

# Sustainability Appraisal

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES

## Core Strategy

Submission Version | May 2011



|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Non-Technical Summary</b>                             | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1 Background</b>                                      | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Legal and Policy Requirements</b>                     | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Purpose of the SA Report</b>                          | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations</b>     | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Local Development Framework</b>                       | <b>12</b> |
| <b>2 Appraisal Methodology</b>                           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Equalities Impact Assessment</b>                      | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Health Impact Assessment</b>                          | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Difficulties Encountered</b>                          | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Consultation</b>                                      | <b>15</b> |
| <b>European Habitats Directive</b>                       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>3 Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context</b> | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Key Plans and Programmes</b>                          | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Baseline Information</b>                              | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Key Sustainability Issues</b>                         | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Sustainability Framework</b>                          | <b>23</b> |
| <b>4 Assessment of Plan Policies</b>                     | <b>30</b> |
| <b>Previous Appraisal</b>                                | <b>30</b> |
| <b>Publication Version</b>                               | <b>30</b> |
| <b>5 Mitigation, Implementation and Monitoring</b>       | <b>39</b> |
| <b>6 Conclusions</b>                                     | <b>44</b> |
| <b>Appendices</b>  |           |
| <b>Appendix 1: Equalities Impact Assessment</b>          | <b>45</b> |
| <b>Appendix 2: Consultation Responses</b>                | <b>51</b> |
| <b>Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes</b>              | <b>65</b> |
| <b>Appendix 4: Baseline Information</b>                  | <b>81</b> |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <a href="#">Appendix 5: Business-As-Usual Scenario</a>     | 94  |
| <a href="#">Appendix 6: Full Sustainability Appraisals</a> | 97  |
| <a href="#">Appendix 7: Impacts Assessment</a>             | 105 |
| <a href="#">Appendix 8: Monitoring Framework</a>           | 109 |

## Non-Technical Summary

### What is a Sustainability Appraisal?

This summary is an overview of the assessment work carried out and explains how the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) ties in with the Core Strategy as a whole. The purpose of the SA is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of planning policy documents. It is a legal requirement for local authorities to carry out a SA. Under European Directive, local authorities are required to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and an 'Environmental Report' must be prepared. Both of these requirements are covered in this report by incorporating both the SA and SEA.

The Sustainability Appraisal is a process which is carried out at the various stages in the development of the Local Development Framework (LDF) documents. The preparation of the SA for the Core Strategy has involved four key stages:

- The production of a Revised Scoping Report 2008 (carried out by Atkins) setting out the scoping of the SA work to be carried out in relation to the Core Strategy;
- The production and consultation of the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009;
- The production of a Core Strategy Publication Version Sustainability Appraisal Report 2011;
- The production of a Core Strategy Submission Version Sustainability Appraisal Report 2011.

### The Sustainability Appraisal Framework

At the start of this process, an analysis of other plans, programmes and policies, baseline data was carried out. The Scoping Report identified some key issues in Kingston, which are the following:

- There exists pockets of deprivation within a generally affluent borough that need to be addressed;
- There is limited availability of brownfield sites, hence building may occur on greenfield;
- There are a large number of Conservation Areas within the borough;
- There are areas of the borough which have poor access to open space;
- There is the challenge of climate change;
- Issues with air quality and lack of monitoring data;
- Fairly high domestic greenhouse gas emissions;
- Accessibility to borough from Surrey as well as barriers to non-car movement such as A3;
- Flood risk from surface water flooding and streams/rivers;
- Poor water quality; and
- Barriers to employment.

This analysis enabled the identification of social, economic and environmental issues which were used to develop a framework.

The SA framework consists of sustainability objectives against which the plan and the options considered in the development of the plan have been tested. The sustainability objectives are presented below:

1. To reduce poverty and social inclusion
2. To reduce crime and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime
3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community
4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the

- community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure
5. To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health
  6. To provide the education and skills of the population
  7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity
  8. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car
  9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale
  10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough
  11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk
  12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources
  13. To improve air quality
  14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions
  15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy
  16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling
  17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities
  18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment
  19. To foster a strong tourism industry

The appraisal demonstrated that the policies in the Core Strategy are sustainable and overall have a positive impact when assessed against the sustainability objectives.

### **Policy Amendments and New Policies**

The Core Strategy seeks to balance environmental issues with economic and social needs and ensure that development is sustainable and does not cause irreversible harm to important resources and features. Consultation of the Preferred Strategy and the accompanying SA Report took place from November 2009 to January 2010. This report is required to explain any proposed changes to the Preferred Strategy as a result of the consultation. The majority of the changes which have been made to the Core Strategy policies since the publication of the Preferred Strategy are minor, however the structure of the document has changed considerably. As these changes relate to the structure of the document and policy amendments are minor then a full SA is not required. This approach is in accordance with government guidance, 'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive' (Office of Deputy Prime Minister, 2005). However, there are 3 new policies, DM14 Loss of Housing, IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure and IMP4 Facilitating Delivery and their full sustainability appraisals are included within this report.

### **What are the Likely Significant Effects of the Plan?**

A key element of the SA Report consists of the testing of the Core Strategy against the SA objectives in order to identify likely positive impacts and also determine whether any negative impacts could arise. This assessment concluded that the Core Strategy, given appropriate implementation, is likely to have a very positive impact on sustainability. In summary, the significant effects of the Core Strategy which have been

identified are the delivery of new housing which will meet the needs of the population, employment opportunities which are accessible to all, sustainable economic growth and reduction in the need to travel. Improved health, education and community facilities will have a positive impact upon social sustainability. Whilst the adaption of the existing built environment to climate change, designing for climate change in new development and mitigation of flood risk will have a significant positive effect on environmental sustainability. The enhancement and protection of the Borough's open spaces, waterways and biodiversity will further enhance this.

An important outcome of the SA process is to maximise the positives effects of the Core Strategy. Thus any negatives effects which have been identified are minimised through the adoption of mitigation measures and these can be found in Section 6 of this report.

The SA Report advises on the implementation of the policies, which will be strengthened by the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). The SPDs will help achieve further positive effects on the Borough and will set out detailed guidance on implementation of the Core Strategy policies. The SA Report sets out how the Core Strategy policies will be monitored to ensure their effectiveness and delivery of sustainability.

### **What Difference has the Sustainability Appraisal Process Made?**

The Sustainability Appraisal process has been carried out alongside the development of the Core Strategy policies and has therefore been able to inform the formulation of the policies. Consultation throughout the Plan at the key stages and on the SA has meant that environmental, social and economic considerations have integrated into the process.

Nineteen sustainability objectives were selected covering a wide variety of environmental, social and economic issues such as flooding, biodiversity, climate change, energy efficiency, housing, and economic growth.

This SA Report supports the publication of the Core Strategy and will be submitted as part of the evidence base .

### **Next Steps**

The final SA Report and submission version of the Core Strategy will be submitted to the Planning Inspector for consideration at the Examination in Public, and made publicly available for inspection, therefore representations cannot be treated as confidential.

# 1 Background

## Legal and Policy Requirements

**1.1** Under the regulations implementing the provisions of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is required for Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and potentially Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) contained in a Local Development Framework (LDF). The purpose of the SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans.

**1.2** SA helps planning authorities to fulfil the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in preparing their plans. Overall, the aims of the SA are to:

- Increase the sustainability of the LDF by ensuring that the principles of sustainable development are integrated into the policy-making process;
- Provide a high level of environmental protection and ensure that environmental, economic and social implications are considered in the preparation of the LDF documents;
- Consult on the SA procedure to allow stakeholders and the public to have an input into its production; and
- Provide an environmental, economic and social audit at appropriate spatial and temporal levels.

**1.3** The EU Directive 2001/42/EC on assessments of effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive) came into

force in the UK through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

**1.4** The overarching objective of the SEA Directive is:  
*“To provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans... with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuring that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans... which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.”*  
 (Article 1)

**1.5** Under the requirements of the SEA Directive, a plan or programme will be subject to environmental assessment if it meets various criteria including:

- The plan/programme is subject to preparation and/or adoption by an authority at national, regional or local level or prepared by an authority for adoption, through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government;
- It is required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions; and
- It is likely to have a significant effect on the environment.

**1.6** The LDF is prepared and adopted by an authority at the local level and is required by legislative provisions. It is prepared for the purposes of town and country planning/land use. It is therefore the case that the DPDs and most of the SPDs prepared as part of the Kingston LDF are required to be subject to environmental assessment, as they are being developed, under the SEA Directive.

**1.7** The SEA Directive and the SEA regulations require that the “likely significant effects on the environment are assessed, including issues such as:

- Biodiversity;
- Population;
- Human health;
- Fauna and flora;
- Soil;
- Water;
- Air;
- Climatic factors;
- Material assets;
- Cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage;
- Landscape; and
- The interrelationship between these factors”.

24, in PPS1 states: “*Planning authorities should ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in their development plans. In particular, they should carefully consider the inter-relationship between social inclusion, protecting and enhancing the environment, the prudent use of natural resources and economic development.*”

**1.9** The SA process is described in the guidance titled 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (ODPM, Nov 2005). The methodology and process described wholly integrates the EU Directive requirements into this report. The following table outlines the stages of the process and what is carried out when. The 2005 guidance has since been updated by the Communities and Local Government (CLG) 'Plan Making Manual'. The CLG guidance 'Towards a more efficient and effective use of Strategy Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal in spatial Planning Final Report 2010' has also been referred to.

### Purpose of the SA Report

**1.8** The Sustainability Appraisal should be an integral part of the Development Plan Document (DPD) preparation process. In this way it helps to reinforce Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development. Paragraph

**Table 1 : Stages of SA against DPD stages**

|  |
|--|
| <b>DPD Stage 1: Pre-production – Evidence Gathering</b>  |
| <i>SA stages and tasks</i>   |
| <p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A1:</b> Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives.</li> <li>• <b>A2:</b> Collecting baseline information.</li> <li>• <b>A3:</b> Identifying sustainability issues and problems.</li> <li>• <b>A4:</b> Consulting on the scope of the SA.</li> </ul> |
| <b>DPD Stage 2: Production</b>   |
| <i>SA Stages and tasks</i>   |

|   |
|---|
| <p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>B1:</b> Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework</li> <li>• <b>B2:</b> Developing the DPD options</li> <li>• <b>B3:</b> Predicting the effects of the DPD.</li> <li>• <b>B4:</b> Evaluating the effects of the DPD.</li> <li>• <b>B5:</b> Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects.</li> <li>• <b>B6:</b> Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPDs.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>C1:</b> Preparing the SA Report.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Stage D: Consulting on the preferred options of the DPD and SA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>D1:</b> Public participation on the preferred options of the DPD and the SA Report.</li> <li>• <b>D2(i):</b> Appraising significant changes.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>DPD Stage 3: Examination</b></p>  |
| <p><i>SA stages and tasks</i></p>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>D2(ii):</b> Appraising significant changes resulting from representations.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>DPD Stage 4: Adoption and monitoring</b></p>  |
| <p><i>SA stages and tasks</i></p>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>D3:</b> Making decisions and providing information.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the DPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>E1:</b> Finalising aims and methods of monitoring</li> <li>• <b>E2:</b> Responding to adverse effects.</li> </ul>  |

## Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations

**1.10** The SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633: The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004)

requires the SA Report to set out how it is in conformity with the SEA directive, by setting out how the requirements have been met. The table below sets out where the relevant information can be found in this SA Report which represents the required contents of the 'Environmental Report'.

Table 2 : Compliance with SEA Directive

| <b>SEA Regulations requirement for an Environmental Report</b>  | <b>Where covered in SA Report</b>  |
|---|--|
| Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely 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 whole report covers this.  |
| An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.  | Section 1 sets out the plans objectives and contents.<br>Section 3 summarises the relationship with other relevant plans and further detail is provided in Appendix 3.                   |
| The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.  | Section 3 summarises the current state of the environment and Appendix 4 provides further detail on this. Appendix 5 covers the likely evolution without the implementation of the plan. |
| The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.   | The environmental characteristics are in Section 3 and Appendix 4 provides further detail.   |
| 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.   | Section 3 looks at the key sustainability issues covering social, environmental and economic issues.   |
| The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.                            | Section 3 and Appendix 4 highlight the relevant environmental  |

| <b>SEA Regulations requirement for an Environmental Report</b>   | <b>Where covered in SA Report</b>   |
|--|---|
|  | protection objectives and how they influenced the sustainability objectives.  |
| The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects). | Significant effects are summarised in Appendix 6 and Appendix 7 provides further detail on short, medium, long term impacts of the plan as a whole.             |
| 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.  | Section 5 sets out mitigation measures to prevent any adverse effects on the environment from implementing the plan.  |
| 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.   | Reasons for selecting policies is in Section 4 and assessment in Appendix 6. Section 2 covers difficulties encountered when compiling the required information. |
| A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring  | Section 5 summarises monitoring proposals and Appendix 8 sets out the monitoring framework.   |
| Consultation: Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity 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).  | Consultation information for this report is contained in Non Technical Summary. Section 2 sets out previous consultations held                                  |

| SEA Regulations requirement for an Environmental Report | Where covered in SA Report   |
|---|--|
|   | and Appendix 2 sets consultation responses received on <i>Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009</i> and the <i>Revised Scoping Report (Atkins, 2008)</i> . |

### Local Development Framework

**1.11** The Core Strategy, which this report accompanies is one of a suite of DPDs which will form the LDF. The Council's LDF consists of the following documents:

- Core Strategy;
- Joint South London Waste Plan;
- Proposals Map;
- Kingston upon Thames Area Action Plan, K+20.

**1.12** Supporting guidance includes:

- S106 Planning Obligations SPD;
- Affordable Housing SPD;
- Access for All SPD; and
- Shopfront and Shopsign Design Guide SPD

**1.13** The Core Strategy consists of

- Area Guidance;
- Key Areas of Change; and
- Thematic policies

**1.14** The Area Guidance reflects locally important and strategic areas for development and covers:

- Kingston Town Centre;
- Maldens and Coombe;

- Surbiton; and
- South of the Borough.

**1.15** There are three Key Areas of Change, each with their own vision and delivery strategy and they are:

- Kingston Town Centre;
- Tolworth; and
- Hogsmill Valley

**1.16** The Thematic policies are Borough wide and cover issues such as climate change, sustainable transport and heritage. Each theme contains core and development management policies. They have been separated into three themes and are as follows:

1. A Sustainable Kingston;
2. Prosperous and Inclusive; and
3. Safe, Healthy and Strong

## 2 Appraisal Methodology

**2.1** In accordance with Table 1: 'Stages of SA against DPD Stages', Stage 1A is covered by the Revised Scoping Report 2008 (Atkins), where the sustainability objectives were derived from a baseline information review of the Borough, other relevant plans and programmes and public comments. It outlines the framework by which the assessments contained in this report and the previous SA Report were carried out. The Revised Scoping Report was consulted on to ensure an appropriate range of objectives had been chosen.

**2.2** The Stage 2B tasks in Table 1 have been undertaken in the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 which included:

- a compatibility assessment of Core Strategy objectives against the sustainability objectives
- an assessment of Options
- an assessment of Preferred Policies
- mitigation and implementation of the policies

**2.3** Each policy has been assessed against each of the 19 sustainability objectives which form the Sustainability Framework. The 19 sustainability objectives are as follows:

1. To reduce poverty and social inclusion
2. To reduce crime and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime
3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community
4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure
5. To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health
6. To provide the education and skills of the population
7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity
8. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car
9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale
10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough
11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk
12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources
13. To improve air quality
14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions
15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy
16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling
17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities

- 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment
- 19. To foster a strong tourism industry

**2.4** The production of the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 meets Stage 2C in Table 1 and the consultation of the report meets Stage 2D requirements. The assessment methodology framework in Table 3 below provides a consistent approach to the appraisal process.

**Table 3 :Assessment Methodology Framework**

| Level of Impact | Definition of Impact           |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| ++              | Strongly positive              |
| +               | Positive                       |
| 0               | Neutral/no effect              |
| -               | Negative                       |
| --              | Strongly negative              |
| +/-             | Both positive/negative impacts |

**Equalities Impact Assessment**

**2.5** Local Authorities have a legal responsibility to undertake an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) under The Race Relations Amendment Act 2000, Disability Discrimination Act 2005 and the Equality Act 2006. The Equalities Act 2010 strengthens the existing legislation. An EQIA is a means of refocusing services or employment practices on the needs of diverse communities or diverse groups of staff. It is a process of analysing a proposed or existing service, strategy, policy, or project. The aim is to identify any effect or likely effect on different groups within

the community by anticipating and identifying the discriminatory or negative consequences for a particular group or sector of the community on the grounds of race, disability, gender, age, religion and belief, and sexual orientation. Consequently, local authorities must assess their policies and functions, set out how they will monitor any possible negative impacts and to make sure that, as far as possible, any negative consequences are eliminated or minimised and opportunities for promoting equality are maximised.

**2.6** In line with CLG guidance '*Towards a more efficient and effective use of Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal in spatial Planning*' March 2010, the SA has integrated the EQIA assessment into the process. This method ensures efficiency and avoids duplication as the EQIA assessment shares the same thought process as the SA.

**2.7** The assessment process in the SA has ensured that it addresses the different requirements of the community that have not been previously considered. The vision, core strategy objectives along with the core and development management policies in the Core Strategy Submission Version have been developed to reflect the diversity of the population. Furthermore, the requirements of the EQIA have been covered by the social sustainability objectives which have been developed and informed by baseline information. All the policies in the Core Strategy have been assessed against social sustainability objectives as well as the environmental and economic objectives. It is considered that this approach, reflects the requirements contained within the EQIA guidance.

To support this integrated approach, more detail is provided in the Appendix 1 of this report.

## Health Impact Assessment

**2.8** The Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is a voluntary approach that ensures decision making at all levels which considers the potential impacts of decisions on health and health inequalities. It identifies actions that can enhance positive effects and reduce or eliminate negative effects.

**2.9** In line with CLG guidance *Towards a more efficient and effective use of Strategic Environment Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal in spatial Planning* March 2010, the SA has integrated the HIA assessment into the SA process. It is felt that this method enables efficiency and avoids duplication as similar to the EQIA, the HIA assessment shares the same thought process as the SA.

**2.10** The HIA is covered via the inclusion of specific sustainability objectives, SA objective: 03 To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community and 05 To improve the populations health and reduce inequalities in health. The consideration of adequate health facilities for all within the Borough, seeking to improve existing facilities and address deficiency means that the requirements for a HIA have been provided for within the SA as a whole.

## Difficulties Encountered

**2.11** Difficulties have been encountered with monitoring as there are issues associated with collecting information because it is not always readily available. As part of the implementation, monitoring and action

planning it is proposed that data collection measures will be reviewed in order to develop and improve them.

**2.12** Another issue was encountered in identifying relevant key programmes and plans in that these are continually changing, especially with regards to climate change guidance. Consequently key sustainability issues will need to periodically be reviewed to ensure they are in line with a new emerging legislation, national planning policy statements and regional planning guidance.

## Consultation

**2.13** The statutory environmental consultation bodies have been consulted along with any other stakeholders who may be interested in the methodology and outcome of the SA process. Previous consultations are as follows:

- Revised Scoping Report 2008 (Atkins) was consulted on for 5 weeks from 19 May 2008. It sought comments from the statutory consultees and other relevant bodies with an interest in sustainability issues. An earlier version of this Scoping Report was produced and also consulted on in 2005.
- Preferred Strategy and Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 was consulted on from 30 November 2009 to 22 January 2010 for the required 6 week period.
- Core Strategy Publication Version and the Sustainability Appraisal Report 2011 was published online on 31st January 2011 for 6 weeks.

