

# Sustainability Appraisal

---

## ISSUES & OPTIONS

INTERIM DRAFT REPORT



## Spelthorne Takes Shape

May 2018



## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Spelthorne 2035 Local Plan .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Undertaking Sustainability Appraisal .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Summary of SA Assessment.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Sustainability Framework.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Full Assessment of Sustainability Appraisal .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## Introduction

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Localism Act 2011, the Council is required to prepare a Local Plan. To ensure that the Council continues to plan positively for growth across the Borough, a decision was made in 2014 to review its Development Plan evidence base documents and produce a new Local Plan for the period 2020-2035 and to ensure that its policies are in accordance with national policy and guidance.
- 1.2 As a requirement of these Acts, the Local Plan will to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and where relevant, must meet the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive 2001/42/EC. An essential consideration when drawing up planning documents is, therefore, their effect on the environment and people's quality of life, both now and in the future.
- 1.3 The aim of SA is to set out how sustainable development will be achieved through better integration of economic, environmental and social considerations into the preparation and adoption of Local Plan documents. To be effective, a SA must be fully integrated into the plan making process. The SA will be applied at each stage of document production and audit key decisions. SA will be used to monitor the effectiveness of the plan during its implementation in order to inform revisions of the plan that will be more conducive to achieving sustainable development.
- 1.4 An appraisal must be conducted in line with Government guidance, 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks' (ODPM, 2005). While there have been recent changes to national planning policy, namely the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework, this guidance is still considered relevant as it incorporates the European Directive requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment.

## What has been assessed?

- 1.5 This SA report sets out an assessment of the Spelthorne Issues and Options paper (May 2018). The results of this assessment will be used by the Council when drafting the next stages of the Local Plan.
- 1.6 As part of the SA process reasonable alternatives need to be defined and assessed. This includes defining and assessing reasonable alternative sites for development and reasonable alternative approaches to the spatial strategy and other planning issues.
- 1.7 There is no generally accepted definition of what constitutes reasonable and it is up to the Council to decide what is reasonable.
- 1.8 Four strategic options deemed reasonable by the Council have been assessed. Specific sites will be assessed in the next stage of sustainability appraisal through the 'preferred options' stage of local plan development.

- 1.9 Through the SA scoping report (March 2017) the scope for the appraisal has been set out. This is available to view on the Council's website<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.10 This report undertakes an appraisal of the issues and options and sets out how the potential strategic options identified to help meet the Borough's development needs perform in terms of sustainability. This iteration of the SA report forms part of the Issues and Options consultation stage of the plan making process.

## **Spelthorne 2035 Local Plan**

- 2.1 The Borough Council's current Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document was adopted in 2009. The Council is now required to produce a new Local Plan in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012, which will plan for and manage development up to 2035.
- 2.2 It is being prepared to help further inform planning decisions in the area and once adopted, will contain policies and land use allocations necessary to guide development in the Spelthorne up to 2035. On adoption, it is intended that the plan will replace the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009. The Issues and Options consultation is the early part of the Local Plan making process and sets out the challenges that are facing Spelthorne up to 2035 and the potential options for dealing with those issues. Based on those considerations, the Council will then identify a preferred strategy which will be subject to further consultation later in the year. This and the subsequent consultation fulfil the requirements of Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations 2012.
- 2.3 It is important that the SA process is focused on where it can make a positive difference and add value to the decision making process (which at this stage is focused on choosing between alternative options).

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability\\_Appraisal\\_Scoping\\_Report.pdf](https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability_Appraisal_Scoping_Report.pdf).

## Undertaking Sustainability Appraisal

- 3.1 It is important that the SA process is focused on where it can make a positive difference and add value to the decision making process (which at this stage is focused on choosing between alternative options).
- 3.2 Guidance on the preparation of Sustainability Appraisals sets out the stages of the process and how these relate and interact with the parallel plan-making processes. The stages are set out under Table 1, which is taken from the guidance document “Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks” (2005).

Table 1: Stages in Sustainability Appraisal

Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and environmental objectives A2: Collecting information on environmental, social and economic conditions in the Borough A3: Identifying environmental issues and problems A4: Developing the framework for sustainability appraisal A5: Consulting on the scope of the sustainability appraisal
Stage B: Developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects
B1: Testing the plan objectives against sustainability objectives B2: Developing the alternative options B3: Predicting the effects of the draft plan B4: Evaluating the effects of the draft plan B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant environmental effects of plan implementation
Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
C1: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
Stage D: Consulting on the draft plan and Sustainability Appraisal Report and examination of the final plan
D1: Public participation D2i): Assessing significant changes prior to the final plan D2ii): SAR to support submission of the final plan D3: Making decisions and providing information
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan
E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring E2: Responding to adverse effects





## Developing the Scope and Methodology

- 3.3 During 2016 the Borough Council produced and consulted upon a Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal for the new Local Plan. While the majority of the scoping report remains relevant to this SA report, the Council has taken the opportunity to refresh the SA framework in order to streamline the number of objectives to enable a more efficient appraisal of the strategic options and to inform later stages of SA, as part of the Local Plan process. The scoping report relates to stage A of the SA process (as set out in Table 1) and provides a framework for the appraisal of the issues and options.
- 3.4 This document takes up the appraisal process from stage B onwards. It will be used to inform the development of the preferred approach.

