development could further address |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Potential characterisation issues, e.g. design of development, if negative impact upon SA Objective 3 is to be minimised. (Site is adjacent to conservation area). | Increase in provision of residential units, and of type and tenure, would be potentially positive on SA Social Objectives, providing design is given appropriate consideration. | Improvements in environmental sustainability would be likely to have reciprocal economic benefits. | | | economic aspects. Enterprise units could be developed as for site EAL01. It should also be ensured that such schemes focus on the human aspects of regeneration, along with the physical built form, in order to successfully deliver the Councils Sustainability Objectives. |
| EAL03 | +/? | +/? | +/? | Associated public realm improvements. Site is in close proximity to a future Crossrail station. | Flood Zone 1 | PTAL 3. Design and permeability issues. This is a particular issues for housing regeneration sites, which were often poorly designed. |
| | Adjacent allotments are a valuable asset for the local community. Design issues are important here in meeting the Councils SA Objectives. | Housing regeneration will provide additional units and improve quality of existing stock. Benefits for all residents should be delivered, providing adequate resources are channelled towards the community as well as the built environment. It is vital that both of these areas are addressed. | Adjacent to West Ealing and close to Northfields tube | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL04 | ? | + | + | Loss of car park, however significant gains in facilities, services and local housing. | Flood Zone 1 | On a development of this scale, will opportunities for incorporation of renewable energy technologies be maximised? Has sufficient attention been paid to the quality of design and the use of public space? |
| | Conservation area, frontages of heritage value. (Will these frontages be retained?) Church is 2* listed; design should respect this. Noise vibration issues from railway require attention. | Sustainable location should provide a wide range of social facilities, and help to promote a strong cultural and community identity for Ealing Centre. Good transport links. | Mixed use development should have positive impacts on the local economy, also providing a range of local employment opportunities. | | | |
| EAL05 | ? | + | + | The will be added demand on existing infrastructure from new development at higher densities. New development would provide a range of services and facilities for the centre. | Flood Zone 1 | Inspector refused scheme due to tall buildings. Good location and high PTAL. Importance of site in developing the cultural offer and economic vitality of the Metropolitan Centre. It would be more environmentally advantageous if new developments were to limit new car owners. |
| | Relationship with railway line (potential noise and vibration will require high building standards and sensitive design), and relationship with conservation areas, including Haven Green. Green Corridor along railway line. | Proposed scheme will deliver additional residential units and a range of facilities and services. Good public transport links. | Retail, and office development will be positive for the economy and create a variety of local employment opportunities. | | | |
| EAL06 | ? | + | + | Increase in residential, leisure, retail and office floorspace. | Flood Zone 1 | It is anticipated that the site be delivered towards the end of the plan period. Energy links and demands (possibilities for a district |
| | | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|---|---|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Buildings within this site are locally listed. Some noise, vibration and air quality issues due to the proximity of the Uxbridge Road. | Development should increase pedestrian access and permeability between Ealing Centre sites. | Mixed use offices, leisure and retail should provide additional employment opportunities and sustain the economic vitality of the centre. | | | heating network). Transport and Infrastructure demands. |
| EAL07 | ? | + | + | New Cross Rail hub with enhanced PTAL. Step free access. | Flood Zone 1 | Should ensure design is joined with Arcadia, and that possibilities for community space and public areas are optimised within the development of the station area. |
| | The site is adjacent to a conservation area, and the Railway Green Corridor | Development should have a positive impact on the Councils Social SA Objectives. | Proposed transport interchange on Haven Green including a new Bus Station. | | | |
| EAL08 | ? | + | + | Increase in residential, leisure, retail and office floorspace. | Flood Zone 1 | Any scheme should respect the street frontage. |
| | Conservation Area. This site is also adjacent to locally listed buildings, along with buildings of façade or group value. | Gain in residential units, with a range of local facilities to be provided. | Development proposed would have a positive impact upon the local economy. | | | |
| EAL09 | ? | + | + | Gain in office, retail and potential community uses, | Flood Zone 1 | The scheme should take advantage of the 'boulevard' aspect of the design of Uxbridge |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Locally listed fire station is adjacent to this site. (SA Objective 3) | Gain in residential units would be positive. (SA Objective 6) Site has good public transport links | Currently employment land. Any development here will retain the existing office floorspace offer. Employment; (the site is key in linking the two centres). | | | Road. |
| EAL10 | ? | + | + | Potential loss of car park. Will the Public House and Community Hall be retained? | Flood Zone 1 | Loss of the hall and public house on this site would be detrimental. Ideally new development would incorporate replacement facilities. |
| | Frontage of car park requires design consideration. Buildings of façade value within this development site. | New flats developed. | Retail. Job creation. | | | |
| EAL11 | ? | + | + | Underused site. Link to Paddington through Cross Rail. | Flood Zone 1 | Several different site owners. Part of a Metropolitan Centre but largely residential in character. |
| | The site requires sensitive design consideration. Green Corridor. | Development should be sensitive to residential setting; mixed use could provide increased services and facilities. | Within Metropolitan Centre. Mixed use will compliment station location. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL12 | ? | + | +/? | Increased housing provision. | Flood Zone 1 | Owned by Notting Hill Housing Trust. |
| | Opposite Open Space Historic Building is adjacent. Church is listed. | Lane here closed. Residential development is proposed | Improvements in the social and environmental sustainability of the area could have positive impacts on economic prospects | | | |
| EAL13 | ? | +/? | + | Adjacent to residential and listed building | Flood Zone 1 | How will site interact with railway green corridor? |
| | Noise and vibration from rail. | PTAL 2? No bus services. Housing is proposed on site. | Currently light industrial proposed. | | | |
| EAL14 | +/? | + | + | | Flood Zone 1 | Potential loss to residential. Loss of employment. Ref to ELR and Strategy. |
| | Scale of residential and relationship with surrounding development. Can potentially improve street scene. | Office, residential and restaurants permission from 2007. | TVU, BBC used to occupy. Mixed uses proposed. Design and association with Centre Point – same architect. | | | |
| EAL15 | ? | + | +/? | Currently car park and servicing. | Flood Zone 1 | Relationship with surrounding residential. |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Half of site is in a Conservation Area, with business uses. | Permission for Residential. Site of archaeological interest. | Improvements in the social and environmental sustainability of the area could have positive impacts on economic prospects | | | |
| EAL16 | ? | ?/+ | ? | | Flood Zone 1 | Residential historically proposed. Will be subject to review following ELR findings. |
| | Noise / with rail vandalism on trains. Adjacent green corridor | Access – boundary? However good access to public transport and scheme will provide additional housing. | Currently office. PTAL 2. No gain in office space, however development may provide opportunity for improvements. | | | |
| EAL17 | +/? | + | ++ | Gain – leisure opportunity. Hotel being developed. | Flood Zone 1 | Cultural Quarter should be promoted, incorporating Questors, Cinema, Ealing Studios etc. This is a key heritage site in Ealing and should be a central focus for its redevelopment in the future. Locally listed buildings, with façade value. Town Centre and Ealing Green Conservation Area. Architectural interest. Ealing Green MOL (linked with Walpole Park). |
| | Permeability between sites will be important. Comprehensive redevelopment is proposed. | Leisure and Town Centre uses will be positive for SA Objective 1. | Mixed-use town centre offer will fulfil a range of SA Objectives. | | | |
| EAL18 | ? | + | + | Adjacent to residential street. Part of the site includes a high street frontage. | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Metropolitan centre. Conservation area. | 9 units and retail. | Proposing mixed use, residential, retail. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL19 | + | + | + | Mixed use residential and retail is proposed. | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Frontage. Respect to adjacent residential environment. | | Currently mixed use. | | | |
| EAL20 | ? | + | + | Currently a Council car park. This would be lost. | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Green Corridor along railway line. Noise and vibration issues from railway | An increase in residential units is planned. | Improvements in the social and environmental sustainability of the area could have positive impacts on economic prospects | | | |
| EAL21 | ?/+ | + | + | Mixed use Town Centre. | Flood Zone 1 | Site completely vacant. As a site along the Uxbridge Road 'boulevard', there is significant scope to provide a range of developments to enhance the economic vitality of the area. |
| | Possible increase in traffic and local parking needs. | Increase in local facilities. | To be hotel, offices, restaurant. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL22 | ?/+ | ++ | ++ | Office and retail. | Flood Zone 1 | This is a key site in the heart of Ealing's cultural heritage. Film, cinema and creative industries should be facilitated. Intelligent urban design is required to make best use of this development site. Theatre and design connectivity with Uxbridge road and massive potential to enhance the 'cultural quarter'. |
| | Locally listed buildings on this site require design consideration. Successful regeneration of the site could reinforce a strong design and cultural identity for the Town Centre. The site could also more effectively link Walpole Park to the Uxbridge Road. | Successful redevelopment of the site could offer a range of social and cultural assets for the Borough and the wider sub-region. | The associated economic benefits from development would be significant for the local economy, with potential to attract a range of other investment. | | | |
| EAL23 | ?/+ | ?/+ | ?/+ | Mixed use development | Flood Zone 1 | No planning applications so far. Boulevard frontages. Set back. |
| | Offices at present. Ealing Green Conservation area to South of site. Frontage to Uxbridge Road. | Retail development may include local services / facilities for the community. | Retail and office development could provide local jobs and economic growth. | | | |
| EAL24 | ?/+ | + | ?/+ | Add to viability of centre. | Flood Zone 1 | Mixed-use retail is proposed. Grade 2 listed. |
| | Design should take advantage of frontage to Uxbridge Road | Some residential provision | Mixed use retail and commercial could provide local jobs and economic growth. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL25 | ?/+ | ?/+ | ?/+ | High Street Frontage | Flood Zone 1 | Retail corridor. Planning Permission granted for residential development. |
| | | | High PTAL | | | |
| EAL26 | ?/+ | ?/+ | + | Mixed use. More residential than office. | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | | | Designated shopping frontage. | | | |
| EAL27 | ?/+ | ?/+ | + | Mixed-use retail and offices with residential development on upper storeys. | Flood Zone 1 | Planning permission has been granted for this scheme. |
| | | | Frontage to Uxbridge Road | | | |
| EAL28 | ? | ?/+ | + | Mixed use residential and retail. Potential loss of car park. | Flood Zone 1 | No planning permissions so far on this site. Permeability of site is a major issues to be addressed through any new development. |
| | Façade value | Next to library | | | | |
| EAL29 | ? | ?/+ | + | | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Similar issues to EAL 28. | More residential to be provided in the Centre. | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| EAL30 | ?/+ | + | + | Surgery on site should be retained. | Flood Zone 1 | Planning permission has been granted for mixed use development. |
| | Locally listed building. | Residential – more suggested | | | | |
| EAL31 | ?/+ | + | + | | Flood Zone 1 | Noise from high street. Site is surrounded by roads. Pub? CHECK |
| | The site includes locally listed buildings. | Retail and residential is proposed. | | | | |
| EAL32 | ?/+ | + | + | Development will increase retail and residential provision. | Flood Zone 1 | |
| | Adjacent to Green Man Estate. | Community use on site to be retained. | Shopping frontage. | | | |
| EAL33 | ?/+ | + | ?/+ | School site. Vacant. | Flood Zone 1 | Potential. |
| | Grade 2 listed building on site. | In residential area. Retention of school use is advocated. | | | | |