**2.14** This report will be submitted to the Secretary of State along with the Core Strategy.

### European Habitats Directive

**2.15** The European Directive (92/43/EEC) on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (the Habitats Directive) protects habitats and species of European nature conservation importance. The Habitats Directive establishes a network of internationally important sites across Europe designated for their ecological status. These are referred to as Natura 2000 sites and comprise of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs). SPAs are classified under the Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds, the 'Birds Directive'.

**2.16** Articles 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive require an Appropriate Assessment to be undertaken on proposed plans or projects which are not necessary to the management of the site but which are likely to have a significant effect on one or more European sites either individually, or *in combination* with other plans and projects. The regulations require preparation of a separate document to the Sustainability Appraisal which should form part of the evidence base. These regulations require the application of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to all land use plans and for local planning authorities to assess the potential effects of plans on European Sites. The HRA is also commonly referred to as the Appropriate Assessment (AA) however the AA is a step in the HRA process and is only undertaken if the screening assessment concludes there are likely to be significant effects on European sites.

**2.17** Five sites in the HRA screening report were identified however none of these sites fall within the Borough boundary. The Core Strategy policies were screened for potential effects upon: Richmond Park SAC, Wimbledon Common SAC, Mole Gap to Reigate Escarpment SPA, Thames Basins Heath SPA and South West London Water bodies SPA. The HRA screening report concluded that the Core Strategy is unlikely to have a significant negative impact upon these sites. Therefore there an AA would not be necessary.

## 3 Sustainability Objectives, Baseline and Context

### Key Plans and Programmes

**3.1** DPD's must be prepared in the context of other plans and programmes. The SEA Directive requires a context review to be carried out and states that information should be provided on:

- “an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes” (Annex I, a)
- “The environmental protection objectives, established at international, [European] Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation” (Annex I, e)

**3.2** This SA report accepts that the London Plan and its various adopted and draft strategies have been produced in line with European and national legislation and policy guidance.

**3.3** There has been significant new legislation and guidance on climate change in the past few years. For example, the Climate Change Act 2008, aims to improve carbon management and help the transition towards a low carbon economy in the UK as well as demonstrate strong UK leadership and international responsibility for reducing global emissions. It creates a framework for building the UK's ability to adapt to climate change. One of the key provisions of the act is a legally binding target of at least an 80% cut in greenhouse gas emissions by 2050, to be achieved through action in the UK

and abroad. The updated versions of the London Plan reflect this new guidance.

**3.4** There have been updates to national planning policy statements (PPS); PPS3: *Housing 2010* and PPS25: *Development and Flood Risk 2010*. There is a new PPS4: *Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth 2009*, and PPS5: *Planning for the Historic Environment 2010*. Draft PPSs are: *Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment* and the *Consultation on a Planning Policy Statement: Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate*.

**3.5** At a regional level, the London Plan is currently under review and therefore the Core Strategy has taken the policies in *Draft Replacement London Plan 2009* into consideration. The *Draft Replacement London Plan* sets out to meet the needs of a growing population, support an increase in London's development and employment, improve the environment and tackle climate change. It aims to ensure that London's transport is easy, safe and convenient for everyone and encourages cycling, walking and electric vehicles. The draft replacement is more focused in that each policy is subdivided into separate sections on strategic, London wide policy, policy to inform planning decisions and policy on preparation of Borough's LDFs. There are also a whole raft of Mayor adopted and draft strategies. It is important to note that legislation requires the Core Strategy to be in general conformity with Mayor's London Plan.

**3.6** PPS12 states that the spatial planning objectives for local areas, as set out in the LDF, should be aligned not only with national and regional plans, but also with the shared local priorities set

out in the Community Plan. The Kingston Plan 2008, the borough's Community Plan, is the key strategic policy document at a local level. The Core Strategy sets a clear vision, closely aligned with the Kingston Plan, as to how the borough should look and function and how development needs will be met up to 2026. The Core Strategy includes spatial objectives and strategic policies (both grouped under the Kingston Plan themes) and identifies the broad location and amount of development being planned. The Kingston Plan vision is for the borough to continue to be one of the very best places in which to live and work: *'We want Kingston to be a place where people are happy, healthy and enjoy a good quality of life, in a safe and tolerant environment, where business is prosperous, and where everyone in our community can contribute to our success and reach their own full potential.'* The Kingston Plan has three themes, underpinned by ten objectives, which are as follows:

1. A sustainable Kingston; where the environment is protected and enhanced for us and future generations.
2. A prosperous and inclusive Borough where economic prosperity is shared and everyone has the opportunity to achieve their potential and a good quality of life.
3. A safe, healthy and strong Borough where people feel safe, where individuals take responsibility; health inequalities are tackled; and where people respect and support each other.

**3.7** Appendix 3 in this SA Report contains an updated table of relevant plans and programmes, taken from the previous appraisal report. New and updated evidence base studies are listed in the

annexes of the Core Strategy Submission Version and are available on the Council's Local Development Framework web page ([www.kingston.gov.uk](http://www.kingston.gov.uk)).

## Baseline Information

**3.8** The baseline information provides characterisation of the Borough and puts it into a local context by setting out information about the current state of RBK. Appendix 4 in this SA report contains a detailed baseline information table, setting out the sustainability objectives with the relevant indicators, targets, and SEA topics. This table has been updated and contains the latest data available. The summary below is from the previous appraisal and provides information on the social, economic and physical characteristics of the Borough. The summary used the most recent information available at the time of writing the report.

## Social Characteristics and Trends

**3.9** Kingston's population of 156,000 in 2006 was the smallest of all the London boroughs excluding the City of London. Between 2002 and 2008 there was an increase in the total population of 6.61% in the Borough. This was a significantly higher rate of increase than the outer London (2.47%) and Greater London (%) averages. According to the 2001 Census, there are just under 65,000 households, with an average household size of 2.34, single person households form the largest group (32%), with 13% being lone pensioners, followed by couples with dependent children (21%) and couples with no children (17%). The borough population is forecast to increase by 6.6% between 2006 and 2011 and by nearly 7% between 2011 and 2026 (GLA Population Projections 2008 Round). Recent population increase

has been due to a significant rise in the birth rate, as well as new housing provision and these trends are expected to continue with significant implications for housing and community infrastructure.

- 3.10** Kingston (as for Greater London) has a higher proportion of younger residents aged 20-39 than the national average and a lower proportion of older people aged 55-84. Parts of Surbiton and Kingston have a low proportion of children and young people.
- 3.11** Overall the borough has a low proportion of residents in minority ethnic groups, 16% in 2001 compared with 29% for London overall. Tamils and Koreans form the largest ME groups in the borough. New Malden's Korean population is the largest in Europe. Population projections up to 2026 indicate a doubling of the ethnic minority population to 29% by 2026.

### Economic Characteristics

- 3.12** The borough has a healthy economy generally, underpinned by high levels of productivity, knowledge driven employment and an enterprising business environment. Over the past 20 years the economy has transformed from a manufacturing sector base to one based on business and service industries and the public sector. There were nearly 86,000 jobs in 2006, with high proportions in business activities, finance and IT (41%); distribution, retail and catering (23%) and public administration (21%). At the same time, nearly 84,000 residents were available for work, with a high proportion (64%) in the top three socio-economic groups (managers, professionals and technical occupations), compared to 53% for London overall. Despite roughly equal numbers of jobs and residents

available for work, there is a significant imbalance between the types of jobs available and the skills base of residents. The high proportion of lower level service jobs in the borough results in a high proportion of residents commuting out of the borough to work and large numbers of workers commuting into the borough to work (high house prices contribute to the problem).

- 3.13** Kingston town centre, one of 11 metropolitan centres across London, is the borough's main commercial centre and a sub-regional shopping centre, as well as being a significant cultural and leisure destination. The district centres of Surbiton, New Malden and Tolworth cater for more everyday needs, supplemented by local shops. Together these centres provide over 50% of total employment in the borough.
- 3.14** Outside the main centres, eight 'designated' Industrial/Business/Warehouse areas provide a range of business premises and employment opportunities. The cluster of offices along London Road in Kingston, plus numerous sites across the borough, particularly along the main roads, also provide jobs, services and business premises.

### Physical Characteristics

- 3.15** Kingston's attractive low rise suburban residential areas range from the highly desirable areas of Coombe, Kingston Hill and Southborough with their large detached houses in landscaped settings, to the Victorian and Edwardian villas and terraces around Kingston town centre and Surbiton to the inter-war and post war suburbs of semi-detached houses in New Malden, Worcester Park, Berrylands, Tolworth, Hook and Chessington.

**3.16** Property prices are high and many people cannot afford to live in the borough, which makes the provision of affordable housing an important local issue. It also results in local recruitment problems and commuting.

**3.17** The borough is fortunate to be close to large open spaces in Richmond Park, Wimbledon Common, Hampton Court and Bushy Park, as well as having its own green spaces. Over a third of the borough is open space, with large areas designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Green Belt.

**3.18** Kingston has a rich heritage stemming from the town centre’s riverside location and proximity to royal estates and many conservation areas, mostly in Kingston and Surbiton, which contribute to its attractive and distinctive character.

**3.19** Key features of the borough’s transport networks include:

- a strategic road network, including the A3 Kingston by-pass, that carries high levels of traffic passing through the borough as well as local traffic and has a significant influence on the local environment
- good rail services on the South West Trains mainline via Surbiton,

but relatively poor suburban services on the Kingston loop, Shepperton, Hampton Court and Chessington lines

- a comprehensive bus network provided by Transport for London (TfL) London Buses, but poor cross-boundary bus services to Surrey Districts resulting in high car use to and from these areas
- a network of cycle routes (part of the London Cycle Network) though not all are completed or dedicated routes
- two strategic walks - the Thames Path National Trail and the Hogsmill Valley Walk (part of the London Loop)

#### Key Sustainability Issues

**3.20** In the Revised Scoping Report 2008 (Atkins), the key sustainability issues and implications for the LDF were presented and an analysis of the key sustainability issues was provided in the previous appraisal, Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009. The table below provides a summary of the key sustainability issues which takes into account any new issues which might have arisen during the process of the appraisal and consultation responses. The key sustainability issues are set against their relative sustainability objective.

**Table 4 : Key Sustainability Issues**

| Sustainability Objectives  | Key Issues  |
|--|---|
| 1. To reduce social poverty and social exclusion                       | The Borough has pockets of deprivation, which are the Cambridge Estate in the Norbiton Ward, parts of Beverley ward in New Malden and Grove Ward in Kingston. They are the most deprived in terms of health deprivation and disability. |
| 2. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime | The Borough has low crime figures however anti-social behaviour, crime and fear of crime are issues for Kingston Town Centre.   |

| Sustainability Objectives  | Key Issues   |
|--|--|
| 3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community  | Projected increase in population size will mean increasing demand for schools, healthcare and community facilities. These need to be accessible to all members of the community.   |
| 4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure   | House prices within Kingston are higher on average than the national average. Given the Borough's size, and existing patterns of urbanisation, there are limited brownfield sites available for significant development. New housing will need to be a mix of house types, sizes and tenures to meet projected needs, in particular family housing, student accommodation, singles and affordable housing.                   |
| 5. To improve the population's health  | There are marked health inequalities and disparities caused by socio-economic and lifestyle factors which need to be addressed. However, overall health in the Borough is considered to be good and this needs to be maintained by improving and providing new healthcare facilities and leisure opportunities.  |
| 6. To improve the education and skills of the population   | There is a significant increase in demand for school places caused by long term trend of rising birth rates. There is also a significant imbalance between the types of jobs available and skills base of residents.   |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity | The Borough includes a large extent of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land where development potential is very limited. The value of the Borough's existing buildings need to be recognised and they along with previously developed land should be used in an efficient manner. It is important that environmental (including soil) and amenity considerations are taken into account in the delivery of new development. |
| 8. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | The main shortfall and hindrance to sustainable modes of transport is the accessibility into the town centre from the South and West and from Surrey districts, therefore much of the borough remains somewhat dependent on car travel. There is a need to promote the use of sustainable transport modes and reduce car use.  |
| 9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | Kingston is a green and leafy suburb with excellent provision of open space and access to the River Thames. There are opportunities to improve local open space provision and accessibility. The borough shares its boundary with Richmond Park and Wimbledon Common with other local authorities which have a European nature   |

| Sustainability Objectives  | Key Issues  |
|--|---|
|  | conservation importance. These open spaces provide important habitats for wildlife and need to be protected.  |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | A large proportion of the borough is designated as an area of archaeological significance. These designations reflect known historic centres, archaeological sites and spots. The Borough's heritage must be protected from inappropriate development and the impact of climate change. Opportunities for enhancement to historical buildings need to be sensitive. |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk   | Kingston is effected by fluvial and pluvial flooding. Fluival flood risk is from the River Thames, the Hogsmill River, Bonesgate stream, Tolworth Brook and Beverly Brook. The geology of the Borough is characterised to a very large degree by London Clay and this can lead to localised incidents of groundwater flooding.                                      |
| 12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources   | Increasing water consumption means there is significant pressure to manage water as a sustainable resource. The Environment Agency monitor the water quality of rivers in the Borough and these scored poorly. There are government targets to improve these.   |
| 13. To improve air quality   | The whole of the Borough is designated an Air Quality Management Area. There are high traffic levels and periodic congestion on Kingston town centre's and main arterial routes at peak times. This causes air and noise pollution, with negative effects on health.  |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions  | Climate change is a threat to environmental, economic and social sustainability. The Borough's residents are likely to experience severe flooding, hotter summers and water shortages. Tackling climate change through mitigation and adaptation measures is essential.   |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy   | There is a limited provision of renewable energy facilities in the Borough, resulting in a dependence upon fossil fuels for most power and heating needs. A framework is needed to enable the delivery of energy efficiency and renewable energy provision.   |
| 16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling  | Given the Borough's size and population, it is limited in the commercially viable waste management facilities it can sustain. The achievement of waste management targets relies heavily on the promotion of recycling/composting and sustainable waste management  |

| Sustainability Objectives   | Key Issues  |
|---|---|
|   | in terms of maximising use of existing facilities, infrastructure, and minimising the effects on the environment.   |
| 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities                                  | The high proportion of lower level service jobs in the Borough results in a high proportion of residents commuting out of the Borough to work and large numbers of workers commuting into the Borough to work. A variety of employment opportunities are needed to address this imbalance.  |
| 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment | Kingston town centre is a successful metropolitan centre. However, there are physical constraints to economic development of Kingston. The town centre and business areas of the Borough are quite compact and constrained. There is also a limited supply of industrial/business land. Economic development needs to take place in accessible locations and to ensure it does not negatively impact upon the natural and historic environment. |
| 19. To foster a strong tourism industry   | Kingston has a variety of historic attractions, and easy access to nearby tourist attractions such as Hampton Court. Tourism provides employment and creates visitor spending. Tourism along with creativity, and leisure sectors are projected areas of strong growth in the Borough.  |

## Sustainability Framework

**3.21** Together, the analysis of the evidence base, review of other relevant plans and programmes, collection of relevant environmental, social and economic information to characterise the area (the baseline) and consultation with stakeholders and statutory bodies were used for inform the SA Framework. The SA Framework consists of objectives, indicators and targets. These are available in Table 5.1 of the Revised Scoping Report 2008 (Atkins) and the assessment rationale, an interpretation

of the SA Framework is in Table 5.2. This framework has been used to appraise the Core Strategy's policies and objectives.

**3.22** The SEA Directive requires the sustainability objectives to cover 12 topics: biodiversity, human health, fauna and flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between these factors. Table 5 below sets out the all the SEA Directive topics and which sustainability objectives they are covered by.

**Table 5 : Coverage of SEA Directive Topics**

| SEA Directive Topic                                 | Sustainability Objectives        |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Biodiversity  | 7, 9, 13                         |
| Population  | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 17, 18, 19 |
| Human Health  | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14         |
| Fauna and flora                                     | 9, 13                            |
| Soil  | 7, 10, 16                        |
| Water   | 7, 11, 12                        |
| Air   | 8, 13                            |
| Climatic Factors                                    | 8, 14, 15,                       |
| Material assets                                     | 4, 10, 16, 18, 19                |
| Cultural heritage including archaeological heritage | 10                               |
| Landscape   | 7, 8, 9, 10, 16                  |

**3.23** A key part of the developing the SA Framework involved assessing the compatibility of the sustainability objectives in Table 6. This involved assessing each of the sustainability objectives against each other to draw attention to any conflicts between them. Table 7 contains the sustainability objectives which scored negatively and lists the conflicting sustainability objectives with a summary of the reasons why there is a potential conflict. It indicates that the social and economic sustainability objectives 4 and 18 could have the most detrimental effect upon the other environmental sustainability objectives. Increasing economic activity and housing provision could cause harm to habitats and have an adverse impact upon air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, energy efficiency and generation of waste. To minimise negative impacts it will be possible to apply mitigation measures at the development stage

when the planning policies can be considered together. Overall, the assessment shows that it is not possible to consistently avoid harm to all objectives when seeking to achieve others but it does demonstrate that the majority of the sustainability objectives are compatible.

**Table 6 : Compatibility of Sustainability Objectives**

| SA Objective   | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. | 8. | 9. | 10. | 11. | 12. | 13. | 14. | 15. | 16. | 17. | 18. | 19. |
|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. To reduce social poverty and social exclusion   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime   | +  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community  | +  | +  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure   | +  | +  | +  |    |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5. To improve the population's health  | +  | +  | +  | +  |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6. To improve the education and skills of the population   | +  | +  | +  | +  | +  |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity   | +  | +  | +  | -  | +  | 0  |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 8. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | +  | 0  | +  | +  | +  | 0  | +  |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | +  | +  | 0  | -  | 0  | 0  | +  | +  |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | +   |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | +  | +  | +  | -  | 0  | 0  | +  | +  |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | +   |



**Table 7 : Conflicting Sustainability Objectives**

| SA Objective  | Conflicting Objective  | Summary   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure</p> | <p>7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity</p> <p>9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on international, national and local scale</p> <p>10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough</p> <p>11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk</p> <p>12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources</p> <p>13. To improve air quality</p> <p>14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions</p> <p>15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy</p> | <p>The location of new development could be located in flood risk areas. Increasing housing provision in the Borough could place pressure on greenfield sites and the natural environment. It could increase greenhouse gases, energy use, generation of waste, consumption of resources and water. Depending on the location of new housing, it may lead to an increase in congestion and affect air quality. The design and quality of new residential development could affect the Borough's heritage.</p> |

| SA Objective  | Conflicting Objective  | Summary   |
|---|--|---|
|   | 16. To promote sustainable waste management reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling   |   |
| 9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on international, national and local scale              | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment<br>19. To foster a strong tourism industry   | Encouraging a strong economy and an increase in visitor numbers could place pressure upon green spaces in the Borough.  |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk  | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment<br>19. To foster a strong tourism industry   | The location of new development, including employment, and tourism facilities could be located in areas of high flood risk.   |
| 13. To improve air quality  | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment  | The effects of encouraging a strong, stable economy and the actions taken to achieve this could have a negative impact upon air quality.  |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions   | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment  | The effects of encouraging a strong, stable economy and the actions taken to achieve this could increase greenhouse emissions.  |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of | 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | Increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy resources in the built environment could negatively affect the Borough's heritage. The effects of encouraging a strong, stable economy and the actions taken to achieve this could increase the consumption of resources and increase energy use. |

| SA Objective   | Conflicting Objective   | Summary  |
|--|---|--|
| renewable energy   | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment |  |
| 16. To promote sustainable waste management reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling | 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment | The effects of encouraging a strong, stable economy and the actions taken to achieve this could result in an increase in waste generation. |

### 4 Assessment of Plan Policies

#### Previous Appraisal

- 4.1** In section 7 of the previous appraisal, the Plan Issues and Options assessment described the different options for the thematic policies followed by an analysis of the reasons why a particular option was chosen, whilst highlighting any particular issues that become apparent during the assessment process. For more details, please see section 7 of the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009.
- 4.2** In the previous appraisal, the Preferred Policies, Area Based Guidance and Key Areas of Change were fully appraised against the sustainability objectives. For more detail, please see Section 8: Assessment of Plan Policies and Appendices 2: Full Sustainability Appraisals, 3: Area-based Assessments and 4: Key Areas for Change Assessments in the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal 2009.
- 4.3** The compatibility assessment in the previous appraisal demonstrated overall compatibility between the SA objectives and the Core Strategy objectives. This is largely a result of the joined up approach between sustainable development in the themes of the Core Strategy and the development of the Core Strategy objectives. For a more detailed statement on the compatibility assessment please see Section 6 and Appendix 1 of the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009.