## Overview and Summary of the Options and the Appraisal

- 3.5 Each of the potential options has been appraised against the 12 sustainability objectives derived from the scoping report, assisted by the use of decision aiding questions and indicators.
- 3.6 The mechanism for scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Mechanism

Symbol	Effects against sustainability appraisal objectives	Description
	Positive contribution towards sustainability	The option generally supports the achievement of the SA Objective and has a positive effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors.
	Neutral contribution towards sustainability	The option has a balanced effect on the achievement of the SA Objective.
	Negative contribution towards sustainability	The option conflicts with the achievement of the SA Objective and has a negative effect with relation to characteristics of the effect and the sensitivity of the receptors.
	Unknown contribution towards sustainability	At this stage it is unknown how the option interacts with the SA objective. More work may be required or the effect may become more apparent in the later stages of plan development.

- 3.7 Assessments are considered in terms of their overall short, medium and long term effects and commentary is provided should any additional issues or mitigation measures be identified.
- 3.8 The Issues and Options paper contains four strategic options setting out how development may be accommodated in Spelthorne up to 2035.
- 3.9 Option 1: Significantly increase densities in the urban area
- Aim to meet all need for housing, including affordable housing and Gypsy and Traveller pitches, employment and other development in the urban area without amending Green Belt

- Significantly increase densities of all housing sites, particularly those in town centres and near public transport facilities
- Prioritise meeting housing need and relax policies that protect employment sites to allow more conversions and redevelopment for housing schemes
- Build on open space and re-provide sports and recreation facilities in the Green Belt

3.10 Option 2: Large-scale release of Green Belt for development

- Amend the Green Belt boundary significantly to meet our housing and employment need
- Safeguard land in the Green Belt for future need beyond the plan period
- Retain Green Belt designation only for sites that are strongly performing and/or perform a strategic Green Belt function

3.11 Option 3: Focus development in Staines upon Thames

- Make use of a Master Plan approach for development that increases opportunities for new high rise residential buildings
- Significantly increase densities in the Staines area, not just within the central core, where easily accessible to the town
- Prioritise housing need by allowing employment sites such as offices to be converted or redeveloped for housing
- Allocate sites for housing elsewhere in the Borough but only at a density similar to surrounding development

3.12 Option 4: Combination of Options 1-3

- Increase densities in town centres and near transport facilities and other areas where character can accommodate it
- Release some weakly performing Green Belt for development where its release would not adversely affect the integrity of the strategic Green Belt
- Make use of a Master Plan approach for Staines but with housing as one of a range of uses that can be accommodated within the town and not favouring residential development over employment, retail and tourism uses

3.13 Although a 'Do Nothing' option is not considered a deliverable option in the context of current government legislation and guidance, this has been included to show the baseline and assumes that the market will dictate where development will take place. If a do nothing option was pursued, infrastructure would not be planned or incorporated into future development plans as the council would not be aware of where development would potentially take place.

## Conclusions

- 4.1 It is important that the SA process is focused on where it can make a positive difference and add value to the decision making process (which at this stage is focused on choosing between alternative options).
- 4.2 The Sustainability Appraisal provides an understanding of the possible positive and negative impacts of each Strategic Option in terms of its social, economic and environmental effects throughout the plan period.
- 4.3 To comply with the SEA regulations it is necessary to identify any likely significant cumulative effects of the plan. A detailed cumulative effects assessment will be carried out at the draft plan stage and reported as part of the formal SA report.
- 4.4 The main difficulty encountered in the assessment was the lack of detail apparent in the potential approaches (please note that at this stage in the planning process it is entirely expected that the approaches do not contain such detail) which leads to a fairly broad brush assessment of this element of the strategic options assessment. This was dealt with by focusing the assessment on providing a general indication of the relative performance of the potential approaches.
- 4.5 Although Option 1 has positive impacts in terms of making best use of previously developed land and reducing land contamination, it has a number of negative social and economic effects in the long term. This is particularly applicable when considering the effects on health and wellbeing, heritage assets and the commercial viability of town centres.
- 4.6 Option 2 has the most significant negative effects of all the options in terms of the environment due to its large take of Greenfield land and the implications for biodiversity, flood risk and soil quality. There are some benefits in terms of health and wellbeing, however overall it does not encourage sustainable modes of transport.
- 4.7 Option 3, like Option 1 has positive impacts with regards to brownfield land reuse and remediation. It does however have negative connotations for health and wellbeing as well as the economy due to the prioritisation of housing development.
- 4.8 Option 4 has positive social and economic impacts and also scores relatively well in these areas. Whilst there are a number of moderate negative impacts, this option prioritises previously developed land and reduces the overall pressure on undeveloped Green Belt. This option also encourages mixed use development, enabling more sustainable ways of living.
- 4.9 It should be noted that in some areas there were unknown effects due to limited information on the actual distribution of development and information regarding infrastructure capacity not being known at this time. This is particularly relevant to the supply of water and resource efficiency.