Greenford

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| GRE01 | +/+ | +/+ | +/+ | Nature reserve proposed. POS boundary to be adjusted. Net increase of 10 units. | Flood Zone 1 | Two high rise blocks with potentially enlarged footprint. Poor quality. |
| | Noise from adjacent rail line. Site requires significant attention in terms of design. | Consequences of moving people may be negative, however there will be obvious positive benefits to the community from estate regeneration. | Providing physical regeneration of housing is accompanied by investment in the community itself, the scheme could help to ensure the positive economic vitality and viability of the area. | | | |
| GRE02 | +/+ | +/+ | +/+ | Additional residential units. | Flood Zone 1 | Outskirts of Town Centre. Community and cultural use potential. Access to open space -retain. |
| | | It is proposed that the community use be retained. | | | | |
| GRE03 | + | + | ? | Open space should be improved if there is an increase in residential units. | Flood Zone 1 | Retain facades, consider local listing if appropriate. Archaeological interest. What might a cultural centre constitute? |
| | Cultural centre proposed. | Increase in housing units is proposed. | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| GRE04 | ?- | ?- | + | Loss of employment land. | Flood Zone 1 | Residential development should aim to improve the relationship with the canal and retain any heritage assets of significance. Cycle and pedestrian improvements should be developed. Canal is site of Met importance for nature conservation. Any tensions between uses? No A1 uses – Greenford Town Centre is some distance away. Would development be required to deliver extra services? (SA Objective 1). |
| | Impacts on Canal? Buildings of heritage value and Canal Conservation; it is unclear how these will be treated in a development scheme. | Potential conflict between residential development and factories | Employment. Good transport links. It is intended that number of employees on site will be retained | | | |
| GRE05 | ? | ? | + | Waste Management; materials are currently bulked on site then sent off elsewhere for processing. More waste management functions are proposed for the site. | The Site is currently located in EA Flood Zone 1, however the site does straddle the boundary of a 1 in 20year functional floodplain The site is adjacent to EA Flood Warning Area | Council owned – waste and recycling. Potential pollution issues. Adjacent to sensitive River Brent; issues over compatibility of uses. |
| | Continue waste and recycling. HGV's – increased use with intensification of site. POS to south. Buffer required. Nature conservation to east of site. | Amenity | Access? Increase site potential? | | | |
| GRE06 | +/? | ++ | + | Education (sport). Increase in capacity | Flood Zone 1 | MOL to east; relationship with depot? Site consolidation – resist loss of playground |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Redevelopment and refurbishment of the school should have positive impacts on the environment, providing that intensification of the site does not lead to traffic issues, air pollution and vehicular dependency. | Redevelopment of the school and its facilities will have a very positive impact on the Council's Social SA Objectives. | High quality schools will provide an educated community, which is an asset to the economy. | | | area. Dual use of gym for the public also. |
| GRE07 | + | ++ | + | Safeguarded education and sport. | Eastern pocket of the site includes land designated as EA Flood Zone 2, also with Historic Flooding The site is within EA Flood Warning Area | Improve pedestrian access and traffic calming. Site is on Green Belt – this should be redesignated as MOL. Currently sports and pavilion. Relationship with adjacent sports ground (NW). |
| | A40 Green Corridor site. Improvements should be positive for the environment, providing that any intensification of uses is managed appropriately. | Education and sports provision is positive for a range of SA Objectives. | South Greenford Mainline in vicinity. | | | |
| GRE08 | ?/+ | ++ | + | Loss of playing fields. | Flood Zone 1 | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-----------|--|--|---|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Redevelopment and refurbishment of the school should have positive impacts on the environment, providing that intensification of the site does not lead to traffic issues, air pollution and vehicular dependency. | Primary School (Significant need in the area). | High quality schools will provide an educated workforce to contribute to the local economy. | | | |

Hanwell

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--------|----------|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| HAN01 | ? | + | + | Planning Permission for residential and offices. Adjacent employment. Any net loss of | Flood Zone 1 | Potential overlooking from commercial uses onto residential properties. |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Insufficient detail to judge environmental impacts. | Provision of additional residential units would be positive for the Councils Social SA Objectives. | Additional office floorspace could be beneficial for the local economy and provide employment opportunities. | jobs? | | |
| HAN02 | +/? | + | ? | Application for residential and employment mixed use has been made. | Site includes land designated as EA Flood Zones 2 and 3. A section of the site adjacent to the river bank is also a part of the 1 in 20 year functional floodplain The site is within EA Flood Warning Area | Potential flooding issues would discourage residential development. |
| | Need for a buffer. Adjacent to canal side conservation. Canal frontage | Additional residential units could be positive in providing housing for local residents. | What scale of loss of employment land will there be? | | | |
| HAN03 | +/? | + | + | Residential dwellings and office space. | Flood Zone 1 | Shop fronts are run down, but have heritage value. Appeal pending |
| | Grade 2 listed building is adjacent. The document refers to this but does not detail how it might be dealt with. | Mixed use development is considered appropriate in a district centre. | Office development could offer local employment opportunities. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| HAN04 | ? | +/? | +/? | Development proposals would provide net additions to retail and office floorspace along with additional residential units. | Flood Zone 1 | Potential for public realm improvements. |
| | Frontage value? Areas have grown out of Town Centres. | Increased housing provision | Mixed use development would be encouraged in town centres | | | |
| HAN05 | ? | +/? | +/? | Retail, office and residential redevelopment. Currently car show room. Mixed use development is encouraged in the Town Centre. | Flood Zone 1 | Opportunity to re-establish street frontage. Adjacent to residential properties. |
| | | Day nursery is opposite. | PTAL 3. On Uxbridge Road | | | |