#### Publication Version

##### Policy Amendments

- 4.4** As a result of responses received during the consultation of the Preferred Strategy, changes have been made to the policies. However, as these changes to the policy text are minor, a full SA is not required. The justification for this is shown in Table 8 which shows how the Preferred Strategy policies have been developed into the Submission policies. The 'Changes' Column details the reasons for the changes made to policies. The policies have been amended in response to consultation comments, updates to national planning policy guidance, new legislation, in addition to reflect new information presented in studies and research that provide an updated evidence base. The amendments also needed to take into account the requirements of the *Draft Replacement London Plan 2009*. The new policies in the Core Strategy Submission Version are in Table 9 and have been fully appraised in Appendix 6.
- 4.5** Other amendments have been made to the submission document including changes to the Area Based Guidance where the areas have been renamed after the Boroughs neighbourhoods. The West Area has been renamed Kingston Town, The East Area has been renamed Maldens and Coombe, The Central Area has been renamed Surbiton, and The South Area has been renamed South of the Borough.
- 4.6** An addition has been made to the Key Areas of Change and Kingston Town Centre has been added. This is a key area of change and already has its own delivery plan, *K+20 Kingston Town Centre Area Action Plan 2008*. This plan was subjected to a separate SA in 2005.
- 4.7** The structure of the Core Strategy Publication Version document has changed also. It is considered that

because these changes relate to the document structure that there is no need for a further assessment to be carried. These structural changes to the document were made in order to improve its layout, readability, effectiveness and in response to consultation comments.

Table 8 : Policy Amendments

| Preferred Strategy  | Changes  | Proposed Submission  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>  |  |  |
| TP1 Climate Change and Sustainability   | <p>This policy has been split into two core policies and a DM policy. Policy DM1 supports policy CS1 and CS2, it provides criteria for sustainable construction in line with latest national and London Plan requirements. The sustainable construction standards in Policy DM1 were informed by the Climate Change Evidence Base Report.</p> <p>Policy DM3 supports CS1 and CS2 and provides additional detail on designing for climate change.</p> | <p>CS1 Climate Change Mitigation</p> <p>CS2 Climate Change Adaptation</p> <p>DM1 Sustainable Design and Construction Standards</p> <p>DM3 Designing for Changing Climate</p> |
| TP 2 Decentralised Energy Networks and Low Carbon Zones<br>TP3 Renewable and Low Carbon Development | <p>These policies have been merged into one DM policy. Minor word changes have been made to renewable energy requirements. The opportunity areas for decentralised energy have been amended in the light of new evidence, (the DEMAP Phase 1 Project).</p>   | DM2 Low Carbon Development   |
| TP4 Water Management and Flood Risk   | <p>The policy has been updated in response to consultation responses received from the Environment Agency, GLA and Thames Water. It has also been updated to ensure</p>  | DM4 Water Management and Flood Risk  |

| Preferred Strategy  | Changes   | Proposed Submission  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>  |   |  |
|   | it is in line with the requirements of the London Plan.   |  |
| TP5 Green belt and Metropolitan Open Land<br>TP6 Protection and Provision of Open Space | Policies TP5, TP6 and TP7 have been merged into one core policy and two DM policies. The CS3 policy has been updated in response to consultation responses from GOL and Natural England.  | CS3 The Natural and Green Environment  |
| TP7 Biodiversity<br>TP8 Outdoor Sports Facilities                                       | Boundary changes (TP5) in Coombe to add land at Warren Cutting into MOL designation was not taken forward as the required evidence did not exist in line with the GOL consultation response.<br><br>Local open space needs are now included to reflect Natural England's consultation response and national and regional requirements of development plans. | DM5 Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Open Space Needs                |
| TP9 Thames Riverside  | Minor wording changes have been made to give clearer guidance to the Development Management Team.<br><br>This policy has been split into one core policy and one DM policy. The wording has also been updated to reflect consultation responses.  | DM6 Biodiversity<br><br>CS4 River Thames Corridor, Tributaries and the Riverside |

| Preferred Strategy                     | Changes   | Proposed Submission   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b> |   |   |
|  | The wording has been updated to reflect consultation responses and K+20 AAP. This will give clearer guidance to the Development Management Team.  | DM7 River Thames Corridor, Tributaries and the Riverside  |
| TP10 Sustainable Travel                | Name of the policy changed to clarify that this policy specifically refers to reducing need to travel by ensuring provision of local services. The first bullet point has been deleted as its covered in policy CS6.  | CS5 Reducing the Need to Travel   |
| TP11 Public Transport                  | This policy has been combined with polices from TP12 into one policy to cover sustainable travel.   | CS6 Sustainable Travel  |
| TP12 Cycling and Walking               | This policy has been combined with polices from TP11 into one policy to cover sustainable travel. Polices covering sustainable transport for new development now covered by policy DM8.   | CS6 Sustainable Travel<br>DM8 Sustainable Transport for new Development   |
| TP13 Smarter Travel                    | TP13 has been deleted to avoid some duplication and unnecessary detail but most aspects retained and integrated into other policies. DM8 covers Travel Plans and financial contributions. CS7 covers Car clubs and electric vehicles. DM9 covers Car clubs and electric vehicles for development. | DM8 Sustainable Transport for new Development<br>CS7 Managing Vehicle Use<br>DM9 Managing Vehicle Use for New Development |

| Preferred Strategy                          | Changes  | Proposed Submission  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>      |  |  |
| TP14 Manage Congestion, Car Use and Parking | Policy retained by policies on car clubs/ electric vehicles also added (previously in TP13). Development management policies transferred to DM9.       | CS7 Managing Vehicle Use<br>DM9 Managing Vehicle Use for New Development   |
| TP15 Character, Design and Heritage         | This policy has been split into one core policy and three DM policies.   | CS8 Character, Heritage and Design   |
|   | Policy DM10 provides more detailed guidance, that reflect the aims of TP15.  | DM10 Design Requirements for New Developments (including House Extensions) |
|   | Policy DM10 provides more detailed guidance, that reflect the aims of TP15.  | DM11 Design Approach   |
|   | This policy was amended to reflect consultation responses received from English Heritage to provide more detailed guidance and covered in Policy DM12. | DM12 Development in Conservation Areas & Affecting Heritage Assets         |
| TP16 Waste Reduction and Minimisation       | Minor wording changes to allow for changes to London Plan waste apportionment  | CS9 Waste Reduction and Management   |
| <b>Theme 2: Prosperous and Inclusive</b>    |  |  |
| TP17 Housing Delivery and Mix               | This policy has been split into one core policy and one DM policy. The wording has also been updated to reflect consultation responses.                | CS10 Housing Delivery<br>DM13 Housing Quality and Mix                      |

| Preferred Strategy                           | Changes   | Proposed Submission   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>       |   |   |
|  | New policy as the result of consultation responses.   | DM14 Loss of Housing  |
| TP18 Affordable Housing                      | The policy has been updated to reflect the new Affordable Housing Viability Study. This has included the introduction of a sliding scale of requirements for sites between 5 and 10 units and the introduction of a numerical target for affordable housing delivery over the period of the plan. | DM15 Affordable Housing   |
| TP19 Gypsies and Travellers                  | Minor wording changes to reflect new approach in Draft Replacement London Plan.   | DM16 Gypsy and Traveller Sites  |
| TP20 - Local Economy                         | Minor wording changes have been made as a result of consultation responses and to link better with other thematic policies.   | CS11 Economy and Employment   |
| TP21 - Land and Premises for Employment Uses | This policy has been split into two to give clearer guidance to the Development Management Team.  | DM 17 Protecting Existing Employment Land and Premises<br>DM18 New Employment Uses Outside Designated Areas |
| TP22 - Visitors and Tourism                  | This policy was deleted and its sentiments have been incorporated into policy CS11. A separate policy on one of the many  | CS11 Economy and Employment   |

| Preferred Strategy                       | Changes   | Proposed Submission   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>   |   |   |
|  | aspects of Kingston's economy and employment was thought to give unnecessary and unrealistic emphasis.  |   |
| TP23 - Town and Local Centres            | This policy has been split into three to give clearer guidance to the Development Management Team and incorporate changes in regional and national policy guidance. | CS12 Retail and Town Centres<br>DM19 Protecting Existing Retail Uses<br>DM20 New Retail Development |
| <b>Theme 3: Safe, Healthy and Strong</b> |   |   |
| TP24 Healthcare                          | The policy has been split into one core policy and one DM policy. The objectives of the policy remain the same.   | CS13 Community Health Services<br>DM21 New Health Facilities  |
| TP25 Safer Communities                   | The policy has been split into one core policy and one DM policy. The objectives of the policy remain the same.   | CS14 Safer Communities<br>DM22 Design for Safety  |
| TP26 Schools                             | This policy has been amended to set a framework for schools as well as higher education. Its policy aims are consistent with previous policy.                       | DM23 Schools  |
| TP27 Higher and Further Education        | This policy has been updated to reflect consultation responses but retains similar policy aims.   | CS15 Education  |
| TP28 Community Facilities                | This policy has been split into a core and DM policy with similar policy aims.  | CS16 Community Facilities   |

| Preferred Strategy                         | Changes   | Proposed Submission  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Theme 1: A Sustainable Kingston</b>     |   |  |
|  |   | DM24 Protection and provision of Community Facilities  |
| <b>Implementation and Delivery</b>         |   |  |
| TP29 - Meeting Infrastructure Requirements | This policy has been split into two core policies and moved into a separate Implementation and Delivery section. Two new policies have also been created; IMP2, in response to a representation from Thames Water, and IMP4 to clarify how infrastructure can be delivered. | IMP1 Partnership Working in Kingston<br>IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure<br>IMP3 Securing Infrastructure<br>IMP4 Facilitating Delivery |

**Table 9 : New Policies**

| Core Strategy Theme                | New Policies                           |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Prosperous and Inclusive</i>    | DM 14 Loss of Housing                  |
| <i>Implementation and Delivery</i> | IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure |
| <i>Implementation and Delivery</i> | IMP4 Facilitating Delivery             |

## 5 Mitigation, Implementation and Monitoring

### Mitigation

- 5.1** The 'Environmental Report' should include “*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*” (Annex I(g))
- 5.2** Under the SEA Directive, measures should be proposed to prevent, reduce or offset the significant adverse effects of implementing the DPD. Therefore the predicted effects of the Core Strategy have been analysed in detail

and mitigation measures have been suggested and incorporated. The Core Strategy policies have been developed to ensure that the predicted negative effects have been mitigated and that the positive effects identified will be delivered.

### Thematic Policies

- 5.3** Recommendations were made in the previous appraisal to strengthen the wording of thematic policies. The recommendations are set out in the table below and officer comments have been provided on how they have been taken forward in the Core Strategy Submission Version.

**Table 10 : Mitigation Recommendations**

| Recommendations   | Officer Comments   |
|---|--|
| The Thames Riverside policy should be made aware of the flood risk policy and the implications of one hand proposing further development adjacent to a river whilst also expecting flood risk to be minimised. It is an inherent conflict that needs to be dealt with through robust design principles; | The policy has been strengthened and <i>Policy DM7 River Thames Corridor, Tributaries and the Riverside</i> requires proposals for riverside development and improved facilities to demonstrate that there will be no unacceptable impact upon flood risk.   |
| Decentralised Energy Networks within the borough should seek to explore waste as a potential energy source, and adequate links need to be made with the South London Waste Plan (SLWP);   | In the introduction to the climate change policies, waste to energy systems are identified as a technology suitable for use in decentralised energy systems and the justification text provides the link between decentralised energy and SLWP. Further work into waste to energy has been commissioned and explored in the Climate Change Evidence Base report by BioRegional. Policy CS 9 Waste Reduction and Management supports the EU Waste Framework Directive and the preparation of the SLWP. Furthermore, the policies in the SWLP promote waste to energy systems. |
| Renewable energy measures should be included within developments such as car parks etc;   | Renewable energy measures are promoted in the Core Strategy's climate change policies and this is further supported by the Climate   |

| Recommendations  | Officer Comments  |
|--|---|
|  | Change Evidence Base Report carried out by BioRegional.   |
| There are currently no indications made for renewable energy measures or biodiversity improvements proposed within the gypsy and travellers policy, but given that we require such improvements to normal housing developments, this can be strengthened further | Renewable energy measures are promoted in the Core Strategy's climate change policies and this is further supported by the Climate Change Evidence Base Report carried out by BioRegional. Renewable energy provisions for gypsy and travellers sites will be assessed once planning applications have been submitted as this level of detail is not appropriate for the Core Strategy. |
| There may be some mileage in discussing car park facilities at business parks/ industrial areas, which are currently not mentioned.  | This level of detail is not appropriate for the Core Strategy. Transport policies support sustainable travel modes, requiring new developments to provide travel plans, for parking provision to be limited and provide car club and electric vehicle infrastructure .  |
| Potential negative impacts upon the Borough's heritage as identified in the comparison of sustainability objectives in Section 3, Sustainability Framework could be reduced by amending Core Strategy policy wording.  | Core Strategy Policy CS 1 Climate Change Mitigation has been strengthened and amended to avoid inadvertent pressure on heritage assets. By replacing the word in CS 1, criterion (c) "maximise" with the word "optimise."   |

**5.4** The previous appraisal concluded that overall, the policies in general mitigate one another well, (see pages 42-45 in the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 for a table and commentary on the Effect of Preferred Policies against the Preferred Policies).

**5.5** In the assessment of planning applications, consideration of how the relevant policies interact with one another will be necessary and no policy should be read in isolation. It is expected that the majority of the impacts can be mitigated through consistent application of other policies in the plan, and where national planning guidance and London Plan policies apply. Mitigation measures

need to ensure that benefits are maximised whilst any adverse effects are minimised.

Area Guidance

**5.6** The assessment in the previous appraisal discussed the likely effects of the implementation of the Plan and concluded that there would be a positive impact on each of the areas through the application of the thematic policies. Each Area Guidance has a local strategy for delivery which lists the actions that the Council will take with partners in order to implement these policies.

Key Areas of Change

**5.7** The previous appraisal identified that the reliance placed on the removal of some land from the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) designation to enable improvements in the Hogsmill Valley was potentially contentious. However, the Preferred Strategy consultation showed supported by local residents and landowners because it would provide much greater benefits to the community such as reducing flood risk, provision of housing, waste management facilities and open space. Since then, the Greater London Authority has agreed with the Council, to de-designate MOL in the Hogsmill Valley as part of a wider regeneration strategy.

### Uncertainties and Risks

**5.8** The changes to the London Plan and its accompanying supplementary planning documents posed a potential risk of uncertainty. However, this degree of uncertainty has been minimised as the policies in the Core Strategy have been written to reflect the policies set out in the Draft Replacement London Plan 2009. This approach was taken to ensure that the Core Strategy would remain up to date and because it is required to be in general conformity with the policies in the London Plan.

**5.9** It is important to take into consideration that the Core Strategy is a high level, strategic document. It is a broad based document containing a strategic vision and objectives, providing high level area guidance with core and development management policies. Therefore there are uncertainties when appraising a strategic document, as it can be difficult to identify significant effects at this high level. The implementation of the Core Strategy is

crucial as the significant effects are likely to depend on how the policies are implemented.

**5.10** There are limitations with the appraisal of policies as it can be problematic predicting the impacts of strategic policies. The prediction of impacts has involved professional judgement and assumptions have been made. For instance, the impact of the Core Strategy on climate change is likely to only be measurable beyond the lifetime of the plan. However, because the Core Strategy contains development management policies, the uncertainties related to prediction have been eased as the use of these policies to assess planning applications will have an immediate impact.

**5.11** The preparation of the SA reports have sought to minimise the risk of subjectivity and to provide independent assessment. The Revised Scoping Report 2008 was prepared by the consultancy Atkins Ltd and the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 was prepared by a specialist officer who was not involved in the Core Strategy policy development and research. In addition, a range of officers were consulted when there were uncertainties over scoring the impact of a policy and this process enabled a general consensus to be reached.

### Implementation

**5.12** The production of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) will provide the detail to support the policies in the Core Strategy and therefore enable a greater certainty of delivery by strengthening the implementation of the policies in the Core Strategy. They will also assist in maximising the beneficial effects of policies. Since the publication of the SA Report, the S106

Planning Obligations SPD has been approved and Residential Design, Alterations and Extensions SPD has been prepared. Future SPDs are likely to include:

- Residential Design -new build SPD
- Sustainable Travel SPD
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD
- Revised Planning Obligations SPD
- Revised Affordable Housing SPD

**5.13** The Council has prepared an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will aid the implementation of the Core Strategy. The IDP identifies gaps in the infrastructure to serve the borough's existing population and sets out future infrastructure needs as a result of developments arising from the Core Strategy. It involved working with both internal and external partners to identify the specific infrastructure projects to be delivered, focusing on a range of social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure. To support this, an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule has been prepared which identifies what new or improved infrastructure is planned, who will be involved and the resource implications. This will help the Council better negotiate levels of planning contributions related to areas of particular need and review the tariffs in the Planning Obligations SPD. This schedule will be monitored, reviewed and updated to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is being delivered.

**5.14** The use of planning obligations will be a crucial mechanism as they can be used to mitigate the impact of development in order to make it acceptable in planning terms. The Planning Obligations SPD sets out what types of planning applications will require obligations for financial

contributions. It also provides specific guidance on how contributions will be secured under the themes of the Core Strategy.

**5.15** A Hogsmill Valley Masterplan has been prepared by consultants. This masterplan will assist in the implementation and delivery of the approach identified in the Hogsmill Valley Key Area of Change in the Core Strategy.

**5.16** The adoption of the Joint South London Waste Plan is planned for late 2011. The waste policy in the Core Strategy provides additional support to the objectives of this plan.

### Monitoring

**5.17** The SEA Directive requires the monitoring of significant environmental effects in order to identify any adverse effects and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action and "a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring" (Annex I(g)) must be set out in the SA Report. Therefore as part of the SA process, a monitoring framework is developed to ensure that the Core Strategy policies will be tested on a regular basis for consistency against each other and to determine their use and effectiveness. This will seek to highlight whether policies are progressing towards sustainability or whether a review needs to be conducted in order to create better policies for the Council and borough as a whole.