## Next Steps

- 4.10 Public consultation on the Issues and Options relating to the Spelthorne 2035 Local Plan will take place between 14th May 2018 and 25th June 2018.
- 4.11 The Sustainability Appraisal for the strategic options for the new Local Plan is incorporated into a wider Assessment Methodology process. Details of the Assessment



Methodology process are published in a separate Sustainability Assessment Scoping Report and can be found on the Council's website<sup>2</sup>.

- 4.12 The SA will form an integral part of the process and will evolve alongside the update of the Local Plan. Higher-level appraisals will take place at the earlier stages and will be published alongside the draft plan. This will be reviewed and a more detailed assessment will be undertaken as the plan progresses. Full details will be published within a SA Report at the later stages. The SA will be used as a tool alongside consultation responses to consider options and identify the preferred way forward.

Table 3: Local Plan Timetable

Key stage	Date
Issues and Options consultation (Reg 18)	May-June 2018
Preferred Options consultation (Reg 18)	Winter 2018/19
Publication Local Plan consultation (Reg 19)	Summer 2019
Submission Date	Autumn 2019
Proposed Adoption of Local Plan	Autumn 2020

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability\\_Appraisal\\_Scoping\\_Report.pdf](https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability_Appraisal_Scoping_Report.pdf)

## Appendix 1: Summary of SA Assessment

Objective	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
1. To provide sufficient high quality housing to enable people to live in a home suitable to their needs and which they can afford.	-	0	+	-	+
2. To facilitate the improved health and well-being of the whole population and reduce inequalities.	-	-	0	-	+
3. To increase resilience to climate change, including reducing the risk and minimising the harm from flooding	0	0/?	-/?	0/?	0/?
4. To reduce land contamination and protect soil quality and quantity	0	+	-	+	+
5. To reduce air and noise pollution	0	-	-	-	-
6. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species	+	0	-	0	0
7. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.	+	-	-	-	0
8. To protect, enhance and manage the Borough's open space and landscape character.	0	0	-	0	0
9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport	-	+	-	0	0
10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.	-	-	0	-	+
11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	0	-	-	-	-
12. To maintain and improve water quality and promote the efficient use of water	0	-	-	-	-