Northolt

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--------|----------|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| NOR01 | + | + | +/? | 263 increase in residential units | Flood Zone 1 | Mix? Predominantly social housing. Will this be sufficiently integrated? Greenbelt south of |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Scope for park improvements (poor quality at present). | Redevelopment would be positive in providing additional housing for the local community. | Providing physical regeneration of housing is accompanied by investment in the community itself, the scheme could help to ensure the positive economic vitality and viability of the area. | | | site should be considered. Council led housing regeneration. Will there be community uses on site? As part of S106 or SPD will there be plans for 'holistic' regeneration? (E.g. training / local skills). |
| NOR02 | ? | ? | ? | Residential? However demand for primary school. | Flood Zone 1 | Leased by Council |
| | Adjacent to Green Corridor, could a buffer be required? | Additional residential would be positive on SA Objectives. | Improvement in the urban realm could improve potential for local economic investment. | | | |
| NOR03 | ? | ++ | ? | May be scope for extensions. | Flood Zone 1 | Sites on Greenbelt. Nature conservation issues (A40 Corridor). Accessibility 1a-2 |
| | | Extension and refurbishment of the school will be positive on SA Objectives. | Improvement in the urban realm could improve potential for local economic investment. | | | |

Park Royal

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|---------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| PAR01 | ?/+ | ?/+ | + | Plans to improve the transport interchange and the station square to improve facilities and quality of urban design; i.e. permeability. | Flood Zone 1 | <p>Poor quality urban design and hard landscaping. Heavily polluted. High deficiency in public open space and amenity space; the area needs to be considered for improvement as a whole in this respect. Isolated community bounded by roads.</p> <p>Mayor of London Park Royal Opportunity Area. Transition from employment to residential. No net loss.</p> |
| | Quality of environment is an issue. No green space; this requires elaboration. Square would improve environment. | Noise and air pollution issues. Proposals for residential could be positive on social objectives, but depend on the quality and sensitive design of a scheme to mitigate the existing issues on the site. | Proposed Option could be positive for the local economy. | | | |
| PAR01A | ?/+ | +/? | + | Residential and mixed use. Currently derelict / cleared site. | Flood Zone 1 | Corner position and aspect to street frontage offers opportunities for urban design excellence. The proximity of the rail line to the rear of the site may require some noise / vibration mitigation measures. |
| | Relationship with tall buildings. Adjacent to Green Corridors. | Open Space Issues. Residential development could be positive on social objectives. | Mixed use development could be beneficial to the local economy, as well as increasing activity | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|---------------|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| PAR01B | +/? | +/? | + | Station Square to be designed where petrol station currently stands. | Flood Zone 1 | The proximity of the rail line to the rear of the site may require some noise / vibration mitigation measures. |
| | Relationship with tall buildings. Adjacent to Green Corridors. | Open Space Issues. Residential development could be positive on social objectives. | Mixed use development could be beneficial to the local economy | | | |
| PAR01C | +/? | +/? | + | Residential / mixed use | Flood Zone 1 | Sites need to be considered as a whole, particularly with regard to open space. |
| | Adjacent to Green Corridors. | Open Space Issues. Residential development could be positive on social objectives. | Mixed use development could be beneficial to the local economy, as well as increasing activity | | | |
| PAR01D | +/? | +/? | + | Potential loss of office floor space. | Flood Zone 1 | Sites need to be considered as a whole, particularly with regard to open space. |
| | Adjacent to Green Corridors. | Residential development could be positive on social objectives. | Current office use; losses to residential may have effects on the local economy. | | | |
| PAR01E | +/? | +/? | + | Will introduction of mixed use on | Flood Zone 1 | Sites need to be considered as a whole, |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|---------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Open Space Issues. | Residential development could be positive on social objectives but depend on the quality and sensitive design of a scheme to mitigate the existing issues on the site. | Development of premises could increase economic viability of site. | site decrease the level of available commercial floorspace? | | particularly with regard to open space. |
| PAR01F | +/? | +/? | + | Will introduction of mixed use on site decrease the level of available commercial floorspace? | Flood Zone 1 | Sites need to be considered as a whole, particularly with regard to open space. |
| | Open Space Issues | Residential development could be positive on social objectives but depend on the quality and sensitive design of a scheme to mitigate existing issues on the site (I.e. proximity of industrial uses). | Development of premises could increase economic viability of site. | | | |
| PAR01G | +/? | +/? | + | Will introduction of mixed use on | Flood Zone 1 | Sites need to be considered as a whole, |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|---------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Open Space Issues. Locally listed building will require careful consideration, if objective three of the SA framework is to be met satisfactorily. | Residential development could be positive on social objectives but depend on the quality and sensitive design of a scheme to mitigate existing issues on the site (I.e. proximity of industrial uses). | Development of site could increase economic viability and vitality. | <p>site decrease the level of available commercial floorspace?</p> <p>Introduction of mixed use development will have potential benefits for local residents in terms of access to services (e.g. retail)</p> | | particularly with regard to open space. Considering the proximity of industrial uses, the design of development should be sensitive with regard to issues such as noise. |
| PAR01H | +/? | +/? | + | | Flood Zone 1 | Student accommodation could potentially have a range of impacts upon the councils SA Objectives. Whilst there may be benefits (e.g. increased local spending, cultural diversity and activity), there may be issues around noise |
| | Open Space Issues. | Development would provide housing for students | Development of site could increase economic viability and vitality. | | | |

Perivale

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-----------|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| PER01 | + | ++ | + | Proposed sports village. (Gurnell leisure forms part of the site). Junior Golf development. New pool and new skate park. | Site includes large areas of flood risk including EA Zones 2 and 3, and 1 in 20 year functional floodplain. The site is within EA Flood Warning Area | Green Corridor along railway. Potential issues over compatibility with nature conservation function. |
| | The environmental objectives of the Councils SA Framework should be met positively by this development. | Replacement facilities in proposed sports village would be beneficial for the local community across the range of social SA Objectives. | Improved facilities should be positive on the Councils economic SA Objectives. | | | |