**5.18** In the previous appraisal, the monitoring framework, as shown in Table 9.1 sets out the monitoring indicators which are in the Preferred Strategy and ties them to the sustainability objectives. Since then, the policy monitoring tables in the Core Strategy Submission Version have been altered to provide clear links to

the objectives of the Kingston Plan, Core Strategy and the SA. The indicators in the policy monitoring table have been amended and relevant targets have been provided. Appendix 8 sets out the updated SA Monitoring Framework.

**5.19** It is important to note that the national indicators which make up some of the monitoring indicators have been scrapped. However the Council is currently reviewing all the national indicators which it has signed up to and is assessing which indicators it will be continuing with.

**5.20** The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) has formed part of the LDF and provides a way of assessing, the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which Local Development Document policies are being successfully implemented. The production of the AMR is proposed for review in the Localism Bill. It is recognised that monitoring will need to be adapted in the near future to be in line with the progression of the Core Strategy and that current monitoring indicators may need to be amended or new indicators developed.

### 6 Conclusions

**6.1** The SEA Directive requires the 'Environmental Report' to include the likely significant effects on the environment and to address various impact dimensions. Some of these impacts have already been discussed in the policy and area assessments. The table in Appendix 7 considers the impacts of the Core Strategy as a whole and sets out the different impact dimensions.

**6.2** The effects of identified impacts have previously been discussed, but are summarised here. Overall, the Core Strategy, through its policies, will have a beneficial impact on sustainable development in the Borough, and the key sustainability issues will be addressed throughout the life of the plan. The impacts will range from:

- A reduced level of car use;
- Greater walking/cycling access in the Borough especially around the A3;
- Greater public transport to Chessington with the possibility of a permanent Park and Ride facility;
- A rezoning of Kingston Station to Zone 4;
- Increased open space provision;
- Reduced flood risk around the Hogsmill and Bonesgate Streams, due in part to a more natural realignment of these channels;
- Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from domestic sources;
- Reducing barriers faced by people to employment;
- Providing improved healthcare and childcare facilities;
- Meeting the requirement for school places;

- Seeking to improve and maintain Kingston as a destination for Further and Higher Education;
- Seek to include all sections of the community, from those with multi-ethnicity to disabilities to gypsies and travellers;
- Promote creative industries in the Borough; and
- Encourage businesses to invest in the Borough.

**6.3** It is expected that policies will be used together in order to bring about change for the Borough and encourage the adoption of a more sustainable lifestyle and the list above is by no means an exhaustive one. SPDs are also being prepared to provide guidance on particular issues, such as sustainable travel and freight transport within the Borough, along with expectations of contributions under Section 106 Agreements and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

**6.4** In order for these positive changes to be met, it is important that the LDF is consistently implemented at both Borough wide and area based (neighbourhood) levels.

## Appendix 1: Equalities Impact Assessment

The screening form presented below, is the Council's EQIA Stage One: Screening for Relevance Form. It is undertaken before carrying out a full EQIA, so all strategies and policies are screened for relevance. Some policies will have no relevance to race, gender, disability, age religion and belief or sexual orientation. The completion of this

form demonstrates that a full EQIA is not necessary as the Core Strategy has been identified as having positive/neutral impact. Each policy in the Core Strategy has been appraised against social sustainability objectives as well as environmental and economic. These assessment tables are available in the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009, Section Section 8: Assessment of Plan Policies and Appendices 2: Full Sustainability Appraisals and Appendix 6 of this report.

**Table 11 : EQIA Stage One**

| <b>Form A – Relevance Test (screening)</b>  |
|---|
| <b>Function/Service Being Assessed:</b>   |
| <b>1. Populations served/affected:</b>  |
| Universal (service covering all residents) – The Core Strategy sets out a spatial strategy for Kingston over the next 15 years and therefore affects all the Borough’s residents. It forms part of a suite of documents which make up the Local Development Framework (LDF).  |
| <b>2. Is it relevant to the general duties as specified by the Race Relations Act, Disability Discrimination Act and the Equality Act? (see Guidance notes)</b>   |
| <i>Which of these aspects does the function relate to (if any)?:</i>  |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Eliminating Discrimination</i></li> <li>2. <i>Promoting Equality of Opportunity</i></li> <li>3. <i>Promoting good relations</i></li> <li>4. <i>Preventing harassment</i></li> <li>5. <i>Enabling participation in public life</i></li> </ol>   |
| It is relevant to number 2: ‘Promoting Equality of Opportunity’ and number 5: ‘Enabling participation in public life’.  |
| <i>Do you monitor your users?</i>   |
| Yes - A monitoring framework has been developed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process and this will ensure that the Core Strategy policies will be tested on a regular basis to ensure their effectiveness. The review of policies will also highlight policies which are not working. The monitoring framework is linked to the objectives of the Kingston Plan, Core Strategy and Sustainability Appraisal. |
| <i>Is there any evidence or reason to believe that some groups could be differently affected?</i>   |

| <b>Form A – Relevance Test (screening)</b>  |
|---|
| No - The Sustainability Appraisal assessment concluded that the Core Strategy, given appropriate implementation will have a positive effect.  |
| <i>Which equality groups are affected?</i>  |
| The Core Strategy will either have a positive/neutral impact upon equality (although it is unlikely to have any impact upon the equality strand, sexual orientation).   |
| <b>3. What is the degree of relevance?</b>  |
| <i>In your view, is the information you have on each category adequate to make a decision about relevance?</i>  |
| Yes (specify which groups) – All equality groups are relevant.  |
| <i>Are there any triggers for this review (for example is there any public concern that functions/services are being operated in a discriminatory manner?) If yes please indicate which:</i>  |
| No – Members of the public and statutory bodies have had three opportunities to submit comments on the Sustainability Appraisal and the Core Strategy. None of the consultation responses received have indicated that policies are worded in a discriminatory manner or are likely to have a negative impact.  |
| <b>4. Conclusion</b>  |
| <i>On the basis of the relevance test would you say that there is evidence that a medium or high detrimental impact is likely?</i>  |
| <p>No – The Sustainability Appraisal is a process which is carried out at the various stages in the development of the LDF documents. The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of planning policy documents. The Core Strategy policies and area guidance have been tested against a range of social, environmental and economic sustainability objectives. The assessments demonstrate that a high or medium detrimental impact upon equality is not likely. These assessments are available in the Sustainability Appraisal reports. The relevant sustainability objectives for EQIA purposes are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To reduce poverty and social exclusion</li> <li>2. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime</li> <li>3. To promote accessibilty to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community</li> <li>4.To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure</li> </ol> |

**Form A – Relevance Test (screening)**

- 5. To improve the population's health
- 6. To improve the education and skills of the population
- 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities

The relevant monitoring indicators for the sustainability objectives relating to equality are set out in the table below.

**Table 12 : Equality Monitoring Indicators**

| Sustainability Objective   | Indicators   |
|--|--|
| 1. To reduce social poverty and social exclusion                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning contributions/CIL to the improvements of open spaces</li> <li>• New and converted dwellings on previously developed land</li> <li>• Net additional pitches (Gypsies and Travellers)</li> <li>• Gross affordable housing completions</li> <li>• Intermediate and social rented dwellings as a % of total affordable completions</li> <li>• Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>• % of population of working age claiming key benefits such as Job Seekers Allowance (National Statistics)</li> <li>• Number of Super Output Areas within the most 10% and 20% most deprived wards in the Country using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (Communities Local Government)</li> <li>• % of children that live in families that are income deprived (London Housing)</li> </ul> |
| 2. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases/decreases in incidences of crime and disorder across the borough and results of public opinion surveys regarding fear of crime and actual/perceived crime hot spots</li> </ul>  |

| Sustainability Objective   | Indicators   |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of road traffic accidents and progress towards accident reduction targets</li> <li>• Creation of new and improved links to new and existing health facilities</li> <li>• Net gain in numbers of floor space and concentrations of A4, A5 and D2 and other associated sui generis uses in Kingston Town Centre and the District Centres. Monitor number of successful licensing applications</li> <li>• Number of additional late night bus and rail services provided, including to neighbouring Surrey districts</li> <li>• Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>• Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>• Reduce crime and the opportunities for crime, particularly in crime hot spots, through good design practice</li> </ul>  |
| <p>3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award Standards importance</li> <li>• Planning contributions/CIL to improve open spaces</li> <li>• Total units designed to wheelchair standards as a % of housing completions</li> <li>• Lifetime homes as a % of housing completions</li> <li>• Seek a diversity of uses in Local Centres</li> <li>• Number of primary schools and secondary school places within the Borough</li> <li>• Number of additional permanent school places/Forms of Entry provided</li> <li>• Number of permanent school expansion schemes completed</li> <li>• Amount of new managed student accommodation completed</li> <li>• Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>• Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>• No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> </ul> |
| <p>4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied</p>                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan period and housing targets</li> <li>• Building for Life Assessments</li> <li>• Gross affordable housing completions</li> <li>• Net additional pitches (Gypsies and Travellers)</li> </ul>  |

| Sustainability Objective   | Indicators  |
|--|---|
| by adequate supporting infrastructure                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing completions by size, type and tenure</li> <li>• Total units designed to wheelchair standards as a % of housing completions</li> <li>• Lifetime homes as a % of housing completions</li> <li>• No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> </ul>   |
| 5. To improve the population's health                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award Standards importance</li> <li>• Mode share for cycling</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>• Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>• No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> <li>• Creation of new and improved links to new and existing health facilities</li> <li>• Number of road traffic accidents and progress towards accident reduction targets</li> <li>• % of population partaking in 5 x 30 minutes of physical activity per week (Sport England)</li> <li>• % of people who describe their health as good (National Statistics)</li> </ul> |
| 6. To improve the education and skills of the population             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of primary schools and secondary school places within the Borough</li> <li>• Number of additional permanent school places/Forms of Entry provided</li> <li>• Number of permanent school expansion schemes completed</li> <li>• Amount of new managed student accommodation completed</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>• Change in the number of community facilities available</li> </ul>   |
| 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment land available by type</li> <li>• Total amount of additional employment floor space by type</li> <li>• Total amount of completed employment floor space on previously developed land</li> </ul>   |

| <b>Sustainability Objective</b> | <b>Indicators</b>  |
|---------------------------------|--|
|                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="571 286 1214 320">• Seek a diversity of uses in Local Centres</li><li data-bbox="571 353 1166 387">• Overall employment rate (Nomisweb)</li></ul> |

## **Appendix 2: Consultation Responses**

Table 13 sets out the responses received on the Preferred Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report 2009 and Table 14 sets out the responses received for the Revised Scoping Report (Atkins, 2008) along with RBK comments.

Table 13 : Consultation Responses

| Name               | Nature of Representation | Representation  | Officer Response   |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Natural England    | Support                  | The Sustainability Appraisal is in line with relevant legislation and has clear links to appropriate plans, programmes and policies. The approach and methodology used is also appropriate and in line with other London Boroughs, and therefore is acceptable to Natural England. There are a number of resources available to assist you and developers when considering the implications of development proposals on the natural environment in Greater London.  | Comments of support noted.   |
| Environment Agency | Support with amendments  | SA Objective does not appear to be reflected in the core strategy. There is no reference to water resources management and water quality is only indirectly referred to in the promotion of SUDS which will have water quality benefits. In the assessment of the Core strategy objectives against the SA objectives, CO 2, 9 and 23 are supposed to have a positive assessment against SA12. Managing and reducing flood risk does not directly have a benefit for water quality. Protecting the environment along the Thames (CO9) does not go far enough and ignores the environment across the borough that should also be protected in the same way. 5.3. Other sources of flooding should be included in this section not just fluvial flood risk. 9.2 We agree that there could be possible conflict between policies Thames riverside TP9 and flood risk TP4. | Comments of support with amendments noted.<br>Changes to flood risk policy have been made to include reference to water quality, water efficiency measures and other types of flooding e.g. surface water and sewer. Policy CS4 covers the River Thames Corridor, Tributaries and the Riverside. |
| English Heritage   | Support with amendments  | Pg7<br>Table 3.1 Relevant Plans and Programmes Either under Historic Environment and cultural Assets or High Quality Urban Design the Government endorsed EH/CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings (2007) should be reviewed. Not reviewing this important guidance is reflected in the inadequate policy framework proposed in the Preferred Strategy.   | Policy DM10 provides guidance on the scale, skylines and strategic views. We recognise the need to provide more detail, a strategy for Tall Buildings  |

| Name | Nature of Representation | Representation  | Officer Response   |
|------|--------------------------|---|--|
|      |                          | <p>Pg17</p> <p>Baseline Information para 4.13</p> <p>The level of detail provided with regards to the Borough's rich heritage is very limited. It lacks both quantitative and qualitative value when describing the breadth and depth of designated and non-designated heritage assets that help define the character of the Borough. This is especially disappointing when it is known that the Council has developed a Borough-wide characterisation study and adopted a Cultural Strategy, both of which are being used as evidence base. A more detailed baseline needs to be provided in order to assess effectively the impact of policies upon the historic environment.</p> | <p>SPD is indicated. The London Plan and K+20 provide additional guidance.</p> <p>Information in the SA Report and LDF evidence base is considered to provide adequate basis for policy. However there is a recognised need for future work.</p> |
|      |                          | <p>Pg21-22</p> <p>Key Sustainability Issues</p> <p>Para 5.21-5.22 Welcome the quantitative information on the historic environment, but there is a lack of qualitative detail. For example what is the condition of the historic environment, is it well cared for, or is it at threat from development pressures? Are there opportunities for heritage assets to be enhanced or is there a need for greater policy direction? At present this sort of analysis of the historic environment as a sustainable asset has not been fully explored.</p>   | <p>Noted. See above.</p>   |

| Name | Nature of Representation | Representation  | Officer Response   |
|------|--------------------------|---|--|
|      |                          | <p>Pg37-38<br/>Table 8.1</p> <p>Preferred Policies against SA objectives Please see our detailed comments to each of the policies in Appendix 2</p>   |  |
|      |                          | <p>Pg57</p> <p>Table 9.1 Monitoring Framework Objective 10 – Monitoring Indicator</p> <p>We would suggest that the indicator relating to the Buildings at Risk Register is amended so that it reflects English Heritage's revised approach to monitoring the historic environment. This essentially expands the concept of Listed Buildings at Risk, to Heritage at Risk, which incorporates a wider range of heritage assets, such as conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, registered parks and gardens and battlefields.</p> <p>It should be recognised that investment in the historic environment provides economic benefits which could be capitalised to help provide wider regenerative social and environmental benefits.</p> | <p>Noted. Amendments have been made to the monitoring indicator.</p>   |
|      |                          | <p>Pg71-149</p> <p>Appendix 2 Full SA Policy 1</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to how the climate change policy will impact upon the historic environment. Measures of adaptation and mitigation if done inappropriately could cause harm to the integrity of heritage assets e.g. solar panels on a listed building.</p>  | <p>To meet these concerns, the policy guidance on heritage has been strengthened. The Core Strategy is a strategic document and can not provide detailed guidance.</p> |

| Name | Nature of Representation | Representation   | Officer Response |
|------|--------------------------|--|------------------|
|      |                          | <p>Policy 4</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to how the water management and flood risk policy will impact upon the historic environment. For example, through good design and understanding of the significance of heritage values, measures to manage flooding could be implemented without comprising the integrity of the historic asset such as archaeology or the special character of a conservation area that adjoins a water course.</p> <p>Policy 5</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the heritage value of all landscapes designated as Green Belt and MOL. At present the focus appears to be on Hogsmill.</p> <p>Policy 6</p> <p>Consideration should be widened to include landscapes that may not be designated but are still valued e.g. approximately 55 open spaces identified by the London's Park and Gardens Trust.</p> <p>Policies 10-14</p> <p>It is important to consider the impact of transport provision and measures upon the historic environment. For example PPG15 makes specific reference to transport proposals and the need for the historic environment to be carefully considered in the development of schemes. It is not clear whether this issue has been fully addressed as part of this appraisal.</p> <p>Policy15</p> |                  |

| Name | Nature of Representation | Representation  | Officer Response |
|------|--------------------------|---|------------------|
|      |                          | <p>Generally support the conclusions drawn, subject to further development of the Borough Character Study. As already discussed the Study lacks sufficient detail with regards to heritage matters and tall buildings issues.</p> <p>Policy 17</p> <p>Welcome the comment of linking up this policy with the Borough Character Study. We would add that it should also link up with a further amended Policy TP15.</p> <p>Policy 20</p> <p>It should be recognised that investment in the historic environment provides economic benefits which could be capitalised to help provide wider regenerative social and environmental benefits.</p> <p>Policy 21</p> <p>Many previously developed sites may have heritage value. This should be recognised in the context of this policy and its impact upon the heritage sustainability objective.</p> <p>Policy 22</p> <p>Greater access to the heritage assets and understanding the history of the Borough can help provide additional benefits which should be recognised.</p> <p>Policy 23</p> |                  |

| Name | Nature of Representation | Representation   | Officer Response  |
|------|--------------------------|--|---|
|      |                          | <p>Analysis should be widened beyond the impacts upon Kingston Town Centre as the policy clearly refers to all centres. Suggested amendments to the Policy TP23 should help expand the effectiveness of the policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Policy 29</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the impact of this policy upon the historic environment. As advised on the Core Strategy we would seek to ensure that the historic environment is identified as a priority in planning obligations as the impact of developments can be significant to the integrity of heritage assets.</p> |   |
|      |                          | <p>Pg155-159</p> <p>Appendix 4</p> <p>Key Areas for Change Assessment Objective 10</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the impact of heritage assets identified in the Area. This includes two listed structures/buildings (e.g. Mortuary Chapel and tomb stone, both Grade II) in the Cemetery of Bonner Hill Road and its and Surbiton Cemetery potential historic landscape value.</p>  | <p>Comments noted. Tolworth Area Guidance in the Core Strategy does have regard to character and heritage. It will be considered in more detailed work.</p> |
|      |                          | <p>Pg160-172</p> <p>Appendix 5 Baseline Information Objective 10 - Indicator</p>   | <p>Noted. Amendments have been made to the monitoring indicator.</p>  |

| Name |  | Nature of Representation |  | Representation | We would suggest that the indicator relating to the Buildings at Risk Register is amended so that it reflects English Heritage's revised approach to monitoring the historic environment. This essentially expands the concept of Listed Buildings at Risk, to Heritage at Risk, which incorporates a wider range of heritage assets, such as conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments, registered parks and gardens and battlefields. | Officer Response |  |
|------|--|--------------------------|--|----------------|---|------------------|--|
|      |  |                          |  |                |   |                  |  |