## Appendix 2: Sustainability Framework

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
<b>1. To provide sufficient high quality housing to enable people to live in a home suitable to their needs and which they can afford.</b>	<p>Will it provide housing to help meet identified needs?</p> <p>Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</p> <p>Will it improve affordability?</p> <p>Will it provide specialist accommodation for elderly/disabled persons?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total housing completions by size, type and tenure.</li> <li>• Number of households on the housing register. Plot requirements on the self-build register.</li> <li>• Lower quartile property price compared against lower quartile workplace earnings.</li> </ul>
<b>2. To facilitate the improved health and well-being of the whole population and reduce inequalities.</b>	<p>Will it improve access to or provide healthcare and/or cultural and community facilities?</p> <p>Will it help to meet Accessible Natural Greenspace standards (ANGst)?</p> <p>Will it improve access to or provide green/blue infrastructure/ leisure/ recreation facilities?</p> <p>Will it improve highway safety for road users, cyclists and pedestrians?</p> <p>Will it contribute toward a safe &amp; secure built environment?</p> <p>Will it help to address pockets of deprivations and child poverty?</p> <p>Will it reduce recorded levels of crime?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of people whose health is classed as not good.</li> <li>• Life expectancy Adult &amp; child obesity levels.</li> <li>• IMD Health Rankings Motorists/pedestrian/cyclists – number killed and/or seriously injured (KSI) per 100,000 population.</li> <li>• Amount and quality of green infrastructure/recreation space by type (ha) or leisure facilities.</li> <li>• Accessibility to Hospitals &amp; GP Surgeries.</li> <li>• Capacity of Health Facilities.</li> <li>• Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANGst) Targets.</li> <li>• Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD).</li> <li>• Number of developments implementing 'Secured by Design'.</li> </ul>
<b>3. To increase resilience to climate change, including reducing the risk and minimising the harm from flooding</b>	<p>Will it reduce the number of properties at risk from all forms of flooding?</p> <p>Will it reduce the severity of a flood event?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of properties at risk from flooding.</li> <li>• Number of properties with flood mitigation installed.</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
	Will it increase the number of properties linked to sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of properties built with SuDS installed.</li> </ul>
<b>4. To reduce land contamination and protect soil quality and quantity</b>	<p>Will it maintain the area of grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land?</p> <p>Will it remediate contaminated land and/or improve soil quality?</p> <p>Will it achieve efficiency in land use and avoid development of greenfield land over the redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings?</p> <p>Will it reduce the amount of derelict and/or underused land and/or vacant/unfit properties?</p> <p>Will it promote higher density development in appropriate locations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of contaminated land remediated.</li> <li>• Area of grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land permanently lost to development (ha).</li> <li>• Percentage of development built on previously developed land.</li> <li>• Average density on sites with 10 or more dwellings (Dwellings per Ha.).</li> </ul>
<b>5. To reduce air and noise pollution</b>	<p>Will it improve air quality, in particular concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>?</p> <p>Will it reduce the number of properties or sites affected by poor air quality?</p> <p>Will it reduce the number of residential properties affected by and exposed to noise?</p> <p>Will it reduce congestion leading to pollution?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual average of NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, within AQMAs relative to national standards.</li> <li>• The number of properties and land affected where levels of NO<sub>x</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> exceed national targets.</li> <li>• The monitoring of LEQ noise levels around airports.</li> <li>• Number of non-airport related noise complaints received per annum.</li> </ul>
<b>6. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species</b>	<p>Will it maintain or enhance designated sites?</p> <p>Will it maintain/enhance numbers of priority species or the extent and condition of priority habitats identified in Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and the Borough as a whole?</p> <p>Will it avoid the fragmentation of designated and priority habitats?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of wild birds.</li> <li>• Extent and condition of SPA/Ramsar sites.</li> <li>• Extent and condition of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) meeting PSA targets.</li> <li>• Extent and condition of priority species and habitats identified in Biodiversity Opportunity Areas in Spelthorne.</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
	<p>Will it contribute towards achieving net gains in biodiversity?</p> <p>Will it help to deliver any identified Nature Improvement Areas?</p> <p>Will it protect the Borough's green/blue infrastructure and enhance connectivity?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number, area and condition of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) within Spelthorne.</li> <li>• Extent and condition of ancient woodlands</li> <li>• Number of Biodiversity improvement/enhancement schemes implemented per annum.</li> </ul>
<b>7. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</b>	<p>Will it conserve or enhance heritage assets, the historic environment and their settings?</p> <p>Will it improve the quality of the historic environment?</p> <p>Will it provide increased access to and enjoyment of the historic environment?</p> <p>Will it ensure that development is well-designed and is well-related to the surrounding townscape?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of listed buildings, ancient monuments and conservation areas.</li> <li>• Statutory or locally listed buildings or structures at risk.</li> <li>• Statutory or locally listed buildings or structures demolished.</li> <li>• Scheduled ancient monuments at risk.</li> <li>• Number of archaeological finds.</li> <li>• Conservation area appraisals and level at risk.</li> </ul>
<b>8. To protect, enhance and manage Borough's open space and landscape character.</b>	<p>Will it protect and enhance landscape character?</p> <p>Will it ensure the quality of and provision of suitable open space, where need is identified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and quantity of open space provision</li> <li>• Areas with landscape assessment</li> </ul>
<b>9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport.</b>	<p>Will it avoid contributing to congestion on the highway network?</p> <p>Will it promote more sustainable modes of travel?</p> <p>Will it provide improved access to public transport services and facilities?</p> <p>Will it provide opportunities for integrated Transport?</p> <p>Will it promote travel to work/school by foot, cycle or public transport?</p> <p>Will it provide for disabled access to all transport options?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic counts</li> <li>• Travel to work by mode</li> <li>• Number of schools/businesses with travel plans implemented</li> <li>• Number of highway/cyclist/pedestrian improvement schemes implemented</li> </ul>