Southall

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-----------|---|--------|----------|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| SOU1 | +/? | ++ | + | Council led housing regeneration will improve quality | Flood Zone 1 | Nature conservation along Canal. Allotments are community open space. Open space |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-------------|---|---|--|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Proposed development has a massive opportunity to increase environmental quality for the residents of the estate. Proximity of the site to the canal offers scope for waterside regeneration opportunities. | Mix of tenures. Some phasing issues in terms of displacement. However the overall effect of the housing development should be very positive on the Councils social SA Objectives. | Successful redevelopment of the estate would have positive effects on the local economy. | of housing stock. | | enhancements along the canal offer scope for waterside regeneration opportunities. |
| SOU2 | +/? | ++ | + | 23 net increase in residential units and improvement in quality of housing stock. | Flood Zone 1 | Crime issues. Poor environmental quality. Low PTAL. These issues should be resolved. |
| | Improvements to the public realm would be a vital part of any proposed development scheme, however at this stage it is unclear as to how these improvements might be realised. | The housing regeneration project would have a significant positive contribution to the social SA Objectives of the Council. | Improvement in housing stock should have a positive overall effect on the economy, however as a holistic regeneration project, it could be argued that there is a need for 'starter' units in order for people to start / set up new businesses. | | | |
| SOU3 | ++ | ++ | ++ | 3750 units residential gain. This site forms a significant | Flood Zone 1 | Planning permission granted. S106 agreed. Listed Water Tower adjacent requires |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-------------|---|--|---|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | ChiP and BioFuel Plant refused. However energy centre will be developed as a separate entity. The development has a Sustainability Strategy, which encompasses a range of measures to maximise the energy performance and quality of buildings. | Development will provide a range of social infrastructure, including leisure, retail, sports and community facilities. | Retail and office development should improve the economic viability and vitality of the area. | apportionment of development in the Borough over the plan period. | | sensitive consideration. Transport into the Town Centre is often congested. Greenbelt to West. Heavily contaminated. Public transport impacts should be fully understood, monitored and managed. |
| SOU4 | +/? | ++ | + | Major employment site. No net loss of employment is envisaged through this type of development. | Flood Zone 1 | Vehicle access is an issue. MEL to east. Some potential issues regarding compatibility of uses. Consideration should be given to the future of the Sunrise Radio Building and how it might be incorporated into future development. |
| | Green Corridor to North. Buffer is required to deal with this. The future of the locally listed building is uncertain. | 590 additional residential units will be provided, having a positive impact upon the Councils Social SA Objectives. | Proximity of Crossrail Station offers excellent opportunities to maximise development opportunities on this site. | | | |
| SOU5 | ? | ++ | + | Mixed use proposed would increase facilities for the local | Flood Zone 1 | Transportation and air quality issues in this area could be attended to in part through the |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|-------------|--|---|---|--|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Heritage value of buildings. | Additional residential, retail, community and leisure uses would be positive on the Councils social objectives. | Proposed development types could have a positive effect on the economy. | community. | | planning process. |
| SOU6 | ? | ? | + | Development proposed would need to be | Flood Zone 1 | The community centre is locally listed. There is a need to improve transport, the public realm and consider the relationship between any residential development and the adjacent railway (E.g. noise and vibration issues, air quality). |
| | Locally listed facades should be considered as development proceeds. | Provision of residential dwellings and retail would be positive on the Councils social SA Objectives, but the future of the community centre is unclear from the proposals. | Mixed use office, retail and residential is proposed. | | | |
| SOU7 | ? | + | + | Currently warehousing, offices, light industry. Residential community and proposed library. Retention of the Dominion Centre. Crime issues. Open space provision here is poor. | Flood Zone 1 | Transport, congestion, parking are all issues here. |
| | Façade of heritage value. | Residential and community uses would be positive on social objectives | Mixed use development should be positive on the Councils economic objectives. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|---|---|-----------------|--|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| SOU8 | ? | + | ? | Former primary school. | Flood Zone 1 | Development should aim to integrate heritage buildings. Residential parking is an issue. |
| | Lack of amenity space in the area. There is a locally listed building on the site. | Close proximity to Town Centre and transport routes. | Quality housing redevelopment could have positive effects on the local economy. | | | |
| SOU9 | ? | ?/+ | ? | Industrial change of use to residential. | Flood Zone 1 | <p>Element of employment provision to be retained.</p> <p>Waste facilities to South (compatibility issues here).</p> <p>Should there be more comprehensive redevelopment. Treat 9+10 as whole sites.</p> <p>Poor public transport accessibility needs to be resolved in order for development to meet SA Objectives.</p> |
| | Green corridor to South; opportunities to link with residential development to develop links into green infrastructure network. | Residential development could benefit from green corridor. | | | | |
| SOU10 | ? | ?/+ | ? | Industrial change of use to residential. | Flood Zone 1 | <p>Light industrial uses, Grand Union Canal to South.</p> <p>Poor public transport accessibility needs to be resolved in order for development to meet SA Objectives.</p> |
| | Green corridor to South; opportunities to link with residential development to develop links into green infrastructure network. | | | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|--|---|--|--|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| SOU11 | ? | ++ | + | Development at this site is included within two Southall regeneration frameworks. | Flood Zone 1 | <p>Station is adjacent. Potential environmental issues from rail. Access issues into and out of site. Retention of cultural uses. Also mixed use employment and residential. Opportunity to create better high street frontage to compliment the existing urban morphology of the centre.</p> <p>Some traffic issues in this vicinity would need to be resolved in order for development to contribute positively to environmental SA Objectives.</p> |
| | Environmental implications of development at this stage are unclear. | Enhancement of leisure, residential, cultural and religious uses would be positive for the SA indicators. | Proposals could enhance the vitality and viability of the local centre. | | | |
| SOU12 | ? | ++ | + | | Flood Zone 1 | Noise and vibration issues from the adjacent rail line require consideration. |
| | Noise issues from railway line. | Mixed use residential would be positive for the councils social SA Objectives. | Retail and / or office development would have a positive impact, and would be well suited to the station location. | | | |
| SOU13 | ? | ++ | + | Large site. More residential development is proposed. It is planned that the existing community use and car park be retained. Opportunity to create better high street frontage to compliment the existing urban morphology of the centre. | Flood Zone 1 | <p>Open space to east could be incorporated into a development scheme.</p> <p>Former Odeon building and Red Lion PH should be incorporated into development schemes, if SA Objective 3 is to be satisfied.</p> |
| | Future of Grade II Listed Red Lion PH is uncertain from current proposals. | Residential and community use would be positive on the Councils Social SA Objectives | Regeneration of high street frontage would be positive for local retail economy. | | | |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|---|---|--|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| SOU14 | ? | + | + | Long term potential for residential. Permission has been granted for offices and light industrial. | Flood Zone 1 | Any development would have to consider the proximity of residential properties to the site. (E.g. noise, overlooking). |
| | Possible noise issues arising from proximity to residential uses | Some issues regarding distance to rail services | | | | |
| SOU15 | ? | ++ | + | Mixed use to accommodate residential. | Flood Zone 1 | Retain education and religious uses. Note that the site is relatively constrained in that it has been almost built out to its entirety. |
| | Listed church. A large development site that would require a coordinated and considered approach to design. | Residential development, and enhancement of community, educational and religious uses would be positive for the Councils Social SA Objectives | The site offers opportunities for economic redevelopment. As a large site, it would also offer opportunities. | | | |
| SOU16 | ? | ? | ? | Transport issues. 2008 application was refused on grounds of... | Flood Zone 1 | Cul de sac; issues regarding site permeability. Opportunities for improving transport issues on site. |
| | Development proposals would have to consider surrounding residential development. | | It would be envisaged that | | | |
| SOU17 | + | + | ?/+ | Proposed 'land swap' with MOL. No net loss of employment land | Flood Zone 1 | Transport and access issues. The site is cut off by canal and rail. There is potential for |

| Site Name | Performance of Initial Proposal against SA Objectives | | | Will there be any loss or gain of facilities, assets or services? | SFRA Flood Zone | Notes (Mitigation, scope for enhancement or alternative uses). |
|--------------|---|--|----------|---|-----------------|---|
| | Environmental | Social | Economic | | | |
| | Potential open space improvements. | Range of options detailed would be positive. | | is envisaged. | | environmental improvements along a number of stretches of the canal network, and opportunities for links to the canalside park. |
| SOU18 | ? | + | ? | Residential proposed (refused). | Flood Zone 1 | Former British Waterways Boatyard. Relationship with adjacent site. Subject to design and buffer. Scale and massing in relation to setting. |
| | Incorporation of a buffer would be positive, however there is insufficient detail to measure potential impacts of a scheme. | Residential development should be positive on social objectives | Low PTAL | | | |
| SOU19 | ? | ++ | + | Planning permission for high school and play area. | Flood Zone 1 | Public Open Space to east. |
| | Insufficient detail to measure potential impacts of a scheme. | Adjacent to Sports Centre. Educational use of site scores highly against Social SA Objectives. | | | | |

15. Headlines from Matrices

Strengths

The combination of sites to be developed across the plan period will bring significant economic benefits, along with opportunities for improving and enhancing green and public spaces, providing social benefits, (for instance new schools) and harnessing opportunities to improve quality and design of the urban realm, street frontages and connectivity between sites. Whilst finer grain details are yet to be considered in a number of cases, and some sites are still at the 'options' stage, it is envisaged that development of the sites will deliver the spatial objectives set out in the Development Strategy.

Uncertainties

At this stage in the planning policy process, the SA can 'steer' development proposals towards the most sustainable approach, and highlight where negative impacts might be either avoided altogether, or mitigated. However due to the provisional nature of the majority of site proposals, it is somewhat problematic to draw firm conclusions. Often the detail of a proposal is required in order to realistically test the full potential impacts upon a specific SA Objective. For this reason, the impacts of a large degree of proposals have been assessed as 'uncertain'.

Specific uncertainties identified are as follows:

- Design has been highlighted as a particular issue for housing regeneration sites.
- Noise and vibration issues may arise on several development sites, due to noise from railways or other major transport corridors. It is not always clear how these will be dealt with, although it would be envisaged that such issues would be dealt with through the Development Management DPD.