**Table 14**

| Name                                | Consultation Response  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Thames Water</b></p>          | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Water and Sewerage Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the new Local Development Framework should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. (This is required by the new PPS12).</li> <li>● The list of sustainability objectives should therefore make reference to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to service development. This is essential to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment.</li> <li>● It is also important that the satisfactory provision of water and sewerage infrastructure forms an integral part of the sustainability appraisal.</li> <li>● Water companies' investment programmes are based on a 5 year cycle known as the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. If any large engineering works are needed to upgrade infrastructure the lead in time could be up to five years, which goes beyond the current funding cycle (this expires in 2010). Implementing new technologies and the construction of new treatment works could take up to ten years.</li> </ul> |
|                                     | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● When reviewing development and flood risk it is important to recognise that water and/or sewerage infrastructure may be required to be developed in flood risk areas.</li> <li>● Water and sewage treatment works are located close or adjacent to rivers (to abstract water for treatment and supply or to discharge treated effluent). It is likely that these existing works will need to be upgraded or extended to provide the increase in treatment capacity required to service new development.</li> <li>● Flood risk sustainability objectives should therefore accept that water and sewerage infrastructure development may be necessary in flood risk areas.</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Surrey County Council</b></p> | <p><b>Sustainability objective: Identifying Other Plans &amp; Programmes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Include a reference to the Waste Strategy for England 2007 (published by DEFRA on 24 May 2007) to the list of plans and programmes at a National Level.</li> </ul>   |

| Name | Consultation Response   |
|------|---|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the theme covering waste management, the commentary on implications for the LDF could also usefully refer to the need for sufficient waste management capacity in addition to ensuring waste is reduced and recycled. If providing capacity within the Borough is problematic, then a reference to promoting greater regional-self sufficiency may be more appropriate.</li> <li>It is noted that the document does not cover minerals. Although mineral extraction is not an issue for the Borough, the supply of minerals to support construction is considered relevant. It may therefore be appropriate to add a new theme entitled "Mineral Supply" with the implications for the LDF being to promote the importation of mineral by rail to reduce the need to transport minerals long distances by road, and hence reflecting the significance of the new rail aggregates depot recently opened in Tolworth by Day Aggregates. The Source should include a reference to the London Plan (Housing Provision Targets, Waste and Minerals Alterations - December 2006) as Policy 4A.5 requires DPD policies to protect existing railhead capacity to handle and process aggregates, and minimise the movement of aggregates by road.</li> </ul> |
|      | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Baseline Characteristics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The indicators for which baseline data has been collated and analysed could usefully include locations of waste disposal facilities receiving waste generated within the Borough in order to enable progress to be monitored towards the achievement of greater regional self sufficiency.</li> <li>It is noted that there is a desire to move away from landfill towards more recycling, composting, and anaerobic digestion. Should the Borough intend to make use of Energy from Waste facilities (such as the new facility due to come on line shortly at Colnbrook) in order to move waste disposal further up the waste hierarchy, then this technology could also be reflected in the indicators.</li> <li>The indicator relating to the number of recycling sites in the Borough could also usefully refer to the overall capacity of these facilities.</li> </ul>  |
|      | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Key Sustainability Issues for Kingston</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commentary on waste could be better explained to spell out what is realistically achievable in terms of providing new waste management facilities.</li> </ul>   |

| Name  | Consultation Response   |
|---|---|
|   | <p data-bbox="231 1041 263 1892"><b>Sustainability Objective: Developing the SA Framework</b></p> <ul data-bbox="295 212 853 1892" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="295 291 375 1892">● Consideration could be given to adding a new SA/SEA Objective to promote the importation of aggregate for construction by rail / non car modes given the recent opening of the new rail aggregates depot in Tolworth.</li> <li data-bbox="375 212 486 1892">● The reference referred to above presumably could include the consideration of providing larger waste management facilities also designed to accommodate waste from neighbouring Boroughs in order to provide greater regional self-sufficiency, otherwise they are unlikely to be viable?</li> <li data-bbox="486 212 694 1892">● It is noted that for SA Objective 16 (to promote sustainable waste management), existing data quality is stated as being high. Does this reflect construction &amp; demolition waste (referred to on page 64) or only municipal waste ? If not, perhaps the SA Objective should be more specific given that page 64 states that consideration will be given to construction waste reduction, re-use and recycling. Progress could be difficult to monitor without good quality data which is very difficult to come by if a significant amount of demolition waste is re-used on site.</li> <li data-bbox="694 212 853 1892">● Total municipal waste arisings. Issues identified suggest that it is difficult for the LDF to ensure municipal waste is reduced. It may be worth looking at the Surrey Waste Plan 2008 recently adopted on 6 May 2008 which is available on the Surrey County Council website. Page B4 contains a section on Waste Minimisation including Policy CW1 which primarily reflects the need for partnership working, raising awareness and leading by example</li> </ul> |
| <p data-bbox="909 1982 981 2116"><b>Natural England</b></p> | <p data-bbox="909 212 981 1892"><b>Sustainability Objective: Identifying other plans and programmes</b> <i>nothing to add to those plans etc already identified by RBK.</i></p>   |
|   | <p data-bbox="1117 492 1157 1892"><b>Sustainability Objective: Identifying Key Sustainability Issues and Implications for Kingston</b></p> <ul data-bbox="1189 212 1380 1892" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1189 246 1268 1892">● Table 4.1 – Key sustainability issues and implications for the LDF includes a section on vacant and derelict land, which should also give consideration to the vacant building stock not just the land.</li> <li data-bbox="1268 212 1380 1892">● Open Space and infrastructure, this section indicates that none of the Boroughs' parks has 'Green Flag' status and this is perhaps something that could be looked at as a possible monitoring indicator. <i>(NB – It already is being monitored in the AMR – 4 are on course to meet this standard by 2010)</i></li> </ul>  |

| Name | Consultation Response   |
|------|---|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Natural England is also pleased to see the links the document makes between green/open spaces and improved air quality, human health and biodiversity and welcomes these links.</li> <li>● Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Transport Section could be linked together more strongly but Natural England welcomes their inclusion.</li> </ul>  |
|      | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework</b></p> <p>Natural England believes that local authorities should consider the provision of natural areas as part of a balanced policy to ensure that local communities have access to an appropriate mix of green-spaces providing for a range of recreational needs, of at least 2 hectares of accessible natural green-space per 1,000 head of population. This can be broken down by the following system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No person should live more than 300 metres from their nearest area of natural green-space;</li> <li>● There should be at least one accessible 20 hectare site within 2 kilometres;</li> <li>● There should be one accessible 100 hectares site within 5 kilometres;</li> <li>● There should be one accessible 500 hectares site within 10 kilometres.</li> </ul> <p>This is recommended as a starting point for consideration by local authorities and can be used to assist with the identification of local targets and standards. Whilst this may be more difficult for some urban areas/authorities than other, Natural England would encourage local authorities to identify the most appropriate policy and response applicable to their Borough.</p> <p>This can assist the Council with identifying the needs of the local community and increase awareness of the value of accessible natural green-space, along with the levels of existing green-space provision, resources and constraints.</p> |

| Name                             | Consultation Response  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>Environment Agency</b></p> | <p><b>Sustainability objective: Identifying Other Plans &amp; Programmes</b></p> <p>The report should include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>National level</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recently published PPS25 Practice Guide (June 2008)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <u>Regional level</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Regional Flood Risk Appraisal</li> <li>• Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/yourenv/consultations/1695546/1696092/?lang=_e">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/yourenv/consultations/1695546/1696092/?lang=_e</a></p> <p>Further, we suggest that the London Plan SPG East London Green Grid Framework and the Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan may have only limited relevance for the SA and could be removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Local level</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are pleased to see reference to the Kingston Town Centre Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) but also suggest the forthcoming borough wide SFRA be included. This is later referenced on page 45 of the report but has been omitted from table 2.1.</li> <li>• Could also include data from High Level Target 5 report i.e. planning permissions granted against Environment Agency advice on flood risk grounds.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|                                  | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Identifying Key Sustainability Issues and Implications for Kingston</b></p>  |

| Name | Consultation Response  |
|------|--|
|      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We are in support of the text in the 'open space and green infrastructure' and 'nature conservation designations and BAP priority habitats, particularly the text in the column 'implications for LDF'.</li> <li>● Page 41: Green infrastructure can be multifunctional and store floodwater or surface water, especially for tributaries of the Thames (see CFMP). There is an opportunity to use areas close/adjacent to urban rivers for flood storage. This could be enhanced in existing areas of open space or through redevelopment.</li> <li>● Page 45: Generally, a good summary of flood risk issues and opportunities, with cross references to the SFRA.</li> <li>● The SFRA for the Town Centre has been completed, and the borough wide SFRA is still in draft</li> <li>● There is no mention of the Sequential Test or the Sequential Approach</li> <li>● This section needs more detail on other sources of flooding</li> <li>● Thames CFMP messages should be considered</li> <li>● The paved surfaces in an urban catchment along with the impermeable soils contribute to the flashy nature of the surface water run-off and the fluvial flooding.</li> <li>● Is the proportion of existing properties in the floodplain correct? Is this information taken from the National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA)? Please note that NaFRA looks at different return periods than the flood zones.</li> </ul> |
|      | <p><b>Sustainability Objective: Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support the text in table 4.1 relating to the enhancement of biodiversity. Further, we support the indicators and targets proposed in table 5.1.</li> <li>● The wording of SA/SEA objective 9 in table 5.1 does not entirely reflect the rest of the text. We would ask that the objective be extended to include all species and habitats, and not just those with designations. This would better reflect the indicator chosen to record sites which are enhanced which are currently of low conservation value, and the requirement for enhancement of biodiversity on all sites.</li> <li>● Need to mention the flood risk Sequential Test to determine appropriate locations for development.</li> </ul>   |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

**Table 15 : Relevant Plans and Programmes**

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics                  | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Mix of type and tenures of housing, including affordable housing      | PPS3; PPS1; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Code for Sustainable Homes; Planning for a Sustainable Future; Accessible London SPG; The London Plan: Interim Housing SPG, The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London – Housing Provision Targets; Draft Replacement London Plan, RBK Housing Strategy; RBK Affordable Housing SPD; RBK Kingston Plan; SPG Planning for Equality and Diversity for London | Policies should ensure adequate provision of quality affordable housing to meet local need.  | Population and Human health | 4                   |
| Health and wellbeing of the population                                | 6th Environmental Action Programme for the EU Community; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Planning for a Sustainable Future; PPS1; PPG17; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG: RBK  | Policies should support and encourage the provision and access to health facilities and promote wellbeing through environmental enhancement. | Population and Human health | 5                   |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF       | Source  | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics                  | SA objective number |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|
|   | Kingston Plan; RBK Cycling Strategy; A Healthy Kingston Strategy; Green Spaces Strategy; Culture Strategy 2008 - 2012.; SPG East London Green Grid Framework  |   |                             |                     |
| Social equality, including the minimisation of poverty and social exclusion | Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Planning for a Sustainable Future; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, RBK Kingston Plan; ODPM Circular 1/06 Gypsy and Traveller Sites; SPG Planning for Equality and Diversity for London | Policies should ensure the provision of a mix of housing types and tenures for different people in need e.g. elderly, infirm, families, unemployed. | Population and Human Health | 1                   |
| Equal opportunities to gain a high standard of education and skills         | PPS1; The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, PPS4; RBK Kingston Plan; SPG Planning for Equality and Diversity for London, 2007  | Policies to ensure that new development is accessible to educational facilities.  | Population                  | 6                   |
| Crime and the fear of crime   | Secured by Design; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, RBK Crime, Disorder & Anti Social Behaviour Reduction Strategy;  | Policies should ensure that good design against crime is integrated   | Population and Human health | 2                   |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics  | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
|   | By Design: Urban Design in the Planning System - Towards Better Practice; RBK Kingston Plan; Reducing Crime Together Strategy (Partnership Plan) 2008/11  | into development.  |   |                     |
| Equitable access to services and facilities                           | PPS3; PPS1; PPG13; CROW Act; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Planning for a Sustainable Future; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, Accessible London SPG; PPG17; Planning for Equality and Diversity in London SPG; RBK Kingston Plan; RBK Cycling Strategy, A Healthy Kingston Strategy; The Mayor's Transport Strategy; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; RBK Green Spaces Strategy, SPG Accessible London; SPG Land for Transport functions | Policies should support and encourage a range of transport modes.          | Population and Human health                         | 3                   |
| Historic environment and cultural assets                              | Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act; PPS1; PPS5; CROW Act; The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future; Transport and the   | Policies should seek to identify, and encourage the management of historic | Material Assets, Cultural Heritage, Landscape, Soil | 10                  |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics   | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------|
|   | <p>Historic Environment; Sustainable Communities Plan; Heritage Protection for the 21st Century; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; The Mayor's Cultural Strategy; RBK Urban Design Action Plan; RBK Draft Borough Character Study; RBK Cultural Strategy; RBK Kingston Plan; RBK Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans; Green Spaces Strategy; Culture Strategy 2008-2012; Thames Landscape Strategy; SPG Revised London View Management Framework; SPG East London Green Grid Framework, Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance for Sustainable Management of Historic Environment - English Heritage,</p> | <p>and cultural assets, to ensure their conservation and enhancement</p>                                       |  |                     |
| <p>High quality urban design</p>                                      | <p>PPS1; Secured by Design; By Design: Urban Design in the Planning System - Towards Better Practice; CABE/English Heritage: Guidance on Tall Buildings;</p>  | <p>Policies should seek to ensure that all new development is of a sufficiently high quality, in line with</p> | <p>Material Assets, Cultural Heritage, Landscape, Population</p> | <p>4, 15</p>        |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF                    | Source   | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics   | SA objective number |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
|  | Sustainable Communities Plan; Heritage Protection for the 21st Century; London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, RBK Urban Design Action Plan; RBK Draft Borough Character Study; RBK Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans; Green Spaces Strategy 2008; SPG Revised London View Management Framework;                          | conservation as well as environmental sustainability principles, in order to ensure there are no negative effects from such growth.                |  |                     |
| Remediation and re-use of previously developed land and increased efficiency in land use | EU Soil Framework Directive; PPS1; PPG2; The First Soil Action Plan for England and Soil Strategy for England (consultation emerging); London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; PPS23; PPS22; PPS25 and companion guide; Sustainable Communities Plan; Building a Green Future: Towards Zero Carbon Development (Consultation); The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, The Mayor's | Policies should ensure that new development takes place primarily on previously developed land and makes efficient use of land through good design | Climatic Factors, Soil, Material Assets, Landscape, Human Health | 7                   |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics                          | SA objective number |
|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
|   | Energy Strategy; The Mayor's Transport Strategy ; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG;  |   |                                     |                     |
| Air pollution and quality   | EU Ambient Air Quality Directive; The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland; The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy; Sustainable Communities Plan; CROW Act; PPS1; PPS23; PPS22; London Climate Change Action Plan; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan, Mayor's Energy Strategy; Mayor's Air Quality Strategy; Mayor's Transport Strategy; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; RBK Cycling Strategy; A Healthy Kingston Strategy; RBK Green Spaces Strategy; SPG Sustainable design and construction. | Policies should provide for and encourage a reduction in air pollution, seeking to enhance air quality. | Air, Human Health, Climatic Factors | 13                  |
| Noise pollution   | EU Directive on Environmental Noise; PPS1; PPS23; PPG24; Sustainable Communities Plan; The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy; The London Plan; Draft   | Policies should seek to minimise the effects from noise on the local area.                              | Human health                        | 14                  |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source   | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics                                    | SA objective number |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------|
|   | Replacement London Plan; The Mayor's Transport Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; RBK Sustainable Construction SPG; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; RBK Kingston Plan.  |   |   |                     |
| Emissions of greenhouse gases   | Climate Change Act 2008; PPS1 and PPS Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1; PPS1; PPS23; PPS22; Draft PPS1 Planning for a Low Carbon Future in a Changing Climate-Consultation; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Code for Sustainable Homes; Planning for a Sustainable Future; Our Energy Future: creating a low carbon economy; Energy White Paper; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; The Mayor's Climate Change Action Plan; Building a Green Future: Towards Zero Carbon Development (Consultation); The Mayor's Energy Strategy; Draft Mayor's Climate Change Adaptation | Policies should provide for and encourage a reduction in the emissions of greenhouse gases. | Climatic factors, Population and Human Health | 3, 14               |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics  | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
|   | Strategy, Draft Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation & Energy Strategy; Mayor's Transport Strategy; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; London Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; RBK Sustainable Construction SPG.   |  |   |                     |
| Biodiversity  | European Spatial Development Perspective; 6th Environmental Action Programme for the EU Community; Conservation of National Habitats and Wildlife Flora and Fauna Directive; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision; Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds; PPS9; UK Biodiversity Action Plan; The Mayor's Biodiversity Strategy and London's BAP; Tidal Thames Habitat Action Plan; The London Plan; Draft Replace London Plan; PPS1; PPG17; RBK Kingston Plan; Hogsmill Valley Walk Strategy; Tolworth Court Farm Fields Management Plan; RBK Tree Strategy; Green Spaces | Policies should ensure that biodiversity is protected, conserved and enhanced. | Climatic Factors, Biodiversity, Flora, Fauna and Soil | 9                   |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics  | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
|   | Strategy, Green Spaces 1st Implementation Plan; SPG Sustainable design and construction; SPG East London Green Grid Framework   |  |   |                     |
| Urban and rural open spaces and green infrastructure                  | PPS1, PPG17, CROW Act, European Landscape Convention, The Historic Environment: A Force for our Future, Heritage Protection for the 21st Century, The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; RBK Allotment Strategy 2008-2018; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision; RBK Urban Design Action Plan, RBK Cultural Strategy, RBK Kingston Plan; Green Spaces Strategy; Green Spaces 1st Implementation Plan; Thames Landscape Strategy; SPG Sustainable design and construction; SPG Providing for children and young peoples play and recreation; SPG East London Green Grid Framework | Policies should ensure that public open spaces and green infrastructure networks are protected and enhanced. | Material Assets, Air, Landscape, Biodiversity, Human Health | 7, 9, 10            |
| Congestion, travel choice, the need for travel by car and the         | CROW Act; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London   | Policies should ensure that  | Population, Human health,                                   | 8                   |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source   | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics                        | SA objective number |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| length and duration of journeys                                       | Plan; The Mayor's Transport Strategy, RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; PPS1; PPG13; CROW Act; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Planning for a Sustainable Future; The London Plan; Accessible London SPG; PPG17; RBK Cycling Strategy; RBK Rights of Way Improvement Plan; Mayor's Transport Strategy; Draft Mayor's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy, Draft Mayor's Community Safety Transport Strategy for Travel & Transport in London; SPG Sustainable design and construction; SPG Land for Transport functions | new development provides a suitable mix of uses and layout is designed to reduce the need to travel. Facilities and amenities should be accessible by different modes of sustainable transport. | air, climatic factors             |                     |
| Use of sustainably produced and local products and recycling products | PPS1, PPS7, PPS10, 6th Environmental Action Programme for the EU Community, PPS23, PPS22, Sustainable Communities Plan, The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, Mayor's Energy Strategy, Draft Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation &   | Policies should encourage the use of sustainably produced and local products.   | Material Assets, Climatic Factors | 15, 16              |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source   | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics   | SA objective number |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------|
|   | Energy Strategy; Mayor's Transport Strategy, Sustainable Design and Construction SPG, RBK Sustainable Construction SPG, RBK LIP, RBK Draft LIP2; RBK Kingston Plan; The London Plan; Draft London Replacement Plan; Water Efficiency in New Buildings (consultation); An Environmental Vision  |   |  |                     |
| Waste management  | European Spatial Development Perspective; 6th Environmental Action Programme for the EU Community; EU Framework Directive on Waste; EU Landfill Directive; European Waste Incineration Directive 2000/76/EC; PPS10, The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London – Housing Provision Targets, Draft Replacement London Plan; Waste and Minerals Alterations; The Mayor's Waste Strategy; Draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy; RBK Waste Strategy and Implementation Plan; RBK Waste Strategy 4th | Policies to ensure that waste is reduced and recycled throughout the life cycle of new development. | Material Assets, Climatic Factors, Soil, Landscape | 16                  |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source   | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics              | SA objective number |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
|   | Implementation Plan April 2007 – March 2010; Draft South London Waste Plan; SPG Sustainable design and construction; SPG Industrial Capacity;  |  |                         |                     |
| Surface and ground waters and sustainable water resources management  | EU Water Framework Directive; EU Groundwater Daughter Directive; Flood Risk Regulations 2009; Future Water The Government’s water strategy for England; Water Efficiency in New Buildings(consultation); PPS25 and Companion Guide; Thames Corridor Abstraction Management Strategy; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision; Water matters; Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan; Regional Flood Risk Appraisal; The Mayor’s Draft Water Strategy; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; Water Act; Water Resources Act; Flood & Water Management Act; Making Space for Water; SPG | Policies to ensure that water quality and resource management is improved. | Water, Climatic Factors | 12                  |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics       | SA objective number |
|---|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
|   | Sustainable design and construction;  |  |                  |                     |
| Risk of and from flooding   | PPS25 and companion guide, EU Water Framework Directive; EU Groundwater Daughter Directive; Flood Risk Regulations 2009; Future Water The Government's water strategy for England; Water Efficiency in New Buildings (consultation); Thames Corridor Abstraction Management Strategy; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision; Water matters; Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan; Lower Thames Strategy; Regional Flood Risk Appraisal; Mayor's Draft Water Strategy; The London Plan; Draft Mayor's Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; Draft Replacement London Plan; Water Act; Water Resources Act; Flood and Water Management Act; Making Space for Water; RBK Kingston Town Centre & Borough Wide SFRA; SPG Sustainable design and | Policies to reduce the risk of and from flooding in new and existing development | Climatic factors | 11, 15              |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics       | SA objective number |
|---|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
|   | construction; SPG East London Green Grid Framework  |   |                  |                     |
| Energy efficiency and renewable energy                                | Energy Performance in Buildings Directive, Integrating renewable energy into new developments; PPS1, PPS Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1; PPS23, PPS22; PPS3; Securing the Future; Sustainable Communities Plan; Code for Sustainable Homes; Planning for a Sustainable Future; The Mayor’s Energy Strategy; Draft Mayor’s Climate Change Mitigation & Energy Strategy; Draft Mayor’s Climate Change Adaptation Strategy; The Mayor’s Transport Strategy; Sustainable Design and Construction SPG; RBK Sustainable Construction SPG; RBK LIP; RBK Draft LIP2; RBK Kingston Plan; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision; Climate Change Act 2008; Planning & Energy Act 2008, Our | Policies should promote the generation and use of renewable energy and ensure that new development is energy efficient. | Climatic factors | 15                  |