General uncertainties identified are as follows:

- The Development Sites Final Proposals document could provide further details around massing, site arrangement, and design. These elements are often required if impacts upon the SA Objectives are to be assessed conclusively.
- As with all planning policies, impacts may be felt largely by the way in which they are interpreted and implemented. Problems arise in this regard when attempting to assess proposals.

Negative effects

The negative effects of site plans are limited at this stage; the aspirations for development of sites are positive. The only area where potential negative effects can be envisaged is through resettlement or re-housing of communities during municipal estate regeneration, or through noise and air pollution effects for development located adjacent to or within proximity to transportation corridors or industrial sites. Whilst it would be envisaged that negative effects could be mitigated through technical, design and orientation measures (e.g. buffers, sound proofing, increased window glazing), these issues have nonetheless been identified for consideration.

Further thought must also be given to the impacts of loss of industry / commercial space where this occurs, and the impacts closely understood in relation to the site and the area. Particular concern surrounds the loss of industrial sites for conversion into offices. Two issues arise in particular:

- Firstly, there is a massive opportunity within the Borough to encourage the creation of Green Industries, and the loss of appropriate industrial floorspace could prejudice this development, impacting negatively upon the associated SA Objectives.
- Secondly, there is a large surplus of offices in some areas. The sites document and supporting ELR do not address these strategic issues in a coherent manner.

Other negative effects arise through anticipated increase in car use at large sites which may place pressure on the road network, if sufficient public transport alternatives are not provided.

16. Mitigation measures

The SEA Directive requires information to be provided on '*the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme*'. Mitigation measures also include proactive avoidance of adverse effects and measures to enhance positive effects.

Mitigation measures can take a wide range of forms:

- Changes to options, including bringing forward new options
- Adding or deleting options
- Refining options in order to improve the likelihood of beneficial effects and to minimise adverse impacts
- Technical measures to be applied during the implementation stage

Mitigation measures referred to at previous stages have been taken into account, as far as possible in preparing this report:

- The formation of 'hybrid' options for sites, combining elements of what were discrete, separate options. These can in several instances be traced back to the outputs of the Sustainability Appraisal reporting process.
- Appropriate policy within the Development Management or Development Strategy DPD's regarding issues around urban design, noise or air pollution for example.
- Pointing to the appropriate document where issues identified might be dealt with (e.g. other DPD or a forthcoming SPD)

17. Monitoring

The SEA directive requires that the Environmental Report (in this case the SA report) include details of the proposed monitoring process. It is essential that the performance of the DPD is regularly monitored to ensure that it is meeting its objectives and that any negative impacts are minimised/eliminated. This monitoring will also be key to ensuring that the DPD remains current and relevant. Revisions to the DPD may also be necessary in light of changes in legislation. In terms of the monitoring itself, many of the indicators identified for the baseline data will be particularly useful. These indicators will allow us to check if the SA predictions of sustainability effects outlined in this report were accurate, and to see if the DPD is contributing to the achievement of the SA objectives. This monitoring exercise will also allow us to identify if the recommended mitigation / enhancement measures are having the correct effect. In order for this to be possible however it will be dependent on ensuring that the baseline data is up to date and regularly reviewed.

Where unforeseen adverse effects are identified as part of this monitoring process, consideration will be given to the need to review the DPD to mitigate against these concerns. It is envisaged that this SA monitoring will form part of the overall annual LDF monitoring exercise. The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) is scheduled to be published in December of each year. It should be noted that some of the baseline data collected for the SA appraisals had previously been collected for the AMR.

As part of the AMR process it would be useful to develop sustainability performance indicators or sustainability best value indicators. Monitoring will also consider the cumulative/synergistic effects of the DPD in light of other LDF documents. Further details on the monitoring process will be outlined in subsequent publications.

18. Future Work / Next Steps

The next stage (B3, Part 3) in the SA process will be to undertake an Appraisal of the Final Proposals.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Glossary of Terms

This Glossary is neither a statement of law nor an interpretation of the law, and its status is only as a guide and should not be used as a source for statutory definitions.

Climate Change

Long-term changes in temperature, precipitation, wind and all other aspects of the Earth's climate. Often regarded as a result of human activity and fossil fuel consumption.

Communities and Local Government

'Communities and Local Government' is the successor department to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). It is an expanded department with a powerful new remit to promote community cohesion and equality, as well as responsibility for housing, urban regeneration, planning and local government

Development Plan Document

Development Plan Documents are prepared by local planning authorities and outline the key development goals of the local development framework.

Development Plan Documents include the core strategy and, where needed, area action plans. There will also be an adopted proposals map that illustrates the spatial extent of policies that must be prepared and maintained to accompany all DPDs. All DPDs must be subject to rigorous procedures of community involvement, consultation and independent examination, and adopted after receipt of the inspector's binding report. Once adopted, development control decisions must be made in accordance with them unless material considerations indicate otherwise. DPDs form an essential part of the Local Development Framework.

Development Strategy

The Core Strategy, a Development Plan Document setting out the spatial vision and strategic objectives of the planning framework for an area, having regard to the Community Strategy (see also DPDs).

English Heritage

Government advisors with responsibility for all aspects of protecting and promoting the historic environment. English Heritage is responsible for advising the government on the listing of historic buildings.

Environment Agency

A government body that aims to prevent or minimise the effects of pollution on the environment and issues permits to monitor and control activities that handle or produce waste. It also provides up-to-date information on waste management matters and deals with other matters such as water issues including flood protection advice.

Evidence Base

The information and data gathered by local authorities to justify the "soundness" of the policy approach set out in Local Development Documents, including physical, economic, and social characteristics of an area.

Habitat Directive

Article 6(3) and (4) of the European Communities (1992) Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora ('Habitat Directive'). The EU Habitats Directive and Birds Directive are implemented in the UK through the Conservation (Natural Habitats) Regulations 1994 (as amended).

Habitat Directive Assessment (HDA)

Also known as an Appropriate Assessment (AA). An Assessment must be conducted if an initial scoping identifies sites listed under the Directive.

Issues and Options

The non statutory 'front loading' stage in the development of a DPD. An authority publishes the document for consultation, setting out the possible approaches it might take and the key decisions which will need to be made as the plan progresses.

Lifetime Homes Standards

Criteria developed by a group convened by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 1991 to help house builders produce new homes flexible enough to deal with changes in life situations of occupants e.g. caring for young children, temporary injuries, declining mobility with age.

Local Development Document

These include Development Plan Documents (which form part of the statutory development plan) and Supplementary Planning Documents (which do not form part of the statutory development plan). LDDs collectively deliver the spatial planning strategy for the local planning authority's area.

Local Development Framework

The Local Development Framework (LDF) is a non-statutory term used to describe a folder of documents, which includes all the local planning authority's local development documents. An LDF is comprised of:

- Development Plan Documents (which form part of the statutory development plan)
- Supplementary Planning Documents

The local development framework will also comprise of:

- Statement of Community Involvement
- Local Development Scheme
- Annual Monitoring Report
- Any Local Development Orders or Simplified Planning Zones that may have been added

Local Planning Authority

The local authority or council that is empowered by law to exercise planning functions. Often the local borough or district council. National parks and the Broads authority are also considered to be local planning authorities. County councils are the authority for waste and minerals matters.

Natural England

Natural England is the Government's statutory adviser on landscape in England, with responsibility for landscape designations such as National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coasts. Natural England is also concerned with England's future landscapes, with involvement in planning policy and a range of environmental land management projects. Natural England incorporates the former bodies of English Nature and the Countryside Agency.

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (PCPA)

The Act updates elements of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduces:

- a statutory system for regional planning
- a new system for local planning
- reforms to the development control and compulsory purchase and compensation systems
- removal of crown immunity from planning controls.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG)

Issued by central government setting out its national land use policies for England on different areas of planning. These are gradually being replaced by Planning Policy Statements.

Planning Policy Statement (PPS)

Issued by central government to replace the existing Planning Policy Guidance notes in order to provide greater clarity and to remove from national policy advice on practical implementation, which is better expressed as guidance rather than policy.

Ramsar Sites

Sites designated under the European Ramsar Convention to protect wetlands that are of international importance, particularly as waterfowl habitats.

Regional Assembly / Regional Planning Body (RPB)

Each of the English regions outside of London has a regional chamber that the regions generally call Regional Assemblies (not to be confused with the term Elected Regional Assemblies). They are responsible for developing and co-ordinating a strategic vision for improving the quality of life in a region. The assembly is responsible for setting priorities and preparing certain regional strategies, including the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Regional Development Agency (RDA)

The nine Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) set up in the English regions are non-departmental public bodies. Their primary role is as a strategic driver of regional economic development in their region. The RDAs aim is to:

- Co-ordinate regional economic development and regeneration
- Enable the regions to improve their relative competitiveness
- Reduce the imbalances that exist within and between regions

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

A strategy for how a region should look in 15 to 20 years time and possibly longer. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies the scale and distribution of new housing in the region, indicates areas for regeneration, expansion or sub-regional planning and specifies priorities for the environment, transport, infrastructure, economic development, agriculture, minerals and waste treatment and disposal. Most former Regional Planning Guidance is now considered RSS and forms part of the development plan. Regional Spatial Strategies are prepared by Regional Planning Bodies.

SA Objective

Ealing has 19 Sustainability Objectives, which were formulated through the Scoping Report. Divided into social, environmental and economic categories, each of the objectives is used to appraise plans and policies in terms of their sustainability performance.

Scoping Report

This includes baseline information about Ealing and identifies key environmental and sustainability issues for the Borough. The objectives and framework for conducting Sustainability Appraisals of plans and policies is set out in this report.

Securing the future – New UK Sustainable Development Strategy (2005)

The strategy builds on the 1999 strategy 'A better quality of life: a strategy for sustainable development in the UK'. The strategy has five basic principles and four agreed priorities, namely sustainable consumption and production, climate change, natural resource protection and sustainable communities.

Special Areas for Conservation (SACs)

A site designated under the European Community Habitats Directive, to protect internationally important natural habitats and species.

Special Protection Areas (SPAs),

Sites classified under the European Community Directive on Wild Birds to protect internationally important bird species.

Statutory consultees

Individuals or organisations that the local authority is bound to consult with by law (statute).

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

An environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes, including those in the field of planning and land use, which complies with the EU Directive 2001/42/EC. The environmental assessment involves:

- Preparation of an environmental report
- Carrying out of consultations
- Taking into account of the environmental report and the results of the consultations in decision making
- Provision of information when the plan or programme is adopted
- Showing that the results of the environment assessment have been taken into account

Submission Document

A Development Plan Document submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination by a government-appointed planning inspector.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

An appraisal of the economic, environmental and social effects of a plan from the outset of the preparation process to allow decisions to be made that accord with sustainable development.

Sustainable development

A widely used definition drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987: "Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." The government has set out four aims for sustainable development in its strategy A Better Quality of Life, a Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK. The four aims, to be achieved simultaneously, are:

- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone
- Effective protection of the environment
- Prudent use of natural resources
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

Appendix 2 – SA Objectives Appraisal Matrix

| Key | |
|-----|-------------------|
| ✓ | Compatible |
| ✗ | Incompatible |
| ? | Possible conflict |
| 0 | No links |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services. | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working. | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance public open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse/remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance public open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse/remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| 3 | ? _i | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | ✓ | ✓ | ? _{ii} | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | ? _{xii} | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | ✓ | ✓ | ? _i | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ? _{iii} | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance public open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse/remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | x _{iv} | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | ✓ _{xiii} | ✓ | x _{xiv} | 0 | 0 | ? _v | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 0 | ✓ | ? _{vi} | 0 | ✓ | ? _{vii} | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | ? _{viii} | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? _{viii} | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| 14 | 0 | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 | ✓ | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | |
| 15 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | |

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Sustainability Appraisal Objective | Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services | Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working | Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage | Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour | Minimise detrimental noise impacts | Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing | Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living | Protect and enhance public open space | Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Improve air quality | Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Improve water quality, conserve water resources, and minimise the impact of flooding | Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the reuse/remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings | Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling | Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment | Support sustainable economic growth | Improve opportunities for education and training | Promote cultural and community identity |
| | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | | | | |
| 16 | ✓ | ✓ | ?ix | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ? | 0 | ? | ? | ?x | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| 17 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| 18 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | 0 | |
| 19 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | 0 | |

Notes regarding compatibility of SA objectives:

ⁱ Ensuring access and inclusion for all without causing harm to the historic environment will require careful attention to design

ⁱⁱ Designing out crime without causing harm to the historic environment will require careful attention to design

ⁱⁱⁱ This objective is likely to lead to new development; this may increase and/or improve the available public open space in the borough, however, it may also result in a conflict where public open space is at risk from development.

^{iv} When ensuring access for all, with potential development of new facilities, the need to protect the natural environment must be taken into account.

^v This objective is likely to lead to new development, which may result in increased pressure on the natural environment and potential loss of habitat, this illustrates the conflict inherent in delivering the principles of sustainable development.

^{vi} An increase in housing and consequent population increase is likely to lead to increased air pollution from vehicles and domestic energy use, however, sustainable design and construction of new development and/or improvements to existing dwellings may help to reduce air pollution.

^{vii} Adaptations to the effects of climate change and measures to reduce contributions to climate change may harm the historic environment and will require sensitive design.

^{viii} This policy is likely to lead to new development; this may help to address and adapt to climate change through the use of sustainable design and construction techniques, but if numbers of dwellings increase, it is likely to lead to increased contributions to climate change and increased water usage and flood risk overall.

^{ix} Any new development potentially resulting from this objective must take into account the requirement to conserve water resources and prevent flooding.

^x The local economy is likely to benefit from the attractive, historic local environment but conflict may arise due to requirements for new business development where this may impact upon the historic character of the borough.

^{xi} Economic growth is likely to lead to development; this must be sensitively designed and sited to avoid impacting on water quality, water resources or flood risk.

^{xii} The incorporation of noise mitigation measures could potentially be resisted, if physical works are required which could be considered unsympathetic in terms of the historic fabric of the building.

^{xiii} Improvements in access to essential facilities could reduce the need to travel and therefore contribute to improvements in air quality.

^{xiv} The incorporation of air quality mitigation measures could potentially be prevented, where these require physical work that may be considered unsympathetic in terms of the historic fabric of the building.