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source  | Implications for LDF  | SEA Topics | SA objective number |
|---|---|---|------------|---------------------|
|   | Energy Future: creating a low carbon economy; Energy White Paper; The Mayor's Climate Change Action Plan; Building a Green Future: Towards Zero Carbon Development (Consultation); CROW Act; RBK Cycling Strategy;  |   |            |                     |
| Soil resources and their quality                                      | European Spatial Development Perspective; 6th Environmental Action Programme for the EU Community; European Nitrates Directive; The London Plan: Draft Replacement London Plan; Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London – Housing Provision Targets; Waste and Minerals Alterations; Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning; An Environmental Vision | Policies should ensure the conservation of soil resources, through protection from contamination, and seek to improve already contaminated soils through remediation. | Soil       | 7                   |
| Employment structure  | Good Practice Guidance on Planning for Tourism 2006; PPS4; Sustainable Communities Plan; The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy; Kingston First BID; RBK Kingston Plan   | Policies to encourage adequate employment development.  | Population | 17                  |

## Appendix 3: Key Plans and Programmes

| Theme relevant to SA/SEA of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames LDF | Source   | Implications for LDF   | SEA Topics                  | SA objective number |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Inward investment projects  | PPS1; PPG4; PPS4; PPS6; Sustainable Communities Plan; The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy; Kingston First BID; RBK Kingston Plan; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; SPG Industrial Capacity  | Policies to promote sustainable economic growth and protect existing employment areas.                       | Population, Material Assets | 18                  |
| Development of tourism  | PPS1; Good Practice Guidance on Planning for Tourism; Sustainable Communities Plan; The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy; Kingston First BID; The Mayor's Cultural Strategy; RBK Cultural Strategy, RBK Kingston Plan; The London Plan; Draft Replacement London Plan; Kingston Visitor Action Management Plan; Thames Landscape Strategy | Policies to encourage the enhancement of tourist potential that also meet the needs of the local population. | Population, Material Assets | 19                  |

## Appendix 4: Baseline Information

**Table 16 : Baseline Information**

| Code          | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)   | Target  | SEA Topics               | Latest Baseline (year)  |
|---------------|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|
| <b>SOCIAL</b> |   |  |   |                          |   |
| 01            | To reduce poverty and social exclusion                              | % of population of working age claiming key benefits such as Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) ( <a href="http://www.nomisweb.co.uk">http://www.nomisweb.co.uk</a> )   | To reduce the numbers of people claiming JSA year on year<br><br>Source: <a href="http://www.statistics.gov.uk">www.statistics.gov.uk</a> | Population, Human Health | 1.6% (May 2010, National Stats)   |
|               |   | % of people who say they are satisfied with their local area as a place to live ( <a href="http://www.kingston.gov.uk">www.kingston.gov.uk</a> )   | Improve year on year  |                          |   |
| 02            | To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime | Number of Super Output Areas within the most 10% and 20% most deprived wards in the Country using the Index of Multiple Deprivation ( <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk">www.communities.gov.uk</a> ) | Reduce and remove wards from the 10% and 20% categories   | Population, Human Health | No SOA in 10% band<br>1 ward in the 10 – 20% band (Borough Profile, 2009)   |
|               |   | % of children that live in families that are income deprived ( <a href="http://www.londonhousing.gov.uk">www.londonhousing.gov.uk</a> )  | Decrease over plan period   |                          |   |
| 02            | To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime | % of Kingston residents and visitors who feel safe during the day time and during the night (BVPI General User Survey)   | Increase over plan period   | Population, Human Health | Norbiton, Coombe Hill, Berylands, Grove, Surbiton Hill, Chessington South and Old Malden are the areas where income deprivation affects children the most (Borough Profile, 2009) |
|               |   | Number of developments Secured By Design principles (RBK)  | Increase over plan period   |                          |   |
|               |   |  |   |                          | Daytime – 42% fairly safe<br>Evening – 48% fairly safe<br>(Ipsos MORI, Places Survey 2008/9)  |
|               |   |  |   |                          | No information available.   |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives  | Indicator(s)   | Target                                | SEA Topics               | Latest Baseline (year)  |
|------|--|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 03   | To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community | % of residents with difficulty accessing services (RBK)  | Reduce year on year                   | Population, Human Health | No information available for this indicator. However the Council has adopted the Equality Standard for Local Government and had achieved Level 3 in 2007.   |
|      |  | % of buildings open to the public where all areas are suitable for accessible to disabled people (RBK )                    | Increase year on year                 |                          | RBK website provides information for disabled people on accessing buildings.  |
|      |  | % of people who say they are satisfied with local sports and leisure facilities (RBK )                                     | No target identified.                 |                          | 50% (Ipsos MORI, Places Survey 2008/9)  |
|      |  | % of residential development which accords with the London Plan Matrix (RBK )  | 100%                                  |                          | Of the 65 residential schemes completed in 2009/10, 14 were built at densities below the 35 u/ha (the lowest point on the London Plan density matrix). No schemes exceeded the upper limit on matrix. This amounts to about 21.5% of completed schemes (RBK, 2009/10) |
|      |  | Total number of passenger journeys made annually on local buses within the area of the authority. (RBK Transport BVPI 102) | Increase over plan period             |                          | Travel to work by bus, mini bus or coach is 6,303 (Borough Profile, 2008)   |
|      |  | Percentage of users satisfied with local buses within the area of the authority (RBK Transport, BVPI 103)                  | Improve                               |                          | 74% (BVPI, Place Survey Data, 2008-9)   |
|      |  | Percentage of total length of footpaths and other rights of way which are easy to use by members of the public (BVPI 178)  | Improve poor quality where identified |                          | All footpaths in Kingston are easy to use for pedestrians and 99% of pedestrian crossings have facilities for disabled people ( Performance Plan 2007/2008).  |
|      |  | Area of public park provision deficiency (RBK)   | Reduce to zero                        |                          | Park provision deficiency by ward<br>Alexandra – 0.27%<br>Berrylands – 1%<br>Chessington South – 8%<br>Coombe Hill – 19%<br>Coombe Vale – 24%<br>Surbiton Hill – 12%  |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)  | Target   | SEA Topics                                | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 04   | To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure | <p><b>People on the homelessness register (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>Households in housing need (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>Housing Completions (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>Affordable housing completions by size, type and tenure (RBK)</b></p>                  | <p>Decrease over plan period</p> <p>Decrease over plan period</p> <p>Meet the London Plan target</p> <p>Increase over the plan period in accordance with the affordable housing policy</p> | Population, Human Health, Material Assets | <p>(Kingston Open Space Assessment, 2006)</p> <p>Around 676 homeless households are living in temporary housing, with 218 households accepted as homeless in 2008/9 (Borough Profile 2009)</p> <p>4,329 in band C or higher (Kingston Housing Register, 2009)</p> <p>145 net additional homes completed during 09/10 (AMR 2010)</p> <p>100 completions (AMR 2010)</p> <p>1 bed intermediate- units</p> <p>2 bed intermediate- units</p> <p>1 bed social rented - units</p> <p>2 bed social rented - units</p> <p>3 bed social rented- units</p> <p>4 bed social rented - units</p> |
| 05   | To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health  | <p><b>% of homes constructed to lifetime home standards (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>% of people who describe their health as good (www.statistics.gov.uk)</b></p> <p><b>% of people with limiting long term illness (www.statistics.gov.uk)</b></p> | <p>100%</p> <p>Increase year on year</p> <p>Decrease over plan period</p>  | Population, Human Health                  | <p>This is currently not monitored but will be available for future years.</p> <p>73.92% (Nov 04)</p> <p>A lower proportion of people in Kingston rate their health as "not good" compared to the England average (Borough Health Profile 2007).</p> <p>12.94% (Nov 04)</p>  |

| Code                 | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)   | Target   | SEA Topics                                    | Latest Baseline (year)  |
|----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
|                      |   | % of population partaking in 5 x 30 minutes of physical activity per week<br>www.sportengland.org  | 70% of the population to be 'moderately active' by 2020 (Game Plan Dec 2002)           |   | Active People 1 (05/06)- 25%<br>Active People 2 (06/07)- 18.4%<br>Active People 3 (08/09) - 27.3%   |
| 06                   | To improve the education and skills of the population   | % of students achieving 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* – C or equivalent (RBK Education, DfES)<br>People aged 16-74 with no qualifications (RBK Education, DfES)   | Improve in line with national and local education targets<br>Decrease over plan period | Population                                    | 83% (AMR, 2010) – Increase since 1997 (RBK)<br>5.8% (Jan 08- Dec 08) – (16-64 age) (RBK)  |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b> |   |  |  |   |   |
| 07                   | To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity | % of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land (housing and employment) (RBK )<br>% of new housing built at more than 30dph dwellings per hectare (RBK)<br>% of new inappropriate development on Greenfield sites including Greenbelt and MOL (RBK) | 100%<br>100%<br>0  | Soil,<br>Landscape,<br>Biodiversity,<br>Water | 100% (AMR, 2010)<br>Average density of residential developments in Borough is 105 for 2009/10 (AMR, 2010)<br><i>Planning applications for new buildings in the Green belt</i><br>Decided: 15<br>Permitted:13<br>Refused: 0<br>Appeals Allowed: No information available<br>Appeals Dismissed: No information available<br>Appeal decision pending: No information available<br>Planning decision pending: No information available<br>Withdrawn: 3<br>Rejected: 2 |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)  | Target   | SEA Topics                                     | Latest Baseline (year)  |
|------|---|---|--|--|---|
|      |   |   |  |  | <p>Conditions discharged: 2</p> <p><i>Planning applications for new buildings in Metropolitan Open Land</i></p> <p>Decided: 8</p> <p>Permitted: 8</p> <p>Refused: 0</p> <p>Appeals Allowed: No information available</p> <p>Appeals Dismissed: No information available</p> <p>Withdrawn: No information available</p> <p>Pending:</p> <p>(AMR, 2010)</p> |
|      |   | <b>% of sites affected by contamination remediated as part of new development and <u>put back into use</u>(RBK)</b>                             | Increase   |  | There is no information available on contaminated sites in the Borough.   |
| 08   | To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car | <b>Travel to work (mode of transport)</b><br>( <a href="http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/">www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/</a> ) | To increase the number of journeys to work by non-car modes year on year | Air, Human Health, Landscape, Climatic Factors | <p>Underground, metro, light rail or tram</p> <p>1877</p> <p>Train – 14625</p> <p>Bus, minibus or coach – 6303</p> <p>Taxi or minicab – 297</p> <p>Driving a car or van – 31808</p> <p>Passenger in a car or van- 2045</p> <p>Motorcycle, scooter or moped – 1297</p>   |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives | Indicator(s)  | Target   | SEA Topics | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|-------------------|---|--|------------|--|
|      |                   |   |  |            | <p>Bicycle – 2331</p> <p>On foot – 7207</p> <p>Other – 320</p> <p>(Neighbourhood Statistics, Resident Population, 2001)</p>  |
|      |                   | <b>Average distance travelled to work</b><br>( <a href="http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/">www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/</a> ) | Decrease   |            | <p>Works mainly at or from home – 6783</p> <p>Less than 2km- 12724</p> <p>2km to less than 5km- 13812</p> <p>5km to less than 10km- 11057</p> <p>10km to less than 20km – 20057</p> <p>20km to less than 30km – 3914</p> <p>30km to less than 40km – 1128</p> <p>40km to less than 60km – 689</p> <p>60km and over- 790</p> <p>(Neighbourhood Statistics, Resident Population, 2001)</p> |
|      |                   | <b>Modal split for cycling (RBK)</b>  | Double cycling share from 3% in 2001 to 6% in 2011 |            | No information available.  |
|      |                   | <b>Overall modal split shift away from car (RBK )</b>   | 55% of all trips by non car modes in 2011          |            | 2% (TfL, 2009) however this figure is based on a survey of 400 people  |
|      |                   | <b>% of residential development which accords with the London Plan Matrix (RBK )</b>  | 100%   |            | 52% (TfL Travel in London 2009)  |
|      |                   |   |  |            | Of the 65 residential schemes completed in 2009/10, 14 were built at densities below the 35 u/ha (the lowest point on the London Plan density matrix). No schemes exceeded the upper limit on matrix. This amounts to about 21.5% of completed schemes (RBK, 2009/10)  |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)   | Target  | SEA Topics  | Latest Baseline (year)  |  |
|------|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 09   | To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | <b>Number/ area/condition of SSSI's, NNR's, SNCI's and LNR's in the borough</b><br>(RBK Environment and Sustainability)      | Ensure the protection and quality is maintained | Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna, Landscape            | SSSI – 0<br>NNR – 0<br>SNCI – 0<br>LNR – 10<br>(AMR, 2010)  |  |
|      |   | <b>Achievement of BAP targets and objectives (RBK)</b>   | Meet BAP targets                                |   |   | There is no information available on this indicator. |
|      |   | <b>Number of sites identified for enhancement as part of development, that are of low conservation value (RBK)</b>           | No target identified                            |   |   | There is no information available on this indicator. |
|      |   | <b>% of major planning applications approved with opportunities for wildlife and biodiversity enhancement built in (RBK)</b> | 100%  |   |   | There is no information available on this indicator. |
| 10   | To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings, sites and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those | <b>Number of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments at Risk (RBK)</b>  | To reduce year on year                          | Cultural Heritage, Soil, Material Assets, Landscape | 5 properties are currently on the Heritage at Risk Register.<br>3 Buildings<br>2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments<br>(AMR, 2010) |  |
|      |   | <b>Historic buildings, sites, areas and/or their settings affected negatively by proposals/policies (RBK)</b>                | No loss or damage                               |   |   | There is no information available on this indicator. |
|      |   | <b>New sites recorded for their archaeological interest (RBK)</b>  | No target identified                            |   |   | There is no information available on this indicator. |
|      |   | <b>Loss or damage to Listed Buildings/Buildings of Townscape Merit (RBK)</b>   | No loss or damage                               |   |   | No loss or damage (AMR, 2010)                        |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives  | Indicator(s)   | Target   | SEA Topics         | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|--|--|--|--------------------|--|
|      | visiting, living and working in the borough                            | <b>Number and extent of conservation areas (RBK)</b>   | Continue protection of these areas and review when required  |                    | 26 conservation areas (AMR, 2010)  |
| 11   | To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk   | <b>Number of planning permissions within flood risk areas granted contrary to advice from the Environment Agency (RBK )</b><br><b>% of major new planning permissions with Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) installed (RBK )</b>  | Zero<br><br>100%   | Water              | 0 (AMR, 2008/09)<br>0 (AMR, 2009/10)<br><br>Planning officers have participated in a SUDS workshop   |
| 12   | To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources | <b>Surface water quality (Environment Agency)</b><br><b>Groundwater quality (Environment Agency)</b><br><b>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to advice on water quality grounds from the Environment Agency (RBK)</b><br><b>Number of incidents of major and significant water pollution (Environment Agency)</b><br><b>Length of culverts opened up into open watercourse and the length of watercourse restored (Environment Agency)</b> | All surface waters to achieve good status (ecological and chemical) by 2015<br>Source: Water Framework Directive<br><br>All groundwater sources to achieve good chemical status by 2015<br>Source: Water Framework Directive<br><br>Zero<br><br>To reduce during plan period<br><br>Increase | Water<br><br>Water | River Hogsmill overall status is moderate and chemical status is good.<br><br>River Thames (Egham to Teddington) overall status is poor and chemical status is fail. (Water Framework Directive, Environment Agency, January 2011).<br><br>There are no source protection zones identified in the Borough.<br><br>Upper Thames Gravels overall status is poor and chemical status is fail (Water Framework Directive, Environment Agency, January 2011).<br><br>0 approved contrary to advice (AMR, 2009/10)<br><br>Between 2002- 2008, 5 incidents have occurred in borough of significant water pollution. One in each year of 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008.<br><br>There is no information available on this indicator. |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)   | Target   | SEA Topics                                       | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|
|      |   | % new major developments incorporating water conservation measures (RBK) | 100%   |  | This is currently not monitored but will be captured under the LDF indicator monitoring sustainability standards.  |
| 13   | To improve air quality  | <b>Achievement of Air Quality Action Plan Targets</b><br>(RBK )          | To meet Air Quality Management Area set targets  | Air, Human Health, Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna | <p>RBK does not have an Air Quality Action Plan. However the AMR 2010 states:<br/>Carbon Monoxide - this indicator can't be monitored</p> <p>NO2 emissions - Monitoring data from a diffusion tube survey carried out in New Malden measured kerb side levels in excess of the annual mean target (but similar to other busy trunk roads in the Greater London Area). These levels support the continued designation of the Borough as an Air Quality Management Area for annual mean NO2. The data however does not indicate that peak hour levels are breaching EU limit values.</p> <p>Ozone emissions - This indicator has not been monitored in the year 09/10</p> <p>Particulate emissions (PM10) - This indicator has not been monitored in the year 09/10. Modelled data would indicate that PM10 is still an issue in London.</p> |
|      |   | <b>Number of days when air pollution exceed limits</b> (RBK)             | Reduce the days over plan period   |  | 14% of all deaths- 180 out of 1,126 deaths were respiratorily related (2006) (RBK)   |
| 14   | To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions | <b>CO2 emissions from Council's operations</b> (RBK)                     | UK's statutory targets are to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2050 and 26-32% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline | Population, Human Health                         | <p>Defra shut monitoring station 2-3 years ago, hence no data available for the area. Proxy indicators could be used such as asthma/respiratory stats</p> <p>Key Performance Indicator for the Low Carbon Management Plan - Increase of 8.28% <sup>(1)</sup> in RBK's emissions in one year. <sup>(1)</sup> This is based on the revised figure for 2008/09 CO2 emissions (21,315,530kg – revised Sep/10). <i>If the original figure submitted in 2009 is used (17,659,799kg), the increase will have been 30.7%. The figure for 2009/10 is 23,080,936kg (revised Oct/10).</i></p>   |
|      |   | <b>Per capita CO2 emissions in Local Authority area</b> (RBK)            | UK's statutory targets are to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2050 and 26-32% by 2020, against a 1990 baseline |  | <p>866 kt CO<sub>2</sub> (2005)</p> <p>866 kt CO<sub>2</sub> (2006) [total figures only, not per capita figures]</p>   |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives  | Indicator(s)  | Target  | SEA Topics              | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| 15   | To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy | <p><b>CO2 emissions from residential buildings</b>(RBK)</p> <p><b>Energy consumption per capita</b> (RBK)</p>   | <p>All new housing should be carbon neutral by 2016</p> <p>No target identified. Fossil fuel use to reduce over the plan period</p>   | <p>Climatic Factors</p> | <p>Domestic sector CO2 emission were 42% in 2006 (RBK Borough Profile 2009).</p> <p>No overall figure yet as there are different fuel sources involved.</p> <p>Electricity</p> <p>Industry &amp;Commerce – 340.1 GWh</p> <p>Domestic Sector – 294.5 GWh (BERR, 2007)</p> <p><a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.html">http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-electricity/page36213.html</a></p> <p>Gas</p> <p>Industry &amp;Commerce - 299.3 GWh</p> <p>Domestic Sector - 1080.2 GWh (BERR, 2007)</p> <p><a href="http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-gas/page36200.html">http://www.berr.gov.uk/energy/statistics/regional/regional-local-gas/page36200.html</a></p> |
|      |  | <p><b>Applications approved incorporating renewable energy</b> (RBK)</p> <p><b>% of new build residential meeting Ecohomes Very Good or Code for Sustainable Homes level 4/6</b> (RBK )</p> <p><b>% of new build commercial meeting BREEAM Very Good Standard</b> (RBK)</p> | <p>On site renewable energy generation of 20% unless unfeasible</p> <p>All new dwellings to meet Code level 4 by 2013 and Code level 6 by 2016</p> <p>All new development to meet BREEAM Very Good standard</p> |                         | <p>Work in progress to educate planning officers about climate change measures</p> <p>Work in progress to educate planning officers about climate change measures.</p> <p>There is no information available on this indicator but this will be monitored in the future.</p>  |