Appendix 3 – Refined SA Framework

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Actively support inclusive access to essential health, community and local services. | Will services be provided to a broad section of the community, e.g. youth/elderly? | Community centres providing youth activities. | No data available | N/A |
| | | Number of accessible libraries. | 10 out of 11. | 15 |
| | | Percentage of local authority buildings accessible by disabled people. | 3.01% | 15 |
| | Will it improve the quality and integration of health services? | Number of health centres with 3 or more disciplines. | No data available | N/A |
| | Will it ensure that essential services are accessible to those without access to a car? | Number of GP surgeries in the borough. | 84 (2005/06) | 27 |
| | | Number of opticians in the borough. | 30 (2005) | 29 |
| | | Number of dental surgeries in the borough | 58 (2005) | 28 |
| | | Access to other key services – No indicator identified | N/A | 63 |
| | | Will it improve the satisfaction of residents with their neighbourhood as a place to live? | Not identified - Survey of residents' satisfaction to be undertaken shortly. | No data available |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| 2. Promote community involvement, voluntary and partnership working. | Will increase community participation in activities and the democratic process? | Percentage of people voting in Elections. | 34.1% (May 2002) | 69 |
| | | Percentage of adults surveyed (in 2002) who feel they can influence decisions in their local area a) individually b) by working together | a) 32% b) 64% | 70 |
| | Will it promote partnership working? | Not identified | No data available | N/A |
| 3. Preserve and enhance the local historic environment and cultural heritage. | Will it protect/enhance the historic environment? | Number of Listed Buildings under each grade | 2004: Grade I – 6 Grade II – 512 Grade II* - 17 | 119 |
| | | Number/percentage of listed buildings on the Buildings at Risk Register. | 11 (2005) | 101 |
| | | Number of conservation areas | 29 (2005) | 87 |
| | | Number of Scheduled Ancient Monuments | 7 (2004) | 120 |
| | Will it protect the quality of designated historic landscapes and townscapes? | Number of Heritage Land/Registered Historic Garden Designations. | 3 Heritage land designations in the UDP (total area: 0.65km ²). 3 Gardens of Special Historic Interest (2005) | 84 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| | | Number of local and strategic viewpoints, views and landmarks in the borough. | 19 viewpoints 7 views 13 landmarks (2005) | 99 |
| | Will it preserve and record archaeological features? | Number of archaeology priority areas. | 8 in Acton 9 in Ealing 2 in Hanwell 7 in Northolt and Perivale 4 in Southall (2005) | 100 |
| | | Number and percentage of archaeological sites at risk. | N/A | 121 |
| 4. Reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour. | Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | Overall crime rate (recorded crime BCS comparator). | 78.3 (2005/06) | 34 |
| | | Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 by Super Output Area – Crime (Rank 1 = most deprived, 32,482 = least deprived). | Ealing 10,561 W. London 12,051 London 11,821 (2004) | 37 |
| | | Total notifiable offences (per 1000 households). | 126 | 35 |
| | | Crime survey: burglary/burglary from dwelling (per 1000 households). | 5.1 | 33 |
| | | Theft of/from motor vehicles (per 1000 households). | 22.6 | 32 |
| | Will it reduce the fear/perception of crime? | Perception/fear of crime – no indicator identified. | N/A | 38 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| 5. Minimise detrimental noise impacts. | Will ambient (environmental/industrial) noise levels be reduced? | Number of noise complaints received by LBE Environmental Health Department for different categories of noise. | Aircraft - 3 Road -15 Rail - 0 Commercial noise -363 Alarms - 123 Domestic noise - 1477 Noise insulation -6 (2004-2005) | 82 |
| | Will it reduce vehicular traffic noise? | | | |
| | Will it reduce the impact of air traffic noise? | | | |
| | Will it reduce perceived noise levels? | Percentage of borough exposed to noise levels above 60dB(A) in the day. | 17% | 81 |
| | | Percentage of borough exposed to noise levels above 60dB(A) at night | 4% | 81 |
| | Will it promote best practice in terms of noise minimisation and attenuation in design? | No indicator identified | N/A | N/A |
| Will it promote the appropriate siting of development which minimises the potential for conflict with incompatible uses? | No indicator identified | N/A | N/A | |
| 6. Improve access to well designed, affordable, inclusive and appropriately located housing. | Will it improve the affordability of housing? | Number/percentage of housing completions which are affordable. | 447 affordable homes completed (31% of total homes completed) (2007/08) | 54 |
| | | Affordable Housing Ratio (house price/earnings affordability)(2006) | 11.2 (2006) | 55 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| | Will it improve the availability of housing? | Total number of housing completions | 701 gross; 637 net (2005/06) | 53 |
| | | Housing Tenure mix | No data available | N/A |
| | | Time on housing waiting list | No data available | N/A |
| | | Number of people sleeping rough on a single night. | 5 | 59 |
| | | Percentage of Local Authority homes which were non-decent (BVPI) | 38% (2005/06) | 57 |
| | | Unfit Homes per 1000 dwellings (AMR) | 52 (2006) | 56 |
| | Will it improve the physical accessibility of housing? | Percentage of homes built which are Wheelchair Accessible. | Data not yet available. To be recorded as part of the Annual Monitoring Report. Target of 10%. | 52 |
| | | Percentage of homes built which are built to Lifetime Home Standards. | Data not yet available. To be recorded as part of the Annual Monitoring Report. Target of 100%. | 51 |
| 7. Reduce health inequalities and promote healthy living. | Will it reduce health inequalities? Will it reduce death rates? | Life expectancy | Male 77.7 Female 82.1 (2008) | 21 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| | | Standardised Mortality Rate | 95 (2003) Below 100 indicates a lower death rate than the national average. | 22 |
| | | Percentage of population in good health. | 71.07% (2001) | 20 |
| | Will it improve access to health facilities? | Number of GP surgeries | 84 (2005/06) | 27 |
| | | Number of NHS dentists | 58 (2005) | 28 |
| | | Number of opticians | 30 (2005) | 29 |
| | Will it improve healthy living? | Accessibility to sports/recreation facilities. | No data identified | N/A |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 8. Protect and enhance public open space | Will it protect open space? | Area of protected open space. | 1701ha % of total area of the borough = 30.7% Comprises: 3 Heritage land sites (65.3 ha) 12 Green Corridors (418.6 ha) 7 Green Belt sites (332.3 ha) 12 Metropolitan Open Land sites (847.6 ha) 139 Public Open Spaces (557 ha) 85 Community Open Space (105.1 ha) | 84 |
| | | Gains or loss in open space (loss of designated open space to development) (AMR – Permissions and Completions data) | Completions – No applications completed which would result in loss of open space Permission – 2 applications (although only one permanent) | 85 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| | Will it enhance the quality of open/green space? | Satisfaction with open space in the borough (Percentage of residents satisfied with the borough's open space) (BVPI) | 56% (2007) Southall Park and Northala Fields awarded Green Flag status (2007/08) | 83 |
| 9. Protect and enhance the natural environment and biodiversity | Will it conserve and enhance existing habitats of importance (notably designated sites)? | Total area of Sites of Metropolitan or Local Importance for Nature Conservation (SMLINCs). | 75 sites Area: 503 ha | 122 |
| | | The number/area of Local Nature Reserves. | 6 LNRs covering 44.91 ha | 138 |
| | | Number/area of Local Nature management areas in the borough | 7 (2005) Area: 704 ha | 86 |
| | | Gains or loss of open space designated for its nature conservation value (AMR – Permissions and Completions data). | No change to areas designated for their nature conservation value | 86 |
| | | Number/area and type of BAP Priority Species and Habitats. | See list for species and habitats – measurable indicator not identified | 97 123 |
| | | The achievement of BAP targets | Indicator not identified | 124 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Will the biodiversity value of watercourses and their associated corridors be protected and enhanced? | <p>Percentage of main rivers and canals recorded as good or fair quality (This indicator relates to water quality and not biodiversity).</p> <p>The length of naturalised green buffer zones for wildlife next to watercourses created.</p> <p>The number of developments providing buffer zones along watercourses</p> | 100% | 94 125 |
| | Will it create new habitats (therefore increasing biodiversity)? | <p>The number or area of habitats created</p> <p>The number of developments providing ecological enhancements</p> | Data not yet identified | 126 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| 10. Improve Air Quality | Will it improve air quality? | Extent of air quality management area(s) | Whole of the borough (2005) | 80 |
| | Will it help to achieve the objectives of the Air Quality Management Plan? | The number of days when air quality is moderate or high | 24 days (2007/08) | 80 |
| | Will it reduce the need to travel by private car? | Method of travel to work and education | Data not yet identified | 91 |
| | Will it encourage freight transfer from road to rail and water? | Not identified | N/A | N/A |
| 11. Reduce contributions to and vulnerability to climate change | Will it lead to an increase proportion of energy needs being met from renewables? | Proportion of energy supplied from renewable sources | No data available | 76 |
| | | The number of planning applications where equipment for renewable power generation has been secured (AMR). | 3 major applications (South Acton Estate, Grange Primary School, Moorlands Care Home) were approved (2005/06) | 77 |
| | Will it encourage cleaner modes of transport? | Method of travel to work and education. | Data not yet identified | 91 |
| | Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions? | CO ² emissions by end user. | Data not yet identified | 73 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| | Will it reduce energy demand? | CO ² emissions by sector. | Data not yet identified | 74 |