| Code            | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)  | Target   | SEA Topics                       | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|-----------------|---|---|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 16              | To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling | <p><b>Kilograms of household waste collected per head per household (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>% of waste arisings which have been landfilled (RBK)</b></p> <p><b>% of waste arisings which have recycled or composted (RBK)</b></p>   | <p>Decrease during plan period</p> <p>By 2010 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 75% of that produced in 1995; by 2013 50% and by 2020 35%</p> <p>Increase over plan period</p> | Material Assets, Soil, Landscape | <p>Waste per head of the population</p> <p>822 kg (2006/07)</p> <p>779 kg (2007/08)</p> <p>617.71 kg (2008/09)</p> <p>371 kg (AMR, 2009/10)</p> <p>27,799.04 tonnes (AMR, 2009/10)</p> <p>18.8% recycled (2007/08), 24.2% recycled (2008/09)</p> <p>6.6% composted (2007/08), 11.2% composted (2008/09)</p> <p>46% recycled (AMR, 2009/10)</p> |
| <b>ECONOMIC</b> |   |   |  |                                  |  |
| 17              | To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities  | <p><b>% of working age in employment</b> (<a href="http://www.nomisweb.co.uk">http://www.nomisweb.co.uk</a>)</p> <p><b>Job density: Number of jobs to working age population by sector</b> (<a href="http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk">www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk</a>)</p> | <p>Improve</p> <p>Improve</p>  | Population                       | <p>73.1% (2008)</p> <p>Total employee jobs-74,400</p> <p>Full-time- 51,600 (69.4%)</p> <p>Part-time- 22,800 (30.6%)</p> <p><b>Employee jobs by industry</b></p> <p>Manufacturing - 3,200 (4.3%)</p> <p>Construction- 1,800 (2.4%)</p>  |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives   | Indicator(s)  | Target                                | SEA Topics                  | Latest Baseline (year)  |
|------|---|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 18   | To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment |   |                                       |                             | <p>Services- 69,400 (93.3%)</p> <p>Distribution, hotels &amp; restaurants- 19,500 (26.3%)</p> <p>Transport &amp; communications- 3,300 (4.4%)</p> <p>Finance, IT, other business activities- 23,000 (30.9%)</p> <p>Public admin, education &amp; health- 18,700 (25.1%)</p> <p>Other services- 4,900 (6.6%)</p> <p>Tourism-related 6,200 (8.3%)</p> |
|      |   | <b>New employment floorspace by type*</b><br>(RBK)  | No target identified.                 |                             | There is no information available on this indicator.  |
|      |   | <b>Employment land availability by type* and annual take up on a yearly basis</b><br>(RBK)                      | Meet the needs of the business sector | Population, Material Assets | <p>No information available on annual take up.</p> <p>Employment floor space with planning permission:</p> <p>B1= 0.8ha</p> <p>B2= 0ha</p> <p>B8= 0.5ha</p> <p>(AMR, 2009/10)</p> <p>Annual take up?</p>  |
|      |   | <b>Net change in VAT registered businesses in the area</b> (ONS)  | No target identified                  |                             | Increase of 195 registrations between 2006 & 2007   |
|      |   | <b>Vacant retail units in defined shopping frontages in Kingston Town Centre and the District Centres</b> (RBK) | Reduce over plan period               |                             | <p>Doesn't note primary frontage units for Kingston</p> <p>Kingston – 43 vacant units out of total of 580 units</p> <p>Surbiton – 6 vacant units out of 78 primary frontage units</p>   |

| Code | SA/SEA Objectives                   | Indicator(s)  | Target                       | SEA Topics                  | Latest Baseline (year)   |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 19   | To foster a strong tourism industry |   |                              |                             | Tolworth – 13 vacant units out of 72 primary frontage units<br>New Maiden- 5 vacant units out of 99 primary frontage units<br>(Annual Centre Audits, 2009)   |
|      |                                     | VAT registrations and deregistrations (ONS)   | No target identified         |                             | 810 registrations & 505 deregistrations (RBK 2007)   |
|      |                                     | Amount of employment land lost to residential development (RBK)   | No target identified         |                             | There is no information available on this indicator.   |
|      |                                     | Visitor Numbers per annum (RBK)   | Improve over the plan period | Population, Material Assets | For 2007, 3,335 visitors (LDA, LATIM Report 2009)  |
|      |                                     | Change in the number, type and size of tourist facilities and developments in the borough (RBK)                     | No target identified         |                             | There is no information available on this indicator.   |
|      |                                     | Change in the number, type, size and variety of night-time economy facilities and developments in the borough (RBK) | No target identified         |                             | -70 licensed premises in Kingston Town Centre<br>-Night time capacity for around 15,500 people<br>-10,000 people visit the town centre in the evenings<br>-3 night clubs<br>-25 or so clubs, pubs and bars (approximate capacity 6,000 persons).<br>-30 licensed restaurants, cafés<br>-Holmes Place and Esporta Health Clubs.<br>-Rose Theatre has capacity for 1,300 people.<br>-Cinemas, the Rotunda & various health clubs increases capacity by 3,500-4,000.<br>(After Dark Strategy, 2007) |

## Appendix 5: Business-As-Usual Scenario

The SEA Directive requires an explicit consideration of the business-as-usual scenario, where the 'Environmental Report' should include *"the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme"* SEA Directive (Annex I (b) ). Table 13 sets out how the Borough might change without

the Core Strategy being in place, by taking the current baseline information and considering how these trends will effect the various SEA topics such as biodiversity, population and human health and so on. The second column of the table identifies what type of impact (positive or negative) is likely to occur without the Core Strategy being in place. It demonstrates that without the Core Strategy in place there would be a double negative impact upon environmental, social and economic sustainability of the Borough.

**Table 17 : The Business-As-Usual Scenario**

| <b>Business-As-Usual Scenario</b>  | <b>Sustainability Impact</b> |
|--|------------------------------|
| Increasing population will place increasing demand on biodiversity, greenfield sites, MOL, open space, Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, water supply and material assets. It is likely to negatively impact upon soil quality and quantity, air quality and the Borough's landscape.   | --                           |
| Social inequalities would increase.  | --                           |
| Anti social activity in the Borough would increase and fear of crime would grow, especially in Kingston Town Centre.   | --                           |
| Norbiton, Berrylands, Beverley and Canbury fall into the group of Super Output Areas that are most deprived in terms of health deprivation and disability. Without intervention deprivation of these areas could increase.   | --                           |
| The demand for school places is part of a long term upward trend caused by rising birth rate, new housing provision, and more people moving into the Borough. The Borough needs new schools and improving current education facilities are essential for skills development. Education provision to meet the needs of a growing population would not be met. | --                           |
| Without intervention, the Borough's health would decline. The provision of health and community facilities need to meet with the needs of the community and be placed in accessible locations. To support this, the provision of open space and improvements in air quality are needed to support a healthy population.                                      | --                           |
| London would continue to have the poorest air quality in the country with increased air pollution and reduction in air quality. Poor air quality would continue to cause ill health and deaths.  | --                           |

| <b>Business-As-Usual Scenario</b>   | <b>Sustainability Impact</b> |
|---|------------------------------|
| Climate change is recognised as a significant environmental challenge. Carbon emissions would worsen and if growth is not managed in a sustainable manner then the effect of climate change is likely to have adverse economic, social and environmental consequences. National and regional reduction targets for carbon emissions would not be met.   | --                           |
| Increase in population and economic activity puts greater demand on energy use. Without a Core Strategy in place there are no local policies to secure renewable and low carbon energy facilities and fossil fuels will continue to be consumed. The existing built environment has low energy efficiency and new development would not meet national and London Plan renewable energy provision targets. The opportunity to improve energy efficiency and increase renewable energy via new development would be missed. | --                           |
| Climate change is likely to result in increased flood risk and intensity of fluvial and surface water flooding. This will have significant impacts upon the Borough causing damage to infrastructure, homes and health.   | --                           |
| The water quality targets in the Water Framework Directive would not be met and the water quality of the River Thames and River Hogsmill would not improve.   | --                           |
| Increasing demand for housing, in particular affordable housing, key worker accommodation and for student housing. Without the Core Strategy, new housing provision would not meet with the needs of the population and provide the right type and size of housing required.  | --                           |
| The infrastructure needed to support a growing population is not delivered and the existing gaps have not been addressed. There could be a shortfall in water supply, sewage, community, health and education facilities and green infrastructure. By adopting the Core Strategy, it would be possible to meet this demand by planning for new housing, infrastructure, and community facilities such as schools, healthcare and leisure facilities.  | --                           |
| The imbalance in employment opportunities continues with a high proportion of residents commuting out of the borough to work and a high proportion of jobs in the borough being filled by workers living outside the borough and commuting in.  | --                           |
| The decline of some local Centres in the Borough is not reversed.   | --                           |
| The opportunity to support sustainable economic growth to accessible key locations and provide a range of employment opportunities is missed. Employment land and premises are not protected from other uses.   | --                           |
| Residents who face barriers to employment, including those in areas of higher unemployment and deprivation, those with health disabilities remain.  | --                           |

| <b>Business-As-Usual Scenario</b>  | <b>Sustainability Impact</b> |
|--|------------------------------|
| The recorded trend in the decrease in the proportion of retail in the primary shopping frontages of the District Centres remains and there is an over proliferation of certain uses and a decrease in the quality of facilities.                     | --                           |
| There is failure to capitalise on the opportunities of the tourism industry and it economic and social benefits.   | --                           |
| Population increase will see the amount of waste produced increase. The Joint South London Waste Plan sets out the framework for sustainable waste management. The Core Strategy, would support this document e.g. by setting out recycling targets. | --                           |
| Car use in the Borough is popular and used for over half of all trips and there are traffic congestion hot spots. Opportunity to promote walking, cycling and public transport is missed.  | --                           |
| 5 listed buildings are currently on the buildings at risk register and without intervention from planning these important buildings would be lost.   | --                           |

## Appendix 6: Full Sustainability Appraisals

The tables below contain the Full Sustainability Appraisal on the new policies added to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission: DM14, IMP2 and IMP4.

| <b>Theme 2 - A Prosperous and Inclusive Borough</b>   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Housing and Affordability</b>  |  |   |
| <b>DM14: Loss of Housing</b>  |  |   |
|   | <b>Core Strategy Proposed Submission</b> |   |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>  | <b>Score</b>                             | <b>Comment</b>  |
| <b>SOCIAL</b>   |  |   |
| 01. To reduce poverty and social exclusion  | 0  |   |
| 02. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime   | 0  |   |
| 03. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community  | 0  |   |
| 04. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure   | ++                                       | By resisting the loss of family accommodation, this will help meet the needs of the community. The availability of family housing is a particular concern in this Borough.  |
| 05. To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health  | 0  |   |
| 06. To improve the education and skills of the population   | 0  |   |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>  |  |   |
| 07. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++                                       | The policy seeks to resist the loss of existing accommodation and therefore this will help protect loss of Greenfield sites for new housing development. It will also safeguard soil quality and quantity as it will result in less disturbance of the soil caused by construction works. |
| 08. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | 0  |   |

| Theme 2 - A Prosperous and Inclusive Borough  |                                   |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Housing and Affordability   |                                   |   |
| DM14: Loss of Housing   |                                   |   |
|   | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |   |
| SA/SEA Objectives   | Score                             | Comment   |
| 09. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | 0                                 |   |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings, sites and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | +/-                               | By protecting existing accommodation, this will help protect the positive aspects of the Borough's character. However it could also have a negative impact as applying the policy too rigidly could limit the opportunities to enhance the Borough's character.   |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk  | +/-                               | Policy seeks to protect existing housing therefore decreases the likelihood of placing new housing development in areas of high flood risk. However protecting existing stock which is already subject to flooding will have a negative effect because redevelopment offers the chance to relocate housing to lower flood risk areas and ensure new development is flood zone compatible. |
| 12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources  | 0                                 |   |
| 13. To improve air quality  | 0                                 |   |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions   | 0                                 |   |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy  | +/-                               | The materials used for construction of new housing and resources used to demolish existing, could have a negative impact upon energy efficiency and resource use. Therefore protecting accommodation has a positive impact. Existing housing stock will need to be retro fitted with energy efficiency measures in order to reduce  |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Theme 2 - A Prosperous and Inclusive Borough</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Housing and Affordability</b>  |  |  |
| <b>DM14: Loss of Housing</b>  |  |  |
|   | <b>Core Strategy Proposed Submission</b> |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>  | <b>Score</b>                             | <b>Comment</b>   |
|   |  | energy use and promote renewable energy. On the other hand, building new housing provides an opportunity to greatly improve energy efficiency from the outset. |
| 16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling | 0  |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC</b>   |  |  |
| 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities  | 0  |  |
| 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment             | 0  |  |
| 19. To foster a strong tourism industry   | 0  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Implementation and Delivery</b>   |  |  |
| <b>IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure</b>  |  |  |
|  | <b>Core Strategy Proposed Submission</b> |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>   | <b>Score</b>                             | <b>Comment</b>   |
| <b>SOCIAL</b>  |  |  |
| 01. To reduce poverty and social exclusion   | 0  |  |
| 02. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime  | 0  |  |
| 03. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community | +  | This policy is supportive and will make a positive contribution towards this sustainability objective. |

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery   |                                   |  |
| <b>IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure</b>   |                                   |  |
|   | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>  | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| 04. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure   | +                                 | Policy is supportive as the Council will seek improvements to water and sewerage infrastructure and that these are completed before occupation of the development takes place. |
| 05. To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health  | 0                                 |  |
| 06. To improve the education and skills of the population   | 0                                 |  |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>  |                                   |  |
| 07. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity   | 0                                 |  |
| 08. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | 0                                 |  |
| 09. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | 0                                 |  |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings, sites and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | 0                                 |  |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk  | 0                                 |  |

|  |                                   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery  |                                   |  |
| <b>IMP2 Sewerage and Water Infrastructure</b>  |                                   |  |
|  | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>   | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| 12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources   | +                                 | Policy supports the long term provision of water supply and availability of water resources as it permits the expansion of the Hogsmill Valley Sewage Treatment Works. |
| 13. To improve air quality   | 0                                 |  |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions  | 0                                 |  |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy | 0                                 |  |
| 16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling                                    | 0                                 |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC</b>  |                                   |  |
| 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities   | 0                                 |  |
| 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment  | 0                                 |  |
| 19. To foster a strong tourism industry  | 0                                 |  |

|  |                                   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery                |                                   |  |
| IMP4 Facilitating Delivery                 |                                   |  |
|  | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>                   | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| <b>SOCIAL</b>                              |                                   |  |
| 01. To reduce poverty and social exclusion | +                                 | Policy will have a positive impact as it will improve access to social infrastructure. |

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery   |                                   |  |
| IMP4 Facilitating Delivery  |                                   |  |
|   | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>  | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| 02. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime   | 0                                 |  |
| 03. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community  | ++                                | The policy seeks to support the co location of facilities with infrastructure needs in order to increase public access thus it will have a strong positive impact upon this sustainability objective.  |
| 04. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure   | ++                                | This policy states that it will ensure commitment to delivery by infrastructure providers as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This policy will have a positive impact by supporting new housing development be achieving necessary infrastructure.                              |
| 05. To improve the population's health and reduce inequalities in health  | +                                 | Policy will have a positive impact as it will target areas deficient in health facilities.   |
| 06. To improve the education and skills of the population   | +                                 | Policy will have a positive impact as it supports sustainable growth and will assist in the delivery of educational facilities.  |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL</b>  |                                   |  |
| 07. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity | ++                                | The policy states that the Council as a landowner will maximise its land and buildings to support the vision and policies in the Core Strategy. This policy will support the efficient use of buildings and previously developed land and protect Greenfield sites from new development. |
| 08. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | +                                 | The policy supports sustainable growth therefore it will have a positive impact upon transport by ensuring new growth is located in highly accessible locations.   |
| 09. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international, national and local scale  | 0                                 |  |

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery   |                                   |  |
| IMP4 Facilitating Delivery  |                                   |  |
|   | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>  | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings, sites and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | 0                                 |  |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk  | 0                                 |  |
| 12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources  | 0                                 |  |
| 13. To improve air quality  | 0                                 |  |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions   | 0                                 |  |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy  | 0                                 |  |
| 16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling   | 0                                 |  |
| <b>ECONOMIC</b>   |                                   |  |
| 17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities  | +                                 | By facilitating the delivery of infrastructure, this will provide new employment opportunities.  |
| 18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment   | +                                 | This policy focuses on facilitating the delivery of infrastructure, this will have a positive impact upon encouraging sustainable economic growth. |

|   |                                   |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Implementation and Delivery             |                                   |  |
| IMP4 Facilitating Delivery              |                                   |  |
|   | Core Strategy Proposed Submission |  |
| <b>SA/SEA Objectives</b>                | <b>Score</b>                      | <b>Comment</b>   |
| 19. To foster a strong tourism industry | +                                 | This policy focuses on facilitating the delivery of infrastructure, this will have a positive impact upon fostering a strong tourism industry. |

**Summary of DM14**

Protection of existing housing will have a significant positive effect on sustainability objective 4 by meeting the needs of the community and 7 by safeguarding greenfield sites and protecting soil quantity. Some of the other predicted effects could have either a positive or a negative impact on managing flood risk, increasing renewable energy efficiency and Borough's character.

**Summary of IMP2**

This policy will have a positive impact on assisting the delivery of housing by providing necessary sewerage infrastructure. It will also have a positive environmental impact on enhancing the availability of water resources.

**Summary of IMP4**

This policy will have a significant positive effect on the environment by reducing the need to travel, protection of Greenfield sites from development. It will have a positive impact upon the majority of the social sustainability objectives particularly on support for housing and providing services and facilities which meet with the needs of the community. This policy will also have a positive impact on all the economic sustainability objectives by facilitating the delivery of infrastructure.

## **Appendix 7: Impacts Assessment**

The Impacts Assessment Table below sets out the predicted impacts of the Core Strategy against the SEA topics and indicates whether the impact is short/medium/long term and if the effect is permanent or temporal. Comments are provided alongside. It demonstrates that the Core Strategy will have an impact upon all the SEA topics and will largely be permanent and positive. It is important to note that professional judgement was used when predicting the short/medium/long term effects.

Table 18

| SEA Topics                                  | Short/Medium/Long term effects | Temporal or Permanent effects | Comments   |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Biodiversity/Flora/<br>Fauna/Soil/Landscape | +S<br>+M<br>+L                 | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of open space and new habitats</li> <li>• Improvements to biodiversity through enhancement measures</li> <li>• Improvements to playing fields and provision of new recreational space</li> <li>• Improvements to riverside recreation and leisure as well as infrastructure and facilities for boat users</li> <li>• Potential secondary impact of employment uses on soil quality and quantity caused by construction</li> </ul>   |
| Population                                  | +S<br>+M<br>+L                 | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential drop in housing levels and employment due to economic recession</li> <li>• Expansion of existing schools and provision of new schools</li> <li>• Improved educational facilities in long term</li> <li>• Increase in provision of affordable housing</li> <li>• Increased housing provision which meets the needs of all sectors of the community</li> <li>• Better accessibility for all members of the community to local services</li> <li>• Provision of new community facilities</li> <li>• Improvements in community safety and reduction in fear of crime</li> </ul> |
| Human Health                                | +S<br>+M<br>+L                 | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deficiencies in health care addressed - improvements at Surbiton Hospital could potentially occur in the short term</li> <li>• Improvement and co-location of health care facilities</li> </ul>   |

| SEA Topics       | Short/Medium/Long term effects | Temporal or Permanent effects | Comments   |
|------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Water            | +M<br>+L                       | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mitigation of flood risk</li> <li>• Water quality is likely to improve over the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>• Increased use of water conservation measures</li> <li>• Increased use of SUDs</li> </ul>   |
| Air              | +M<br>+L                       | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in car use due to reduced need to travel and increase in sustainable transport modes</li> <li>• Reduction in pollution levels</li> <li>• Potential for secondary effects on air quality due to increase in employment uses</li> </ul>   |
| Climatic Factors | +S<br>+M<br>+L                 | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change adaptation plan is likely to be completed.</li> <li>• Sustainable design and construction standards e.g. renewable energy installations will have an immediate impact and will be brought into effect once the Core Strategy is adopted</li> <li>• assessment of planning applications where flood risk is an issue will have immediate effect as they will be assessed in line with the water management and flood risk policy</li> <li>• impact of Core Strategy on climate change will only be measurable over the long term, this includes district heating networks, low carbon zones, increase in renewable energy resources</li> <li>• Reduction in waste production and continued increase in recycling rates</li> </ul> |

| SEA Topics        | Short/Medium/Long term effects | Temporal or Permanent effects | Comments   |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Material Assets   | +M<br>+L                       | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Potential for decline in the short term for material assets</li> <li>● Sustainable growth in economy, Kingston town centre, district and local centres improved</li> <li>● Enhancements in town centre and local centre shopping facilities</li> </ul>        |
| Cultural Heritage | +M<br>+L                       | P                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improvements to the Borough's character</li> <li>● Preservation and enhancement of heritage assets</li> <li>● Potential secondary impacts caused by climate change adaptation/mitigation measures and flood resilience measures on heritage assets</li> </ul> |

## **Appendix 8: Monitoring Framework**

The table below sets out the updated monitoring framework in line with the Core Strategy Monitoring and Performance Tables.

**Table 19 : Table Showing the Monitoring Framework linking Core Strategy policies to the SA Framework**

| SA Objective  | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies  | Headline SEA Directive |
|---|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>1. To reduce social poverty and social exclusion</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning contributions/CIL to the improvements of open spaces</li> <li>● New and converted dwellings on previously developed land</li> <li>● Net additional pitches (Gypsies and Travellers)</li> <li>● Gross affordable housing completions</li> <li>● Intermediate and social rented dwellings as a % of total affordable completions</li> <li>● Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>● Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>● % of population of working age claiming key benefits such as Job Seekers Allowance (National Statistics)</li> <li>● Number of Super Output Areas within the most 10% and 20% most deprived wards in the Country using the Index of Multiple Deprivation (Communities Local Government)</li> <li>● % of children that live in families that are income deprived (London Housing)</li> </ul> | <p>CS3, DM5, DM6, CS4, DM7, CS10, DM13, DM14, DM15, DM16, CS11, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22, CS14, DM22, IMP1, IMP3, IMP4</p> | <p>Population</p>      |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies  | Headline SEA Directive                           |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>2. To reduce and prevent anti social activity, crime and fear of crime</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increases/decreases in incidences of crime and disorder across the borough and results of public opinion surveys regarding fear of crime and actual/perceived crime hot spots</li> <li>● Number of road traffic accidents and progress towards accident reduction targets</li> <li>● Creation of new and improved links to new and existing health facilities</li> <li>● Net gain in numbers of floor space and concentrations of A4, A5 and D2 and other associated sui generis uses in Kingston Town Centre and the District Centres. Monitor number of successful licensing applications</li> <li>● Number of additional late night bus and rail services provided, including to neighbouring Surrey districts</li> <li>● Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>● Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>● Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>● Reduce crime and the opportunities for crime, particularly in crime hot spots, through good design practice</li> </ul> | <p>DM10, CS14, DM22, CS16, DM24,</p>   | <p>Population</p>                                |
| <p>3. To promote accessibility to a range of services and facilities to meet the needs of all sectors of the community</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award Standards importance</li> <li>● Planning contributions/CIL to improve open spaces</li> <li>● Total units designed to wheelchair standards as a % of housing completions</li> <li>● Lifetime homes as a % of housing completions</li> <li>● Seek a diversity of uses in Local Centres</li> </ul>  | <p>CS3, DM5, DM6, CS4, DM7, CS10, DM13, DM14, DM15, DM16, CS12, DM19, DM20, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22, DM23, CS15, CS16, IMP1, IMP3, IMP4</p> | <p>Population, Human Health, Material Assets</p> |

| SA Objective  | Monitoring Indicators   | Links to Core Strategy Policies  | Headline SEA Directive             |
|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of primary schools and secondary school places within the Borough</li> <li>● Number of additional permanent school places/Forms of Entry provided</li> <li>● Number of permanent school expansion schemes completed</li> <li>● Amount of new managed student accommodation completed</li> <li>● Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>● Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>● Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>● No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> </ul> |  |                                    |
| <p>4. To provide a range of high quality housing that meets the needs of the community, accompanied by adequate supporting infrastructure</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Plan period and housing targets</li> <li>● Building for Life Assessments</li> <li>● Gross affordable housing completions</li> <li>● Net additional pitches (Gypsies and Travellers)</li> <li>● Affordable housing completions by size, type and tenure</li> <li>● Total units designed to wheelchair standards as a % of housing completions</li> <li>● Lifetime homes as a % of housing completions</li> <li>● No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> </ul>  | <p>CS8, DM10, DM11, DM12, CS10, DM13, DM14, DM15, DM16, IMP1, IMP2, IMP3, IMP4</p> | <p>Population, Material Assets</p> |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators   | Links to Core Strategy Policies  | Headline SEA Directive        |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 5. To improve the population's health                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award Standards importance</li> <li>● Mode share for cycling</li> <li>● Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>● Development of additional and/or upgraded local health care facilities</li> <li>● No. of new developments with planning obligations/contributions for social, physical, environmental and green infrastructure</li> <li>● Creation of new and improved links to new and existing health facilities</li> <li>● Number of road traffic accidents and progress towards accident reduction targets</li> <li>● % of population partaking in 5 x 30 minutes of physical activity per week (Sport England)</li> <li>● % of people who describe their health as good (National Statistics)</li> </ul> | CS2, CS3, DM5, DM6, CS4, DM7, CS5, CS6, DM8, CS7, DM9, CS7, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22, IMP1, IMP3, IMP4 | Human Health, Material Assets |
| 6. To improve the education and skills of the population | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of primary schools and secondary school places within the Borough</li> <li>● Number of additional permanent school places/Forms of Entry provided</li> <li>● Number of permanent school expansion schemes completed</li> <li>● Amount of new managed student accommodation completed</li> <li>● Number of leisure facilities available</li> <li>● Change in the number of community facilities available</li> </ul>   | CS11, DM17, DM18, DM23, CS15, CS16, IMP1, IMP3, IMP4,  | Population, Material Assets,  |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies  | Headline SEA Directive               |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| 7. To make the most efficient use of buildings and previously developed land (providing this does not harm its biodiversity value) before Greenfield sites and safeguard soil quality and quantity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Planning applications for new buildings in the Green Belt and MOL</li> <li>● Average densities of new developments</li> <li>● New and converted dwellings on previously developed land</li> <li>● Total completed employment floor space on previously developed land</li> </ul>  | CS1,DM1,DM3, CS3, DM5, DM6, CS4, DM7, CS8, DM10, DM11, DM12, CS10, DM13, DM15, DM16, CS11, DM17, DM18, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22, | Landscape, Soil                      |
| 8. To reduce the need to travel and promote modes of travel other than the car   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of new cycle parking spaces in on street locations, at train stations and in new developments</li> <li>● Number of cycle training sessions conducted per year</li> <li>● Mode share for cycling</li> <li>● Number of car club bays</li> <li>● Length of riverside spaces improved</li> <li>● Improved and extended length of Hogsmill Walk</li> <li>● No. of moorings improved from base 2006</li> <li>● Carbon monoxide</li> <li>● NO2 emissions</li> <li>● Ozone emissions</li> <li>● Particulate emissions</li> </ul> | CS1, CS2, DM1, CS5, CS6, DM8, DM9, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22,   | Climatic Factors, Air, Human Health  |
| 9. To protect and enhance wildlife species and habitats which are important on an international,   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve local biodiversity- proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has been or is being implemented</li> <li>● Change in areas and population of biodiversity</li> </ul>  | CS2, DM3, CS3, DM5, DM6, CS4, DM7,   | Biodiversity, Flora/Fauna, Landscape |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies | Headline SEA Directive   |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| national and local scale   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SINCs with management plans/action plans</li> <li>● Number of Local Nature Reserves</li> <li>● Amount of eligible open spaces managed to Green Flag Award Standards importance</li> <li>● No. of riverside spaces improved</li> </ul>   |                                 |  |
| 10. To protect and where appropriate enhance the landscape, buildings and features of archaeological, historical or architectural interest and their settings, promoting a high quality sense of place that is valued by those visiting, living and working in the borough | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Loss or damage to Listed Buildings/Buildings of Townscape Merit</li> <li>● Average densities of new developments</li> <li>● Number of entries on the Heritage At Risk Register</li> <li>● A positive improvement to the quality of the historic environment</li> <li>● Total number of Conservation Areas</li> <li>● % of Conservation Areas with an up-to-date Character Appraisal</li> <li>● Building for Life Assessments</li> </ul> | CS8, DM10, DM11, DM12,          | Material Assets, Cultural Heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage |
| 11. To manage new and existing development in order to reduce flood risk   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● All development proposals to incorporate SUDS</li> <li>● % of new residential developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> <li>● % of all other new build developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> </ul>  | CS2, DM3, DM4                   | Water, Climatic Factors  |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies          | Headline SEA Directive            |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 12. To protect and enhance the availability and quality of water resources   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environment Agency water quality river classification targets</li> </ul>  | CS1, DM1, DM4                            | Water                             |
| 13. To improve air quality   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon monoxide (CO) emissions</li> <li>Nitrous oxide (NO2) emissions</li> <li>Ozone and particulate emissions</li> </ul>   | CS1, CS2, DM1, DM3                       | Air                               |
| 14. To address the causes of climate change through reducing greenhouse gas emissions  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CO2 reduction from local authority operations</li> <li>% of new residential developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> <li>% of all other new build developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> </ul>  | CS1, CS2, DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4,            | Climatic Factors                  |
| 15. To promote the efficient use of resources and minimise the need for energy, through an increase in energy efficiency and use of renewable energy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% of new residential developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> <li>% of all other new build developments that meet required sustainability standards set in Policy DM1</li> <li>Housing Quality- Building for Life Assessments</li> </ul> | CS1, CS2, DM1, DM2, DM3, CS8, DM10, DM11 | Material Assets, Climatic Factors |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies   | Headline SEA Directive             |
|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| <p>16. To promote sustainable waste management, reducing the generation of waste and maximising re-use and recycling</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Number of completed development schemes which include facilities for the storage and collection of waste</li> <li>● 25% of household waste recycled by 2012</li> <li>● Reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste disposed to landfill to 75% of that produced in 1995 by 2010, 50% by 2013 and 35% by 2020</li> <li>● Waste per head</li> <li>● % of waste recycled</li> </ul> | <p>CS1, CS2, DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, CS9</p>  | <p>Climatic Factors, Landscape</p> |
| <p>17. To provide jobs with a diverse range of employment opportunities</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Employment land available by type</li> <li>● Total amount of additional employment floor space by type</li> <li>● Total amount of completed employment floor space on previously developed land</li> <li>● Seek a diversity of uses in Local Centres</li> <li>● Overall employment rate (Nomisweb)</li> </ul>   | <p>CS5, CS6, DM8, CS7, DM9, CS11, DM17, DM18, CS12, DM19, DM20, CS13, DM21, CS14, DM22, DM23, CS15,</p> | <p>Material Assets, Population</p> |
| <p>18. To encourage a strong, stable economy with</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Total additional employment floor space by type</li> <li>● Total completed employment floor space on previously developed land</li> </ul>   | <p>CS11, DM17, DM18, CS12, DM19, DM20, CS13, DM21,</p>  | <p>Material Assets, Population</p> |

| SA Objective   | Monitoring Indicators  | Links to Core Strategy Policies | Headline SEA Directive      |
|--|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| sustained growth from inward and indigenous investment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment land available by type</li> <li>• Total amount of completed floor space for town centre uses within (i) town centre areas and (ii) the borough</li> <li>• Seek a diversity of uses in Local Centres</li> <li>• Development of additional and/or upgraded local healthcare facilities</li> <li>• Amount of new managed student accommodation completed</li> <li>• Change in the number of community facilities available</li> <li>• Number of leisure facilities available</li> </ul> | CS14, DM22, DM23, CS15, CS16    |                             |
| 19. To foster a strong tourism industry                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss or damage to Listed Buildings/Buildings of Townscape Merit</li> <li>• Net gain in hotel bedrooms</li> </ul>  | CS8, CS11, DM17, DM18,          | Material Assets, Population |



"If you are unable to read this document because of disability or language, we can assist you. Please call the Kingston Council Helpline on 020 8547 5757 or ask someone to call on your behalf."

چنانچہ قادر نیستید این نامہ را بہ دلیل ناتوانی یا مشکل زبان بخوانید ما میتوانیم بہ شما کمک کنیم۔ لطفاً خود یا شخص دیگری با شماره کمک شہرداری کینگسٹون تماس بگیرید۔  
تلفن 020 8547 5757 ۰۲۰۸۵۴۷۵۷۵۷

"당신이 신체적인 불편함 혹은 언어 문제로 인해 이 서류를 읽지 못할 경우, 저희들이 돕겠습니다. 킹스톤 의회 상담전화 (Kingston Council helpline) 020 8547 5757 로 직접 전화하시거나 혹은 다른 사람에게 전화를 부탁하십시오"

ئەگەر تۆوانای خویندەنەوی ئەم نوسراوەت نە بەر ئە بەر پەکەوتە/ بێ تۆوانای یاخود ئە بەر زمان تینە گەشتن ، ئەوا ئیئە ئە تۆوانین یارمەتیت بەدین . تکایە پەپۆندی بکە بە هێلی یارمەتی شارهوانی کینگستۆنەوه (Kingston Council) بە ژمارە تە لە فۆنی 020 8547 5757 یان بە کەسی بێ کە پەناوی تۆوه پەپۆندی بکات .

"إن لم تكن قادراً على قراءة هذا النص بسبب اللغة أو أي عائق آخر، اتصل بنا فنحن نستطيع مساعدتك. الرجاء الاتصال بخط مجلس كنجستون للمساعدة (Kingston Council helpline) على الرقم 020 8547 5757 أو اطلب من أي شخص آخر الاتصال بنا نيابة عنك."

“ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਅਪਹਜਤਾ ਜਾਂ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਦੇ ਕਾਰਣ ਇਸ ਦਸਤਾਵੇਜ਼ ਨੂੰ ਪੜ੍ਹਨ ਵਿੱਚ ਅਸਮਰਥ ਹੋ, ਤਾਂ ਅਸੀਂ ਤੁਹਾਡੀ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਾਂ। ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ 020 8547 5757 'ਤੇ ਕਿੰਗਸਟਨ ਕੌਂਸਲ ਦੀ ਹੈਲਪਲਾਈਨ 'ਤੇ ਕਾਲ ਕਰੋ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਨੂੰ ਕਾਲ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਕਹੋ।”

Caso você nao consiga ler este documento devido a incapacidade ou idioma, nós podemos ajudar. Por favor, ligue para o canal de atendimento Kingston Council no telefone 020 8547 5757, ou solicite a alguém para ligar por você.

உங்களால் இந்த கடிதத்தை படிக்க இயலவில்லை என்றால் தயவு கூர்ந்து கிங்ஸ்டன் உதவி மையத்தை நீங்களோ அல்லது உங்களை சார்ந்த எவராவது தொடர்பு கொள்ளவும்.  
தொடர்பு கொள்ள வேண்டிய எண் 020 8547 5757

- کرینگے مدد کو آپ ہم تو ہیں ناقابل سے وجہ کسی پڑھنے کو دستاویز اس آپ اگر فون 020 8547 5757 ۰۲۰۸۵۴۷۵۷۵۷ لائن ہیلپ کاونسل کنگسٹن مہربانی برائے  
کروائے۔ سے کسی یا کیجئے

Haddii aadan awoodin akhrinta dokumentigan sabab naafada ama luqadda ah, waan ku caawin karnaa. Fadlan soo wac Khadka caawimada ee Kawnsalka Kingston 020 8547 5757 ama qof ku matalaya ka codso inuu na soo waco

我们可以协助您，如果您因语言障碍或残疾不能阅读此文件。请拨打金斯敦市议会热线服务电话 020 8547 5757 或请求他人来代表您通话。

If you would like to discuss any aspect of this document or the Local Development Framework generally, please ring the LDF Team on 0208 547 5002 or email us at [ldf@rbk.kingston.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@rbk.kingston.gov.uk)



Place and Regeneration  
Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames  
Guildhall 2  
Kingston upon Thames  
KT1 1EU