| | | Energy efficiency – the average SAP rating of local authority owned dwellings (BVPI) | 68 (2005/06) | 75 |
| | | The number of developments incorporating energy efficient techniques such as green roofs etc | Data not yet identified | 127 |
| 12. Improve water quality, conserve water resources and minimise the impact of flooding. | Will it encourage sustainable water supply and consumption | Groundwater storage (Thames Water) | Average and above (March 2007) | 136 |
| | Will it reduce water consumption? | Surface reservoir storage (Thames Water) | Average (96% Thames Valley, 97% London as a whole) | 137 |
| | | (Three Valleys Water) | Normal range | |
| | | Water consumption per household. | UK figures only | 88 |
| | | Water consumption in non-domestic developments. | Data not yet identified | 128 |
| | | The overall water consumption in the borough per capita. | Data not yet identified | N/A |
| | | The number of developments incorporating water conservation techniques. | Data not yet identified | 129 |
| | Will it reduce flood risk? | The number of planning applications granted which are contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality | Zero (07/08) | 95 |
| The number of properties or the area of developed land at risk from flooding | | See SFRA | 130 | |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| | | <p>The number of planning applications incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS).</p> <p>Or the number or percentage of new developments which have met the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Control the quantity of surface water runoff from new development (discharge rates restricted to Greenfield including 1 in 100 year on-site attenuation) b) Improve the quality of runoff c) Enhance nature conservation, landscape and amenity value of site. | <p>No data available</p> <p>Example systems include conventional attenuation storage (tanks or excavated areas), permeable pavements, grassed swales, infiltration trenches, and ponds.</p> | N/A |
| | Will it improve water quality in the borough? | <p>Percentage of main rivers and canals recorded as good or fair quality in terms of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) biological quality (b) chemical quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) 100% (b) 100% (2003/04) | 94 |
| 13. Enhance existing buildings and facilities, and encourage the | Will it ensure that new development occurs on derelict, vacant and | Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land (BVPI) | 100 (2007/08) | 78 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| reuse/remediation of vacant land and under-utilised buildings. | underused previously developed land? | Gains or loss in open space (loss of designated open space to development)(AMR 07/08) | <p>Completions – No applications completed which would result in loss of open space</p> <p>Permission – 2 applications (although only one permanent)</p> | 85 |
| | Will it encourage the reuse of vacant or underutilised buildings? | Vacancy Rates (EDS) | 6.8% (December 03) | 115 |
| | | Vacancy Rates of Major Employment Locations | 175,108 sq. m. of industrial and warehouse premises are vacant representing 7.8% of total stock (2005) | 114 |
| | | Vacancy rates of retail units within town centres (Ealing Town Centre Health Checks) | <p>Acton –9%</p> <p>Ealing – 4%</p> <p>Greenford – 5%</p> <p>Hanwell – 22%</p> <p>Southall – 2% (2005)</p> <p>Northolt – 2%</p> <p>Park Royal – 8% (2004)</p> | 116 |
| | Will it enhance soil quality/address contamination issues? | Percentage of new homes built on previously developed land (BVPI) | 100% (2007/08) | 78 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------------|
| 14. Reduce waste generation and increase waste recycling. | Will it reduce overall household waste generation? | Number of kilograms of household waste collected per head (BV84) | 385.5 (2007/08) | 118 |
| | Will it increase recycling levels? | Percentage of the total tonnage of waste arising, which have been recycled (Municipal only) (BV82) Household (Total Tonnage) | Total Tonnage: 22,139 15.32% (2005/06) 19,150 (2005/06) | 71 72 133 |
| | Will it reduce commercial and industrial waste? | Total waste arisings (non-municipal). Data not yet available. | Not yet identified | 132 |
| 15. Reduce vehicular dependency and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport | Will it reduce the use of the private car? | Mode of travel used by Ealing residents to visit nearest town centres. | 33% by car/van 25% by bus 22% on foot 2% by tube/train | 64 |
| | Will it increase the proportion of journeys being made by public transport? | Car ownership levels - Households with access to 1 or more car(s)/van(s) | 68.3% (2001) | 93 |
| | Will it generate investment for improvement in transport infrastructure? | Amount of Section 106 funding secured for transport improvements (AMR). | 22 sealed agreements, securing over £3 million in planning benefits in 2005/06. 9.7% of this total was secured for transport works | 134 |
| 16. Promote local employment opportunities, training and skills attainment. | Will it improve employment rates/reduce unemployment levels? | Unemployment rate (Census) | 3.9% (2001) Note variations between wards | 16 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| | Will it create local paid employment opportunities? | New Firms: Registrations – Enterprise: VAT registrations per 10,000 adults. | 50 (2005) | 103 |
| | | Percentage Annual Change in VAT registered stocks at year end | 0.3 (2004) | 135 |
| | Will it promote local employment opportunities through new business establishment? | Inward investment (EDS) | A total of 25 companies originating from overseas are registered with Think London as having set up in Ealing from April 1995 to date (2005) | 111 |
| | Will it increase employment opportunities for all groups, including those most in need? | Unemployment rate – Ward level data (Census) | 3.9% overall (2001) Note variations between wards | 16 |
| | | Employment rate by ethnicity (EDS) | White – 83.5% Non White – 58% | 46 |
| | Will it improve earning levels? | Annual Earnings – Average Household Income (including benefits) (EDS) | £37,559 (Unequalised) (2006) | 47 |
| | Will it improve skills attainment? | Skills Level: Percentage of working age population qualified to degree level or higher (EDS) | 38% (2004) | 43 |
| 17. Support Sustainable Economic growth. | Will it encourage new business start ups? | New Firms: Registrations – Enterprise: VAT registrations per 10,000 adults | 50 (2005) | 103 |
| | | Vacancy rate (EDS) | 6.8% (December 2003) | 115 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| | Will it encourage inward investment? | New Firms: Registrations – Enterprise: VAT registrations per 10,000 adults | 50 (2005) | 103 |
| | | Organisations which support new and established businesses | Business Link for London, West London Business Forum, Gateway Enterprise, Action Acton, Southall Regeneration Partnership, Park Royal Partnership | 102 |
| | Will it ensure that there is a sufficient supply of employment/industrial space? | Distribution of Industrial/Warehousing floorspace in West London (EDS) | Total of 2,237 sq. m. of factory and warehouse floorspace. | 112 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---------------------------|----------|--|---|--------------------------|
| | | Change in employment floorspace – Permissions and Completions data (AMR) | 2005/06 – Permissions: Net gain of 22,500 sq. m. of B1, B2 and B8 Completions: 19,816 sq. m. of employment floorspace completed (60% for B8;26% B1). All development took place on previously developed land; 99% on sites designated for employment use in the UDP, 33% in regeneration areas 2.4ha of land lost from employment use (B1, B2, B8) | 113 |
| | | Vacancy rate of Major Employment Locations (EDS) | 175,108 sq. m. of industrial and warehousing premises are vacant representing 7.8% of total stock (2005) | 114 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|--|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| | Will it support the formation of local supply chains for goods and services? | Organisations which support new and established businesses | Business Link for London, West London Business Forum, Gateway Enterprise, Action Acton, Southall Regeneration Partnership, Park Royal Partnership | 102 |
| 18. Improve opportunities for education and training | Will it improve the qualifications and skills of the population | Literacy and numeracy of 11 year olds (Neighbourhood Renewal Project) | 78% | 41 |
| | | Literacy and numeracy of 14 year olds (Neighbourhood Renewal Project) | 73% | 42 |
| | | Educational Attainment - % of 15 year old pupils in school maintained by the local authority achieving 5 or more GCSE's at grades A*-C or equivalent (BVPI) | 59.4% (2004/05) | 39 |
| | | Educational Attainment - % of 19 year olds with 2 qualifications and above (EDS) | 73.8% of 18-19 year olds | 40 |
| | | Skills Level: % of working age population qualified to degree level or higher (EDS) | 38% | 43 |
| | | Number of pupils with English as an additional language (DFES) | 41.8% (1997) | 44 |

| Proposed LDF SA Objective | Criteria | Indicator | Measurable baseline data | Baseline table reference |
|---|---|--|--|--------------------------|
| | Will it improve access to educational facilities? | Number of educational institutions in the borough | 10 Children's centres, 64 primary Schools (56 of which have nurseries) 12 Secondary Schools, 1 Academy, 22 independent schools, 2 pupil referral units and 6 Schools for pupils with special educational needs | 45 |
| 19. Promote cultural and community identity | Will it foster a sense of pride in the area? | Percentage of people surveyed who think that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds can live together harmoniously. | 71% | 66 |
| | Will it encourage engagement in community activities? | Membership (numbers (2002)) of the main community networks (Ealing Community Network, BME forum and Refugee Forum. | ECN – 230 BME Forum – no data Refugee Forum – 7 (2002) | 67 |
| | | Number of people (2002) volunteering through the volunteer bureau | 257 (2002) | 68 |

For further copies of this document or any of Ealing's local development framework documents, please contact:

Planning Policy
Ealing Council
Perceval House
14/16 Uxbridge Road
London W5 2HL

Tel: 020 8825 5882

Email: Planpol@ealing.gov.uk

Visit: www.ealinginlondon.com