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
<b>10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.</b>	<p>Will it support a stable labour market and contribute towards skills improvement and employment opportunities?</p> <p>Will it support or promote inward investment and business growth?</p> <p>Will it retain the most sustainably located employment sites?</p> <p>Will it maintain or increase the total quantity and/or quality of commercial floorspace?</p> <p>Will it promote mixed use development?</p> <p>Will it promote or enhance the viability, vitality and attractiveness of town or local centres?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IMD employment and education rankings.</li> <li>• Working age population which are economically active.</li> <li>• Educational attainment levels NVQ level 3 and above. The net change in the number of VAT registrations and de-registrations.</li> <li>• Commercial floorspace levels and vacancies.</li> <li>• Area of employment sites lost to other uses (ha). Amount of retail/commercial leisure floorspace implemented (sqm).</li> <li>• Amount of retail/commercial leisure floorspace lost to other uses within town/local centres (sqm).</li> <li>• Footfall numbers</li> </ul>
<b>11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions</b>	<p>Will it promote energy efficiency and/or renewable or low carbon technologies?</p> <p>Will it promote sustainable methods of construction and design?</p> <p>Will it promote the reuse and recycling of demolition waste?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CO2 Emissions (total and per capita).</li> <li>• Number of commercial premises built to BREEAM 'Very good' or better.</li> <li>• Installed renewable/low carbon energy capacity (MW/h).</li> <li>• Amount of demolition waste reused or recycled per annum (tonnes).</li> </ul>
<b>12. To maintain and improve water quality and promote the efficient use of water</b>	<p>Will it protect and improve the quality of all water sources?</p> <p>Will it increase water efficiency?</p> <p>Will it promote greywater recycling/rainwater harvesting?</p> <p>Will it protect and improve hydro-geomorphology and the overall ecological status of the watercourses?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of river and groundwater units in the plan area whose biological and/or chemical quality is rated as good.</li> <li>• Household consumption of water per day.</li> <li>• Number of dwellings completed which exceed Building Regulations standards for water efficiency.</li> <li>• Commercial consumption of water per day.</li> <li>• Number of commercial developments completed with water efficiency measures implemented.</li> </ul>

### Appendix 3: Full Assessment of Sustainability Appraisal

Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
<b>1. To provide sufficient high quality housing to enable people to live in a home suitable to their needs and which they can afford.</b>	By not planning for Spelthorne's specific mix of needs it is unlikely that suitable homes will be provided. Additionally, continuing permitted development rights may mean that affordable and appropriate units for the population are not provided.	-	Option 1 would allow Spelthorne to meet all of its need in the urban area and would recycle land and tackle unfit homes. This option would however not allow Spelthorne to provide a mix of type and size of units to meet a range of needs. This option would also reduce affordability of homes due to decontamination costs and viability issues, as well as there being less land available to meet need. It would be difficult to provide self-build/custom build housing plots and meet the needs of Gypsy and Travellers.	0	Option 2 would allow Spelthorne to potentially meet all of its housing and Gypsy & Traveller need in terms of both numbers and type, as well as increasing affordability. This option would however avoid tackling unfit homes with a focus on the Green Belt. Green Belt release is likely to only yield housing in the medium and long term.	+	This option would significantly increase densities and building height in Staines. Tower blocks would be required to meet the quantity of units required, however this would not provide the sufficient type of homes required for different groups, including families and the elderly. This also applies to delivering affordable housing due to the higher costs of high density development and a lack of spaces to develop larger affordable homes. It is unknown if this option alone could meet all housing need. There could also be negative financial implications as building very tall structures to meet all required levels of housing would have significantly higher development costs, which could reduce supply.	-	Option 4 would allow Spelthorne to meet all of its need and provide the right mix of homes for different groups in the Borough. This option would allow Spelthorne to tackle unfit homes and increase the affordability of units due to the reduced viability and decontamination costs in the Green Belt.	+
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Adoption of standards with regards to accessibility and adaptable dwellings may help to overcome issues of housing mix.									
<b>2. To facilitate the improved health and well-being of the whole population and reduce inequalities.</b>	This option would mean that the Local Plan would not have control over the provision of new facilities or the planning for increase in pressure.	-	Option 1 would reduce accessibility to leisure facilities in the urban area due to the prioritisation of housing development and relocation to the Green Belt. This would also reduce the amount of urban open space. Where existing leisure facilities remain in the urban area, access could potentially be improved, however capacity is likely to reduce and pressure increase. Higher density living without access to urban greenspaces, private amenity space as well as smaller room sizes may be detrimental to wellbeing.	-	Option 2 would increase the opportunity to provide open space, however the level of public access is unknown. This option would also improve well-being and could reduce the pressure on existing facilities in urban areas. This option will reduce deprivation and poverty by delivering more homes, as well as potentially addressing overcrowding and under-occupation. Option 2 however would disperse traffic and could potentially decrease the opportunity for walking. This option would also fail to tackle existing deprivation in urban areas. Development	0	Option 3 would provide no increase in open space and would significantly increase the pressure on existing facilities and infrastructure. The inclusion of high density development in this option means that homes will be provided in tower blocks which can have negative impacts on wellbeing and social exclusion, as well as increasing the fear of crime. Due to potential bird strike risks at Heathrow Airport roof gardens are discouraged which will reduce the opportunity for outdoor space.	-	Option 4 would allow new open space to be provided to positively impact wellbeing. There may be a reduced opportunity to provide new leisure facilities with pockets of development in the Green Belt around the Borough. There is potential to tackle social inequalities in urban areas whilst also providing new open space in the Green Belt. Option 4 would allow for more mixed use development and the opportunity for mitigation of impacts on health. This option provides the least amount of housing pressure on existing infrastructure when compared	+



Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
					would need to be on a great enough scale to provide new community facilities, otherwise it may place increased pressure on facilities that are not provided as part of the development. There could be significant costs of providing the required infrastructure.				to other options. Spreading development across the Borough may reduce access to community facilities.	
POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES	Provision of new infrastructure to meet specific local needs e.g. education and healthcare, can help to mitigate negative impacts. Scheme-specific measures could tackle the perception of and actual crime, as well as including natural surveillance and Secured by Design. Development should also promote healthy lifestyles and make key connections with the surrounding green infrastructure to encourage modal shift.									
3. To increase resilience to climate change, including reducing the risk and minimising the harm from flooding.	Without a Local Plan, developers will still be required to take full account of flood risk and therefore it is likely that flood risks would be minimised.	0	New development opportunities will provide the chance to build in flood risk mitigation. Option 1 would however increase the number of properties built in the highest risk flood areas. Whether development incorporates SuDS and are more resilient to climate change is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage.	0/?	Option 2 would allow more SuDS to be included subject to viability and space allowances, however more development is likely to take place in high flood risk areas, therefore increasing the number of people at risk from flooding. Absorbent land and flood storage capacity will be reduced which will cause negative impacts. Some uncertainty due to scheme-specific impacts.	-/?	Option 3 will increase the number of people living in flood zones but will allow flood mitigation strategies to be implemented. Whether development incorporates SuDS and are more resilient to climate change is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage.	0/?	Option 4 will still mean that some land in flood zones is developed, but may reduce the need to build on areas with the highest level of risk. Effects are somewhat unknown at this stage due to the specific design of schemes but could incorporate SuDS	0/?
POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES	Scheme specific measures may be capable of mitigating the effects of flooding on site however further work will be needed. Buildings would need to incorporate flood resilient design and the implementation of a surface water management scheme may also reduce potential negative impacts.									
4. To reduce land contamination and protect soil quality and quantity.	A Do Nothing option would mean that land will continue to be developed through the planning system, with sustainably located land and previously developed land prioritised.	0	This option would reuse previously developed land and would provide the opportunity for land remediation.	+	This option would require greenfield land development and could have negative impacts on soil quantity and quality, however may provide the opportunity to enhance other existing areas of Green Belt. Option 2 may reduce the number of urban sites remediated due to development being more viable on non-contaminated Green Belt sites. There could also be new areas of contaminated land created, depending on the nature of the developments taking place.	-	This option would reuse previously developed land and would provide the opportunity for land remediation in Staines. Option 3 would require the least amount of land to be developed and would minimize impact on soil.	+	This option would focus on previously developed land both in the urban area and Green Belt. Option 4 would provide remediation opportunities.	+



Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>			No mitigation measures identified as impact largely positive.							
<b>5. To reduce air and noise pollution.</b>	The numbers affected by aircraft noise may rise, however the effects are uncertain at present. Given past trends in air quality, it is considered that this increase is likely to continue into the future. Even in the absence of the plan, future advances in vehicle technologies could see reductions in emissions, although this trend is uncertain as the growth in traffic could offset any gains.	0	Option 1 will focus development in urban areas, therefore will facilitate more sustainable modes of transport and reduce the need to travel which will have secondary effects on air and noise pollution. With the absence of new facilities however, residents may have to travel to facilities located outside of the urban area. Increased concentration of residents in the urban area could increase air and noise pollution. The conversion of employment sites may mean fewer HGVs and fewer traffic movements, especially in the a.m. and p.m. peaks. Higher densities of dwellings also increase the potential for anti-social behaviour and noise nuisance complaints between residents as more people living in closer proximity to each other. The overall rise in population in relation to this strategy is likely to exacerbate pollution.	-	Option 2 could increase the need to travel if new facilities are not provided as part of new sites, which could have negative impacts on air and noise pollution. This option would spread the impacts of increased noise, air and light pollution across the Borough and worsen air quality in existing Green Belt areas. This would increase exposure to pollution. Development in the Green Belt would also reduce the number of quieter zones for recreation and respite away from road noise. The overall rise in population in relation to this strategy is likely to exacerbate pollution.	-	Option 3 will increase the concentration of people in Staines and could therefore lead to increased opportunities for sustainable modes of transport and increased feasibility of car clubs. This could however also concentrate pollution in the town and worsen air quality. This option could also increase the need to travel to facilities outside of Staines and increase traffic due to the prioritisation of housing development. Option 3 would require significant improvements to public transport links and sustainable transport connectivity and would need to improve/revise the highway layout. The overall rise in population in relation to this strategy is likely to exacerbate pollution.	-	Option 4 would allow development to be sustainably managed through a focus on development in urban areas and on some Green Belt. This option would disperse pollution effects around the Borough and may also increase the need to travel where Green Belt is developed in small pockets. Option 4 may allow for greener modes of transport to be utilised where mixed use development is provided in urban areas. Regeneration brings opportunities to reduce exposure through good quality design and introduce other measures such as car clubs and electrical vehicle charging, improve green infrastructure and sustainable public transport services. The overall rise in population in relation to this strategy is likely to exacerbate pollution.	-
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	The development of greener modes of transport and supporting infrastructure will be required to reduce pollution associated with private vehicle use. The inclusion of design principles such as screening against the road network. In terms of tackling short term construction noise, attenuation measures such as barriers, appropriate planting and careful phasing of operations could help to reduce negative impacts. Longer term noise impacts could be mitigated using permanent green attenuation barriers near roads and potentially sensitive areas.									
<b>6. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species.</b>	There is a general trend of the improving condition of SSSIs in Spelthorne. An increase in population is likely to put pressure on habitats, although those with the highest level of protection are likely to fair best.	+	Option 1 could lead to more opportunity for biodiversity enhancements in urban areas, however land swaps for recreational use could have negative impacts on natural habitats. This option would increase development in brownfield areas and would reduce the amount of greenfield land needed in comparison to options 2 and 3. There could however be some fragmentation of urban habitats. Option 1 could secure biodiversity	0	Option 2 could have significantly damaging impacts on biodiversity and would reduce habitat size. This option could also reduce connectivity between habitats and would provide little opportunity for the enhancement of species. Ecologically sensitive areas could be vulnerable to development. Specific development locations unknown.	-	Option 3 would focus development in Staines and would reduce pressure across the Borough, but could lead to increased recreational strain on local open areas such as Staines Moor. This option would however provide benefits for the Borough's biodiversity on the whole and would reduce the strain on biodiversity outside of Staines. This option would use the least amount of land for development. There would however be some negative	0	Option 4 would only develop pockets of Green Belt and would conserve biodiversity across the rest of the Borough. By focusing on previously developed land, urban habitats could be preserved. This option would disperse the impact across the Borough. By meeting all development need this option would mean that a reasonable amount of land would be used. Specific development locations unknown.	0

Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
			improvements and upgrades in the Green Belt but this would not outweigh the absolute loss and damage to 'urban habitats'.				impacts on urban habitats in Staines.			
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Scheme-specific design may overcome any issues relating to biodiversity and promote measures to improve local biodiversity, such as providing strategic green links through the Borough to enhance local ecology.									
<b>7. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</b>	There is unlikely to be any significant change to heritage assets in Spelthorne and this is likely to continue into the future with the absence of a plan.	+	Option 1 could potentially impact townscapes and historic assets in the urban area, particularly conservation areas and the surrounding character. Impacts would be dependent upon the implementation of specific schemes. Buildings at risk could be redeveloped.	-	Potential impacts due to archaeological digs as sites are developed, however this is dependent upon the development of specific sites. Option 2 will protect the townscape of the urban area but Green Belt release could affect the overall character of the Borough. The Borough as a whole may become more urbanised.	-	Option 3 could potentially impact townscapes and historic assets in the urban area and Staines conservation area. This option is likely to significantly alter the character of Staines as a whole.	-	Option 4 would allow development to be more dispersed across the Borough and could reduce the impact on sensitive areas. Potential to impact conservation areas but this is dependent upon specific development locations.	0
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Scheme-specific design may help to mitigate impacts on heritage assets and protect local character. Tall buildings must demonstrate exceptional design quality and integrate positively with the surrounding environment, as well as using high quality sustainable materials.									
<b>8. To protect, enhance and manage the Borough's open space and landscape character.</b>	It is considered that in the future many of the landscape characteristics in the Borough will remain largely unchanged in the absence of the plan. However future development and supporting infrastructure have the potential to affect the Borough's landscape.	0	Option 1 would focus development in existing settlements, therefore it would help to preserve and protect current landscapes. This option would however lead to land swap for recreational use so could result in changes of use.	0	Option 2 would result in the development of Green Belt land throughout the Borough and could have negative impacts on landscapes. This option would result in landscape character becoming more urban. Dependent upon the specific location of development so further work is required.	-	By focusing development in Staines the Borough's landscape character is largely preserved elsewhere, however there may be more pressure on existing open space.	0	Option 4 would result in weakly performing Green Belt being developed, therefore this would focus on areas which are potentially less open, but is still development in the open countryside. This option would however also focus on brownfield land and reduce the overall impact on landscape. There may be an opportunity for compensatory improvements in the Green Belt through this option. Dependent upon the specific location of development so further work is required.	0/-
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Design measures may help to reduce negative impacts on landscape character.									
<b>9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport.</b>	High levels of car use are expected to continue into the future without a plan. The current lack of direct connectivity to Heathrow Airport is likely to increase	-	Option 1 would reduce parking in urban areas, however this could potentially discourage private vehicle use. This could also potentially lead to less traffic but could increase pressure on existing travel	+	Option 2 could potentially disperse journeys across the Borough and increase car use with sites potentially being more remote. If development occurs in pockets across the Borough this may not lead to	-	This option could facilitate better public transport and could also encourage walking/cycling. The focus on residential development would however lead to more out commuting for work and use of other facilities.	0	This option would facilitate more mixed use development and would allow the Borough's most sustainable locations to be prioritised. Option 4 would also lead to some Green Belt development whereby car use	0

Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
	movements on the local/strategic road network.		facilities. Development at key transport nodes could prevent unsustainable travel patterns.		an increased opportunity to improve public transport. Fewer services and facilities are likely to be within walking distance and may be too expensive to provide as part of the development.		This could also lead to a lack of opportunity to improve infrastructure.		may be necessary, however this option may prioritise Green Belt land that is more sustainably located. Option 4 is likely to spread out infrastructure to support growth.	
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Negative impacts relating to transport can be mitigated by the development of greener modes of travel across the Borough and the encouragement of walking/cycling. Mitigation measures will be required to reduce dependency on car use and to encourage the use of public transport.									
<b>10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.</b>	Without a plan, permitted development trends are likely to continue with the loss of office floorspace and conversion to residential use. An ageing population may negatively impact labour supply. There is however an upward trend in educational achievement and workplace earnings in Spelthorne.	-	Option 1 would relax employment designations and would lead to existing commercial sites being vulnerable. Spelthorne could become a 'dormitory Borough' with high levels of out-commuting. This option would however enhance the vitality of the Borough's main towns.	-	Option 2 would direct development away from existing centres, therefore commercial uses could grow with existing sites preserved. There may also be more opportunity for local educational facilities to improve skills. This option would however lead to more commuting and potentially a reduced opportunity to tap into Heathrow growth.	0	Option 3 would preserve the status of Staines as the Borough's largest town and would increase the vitality of its shopping areas. This could however reduce the trade in the Borough's other towns. This option also exploits potential Heathrow growth opportunities. There may however be a lack of opportunity for new educational facilities to develop skills and would also reduce employment sites in Staines.	-	Option 4 would allow for more mixed use development and could incorporate commercial uses to enable growth. This would also allow town centres to thrive and create more sustainable living. Option 4 would allow Heathrow growth opportunities to be exploited and would also disperse development, therefore reducing pressure on existing employment sites. This option also provides potential regeneration opportunities for urban areas, especially Staines, which could increase commercial appeal.	+
<b>POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	Appropriate land use and mix of uses will be needed. Encouraging commercial uses together will enable agglomeration and business growth. The Local Plan should include measures to ensure that local residents have increased access to the skills, training and jobs.									
<b>11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</b>	Even in the absence of a plan, population is predicted to rise and the number of households increase, however when compared with the rate of growth of options 1-4 this is expected to be lower. There may however be less opportunity to incorporate mitigation measures into sporadic developments. Household waste levels are expected to rise.	0	Whether development achieves high levels of energy efficiency, increases renewable energy generation and demonstrates sustainable design and construction principles is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage. There could potentially be less opportunity to provide schemes that adapt to climate change. Conversion of existing buildings may not be able to reach as high energy efficiency standards as new build. Potential reduced need to travel.	-	Whether development achieves high levels of energy efficiency, increases renewable energy generation and demonstrates sustainable design and construction principles is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage. Option 2 could provide the opportunity to incorporate large scale renewable energy schemes. New homes could be more energy efficient in line with building regulations. Emissions may increase if the need to travel rises. This	-	Whether development achieves high levels of energy efficiency, increases renewable energy generation and demonstrates sustainable design and construction principles is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage. Option 3 could also increase the opportunity for district heating schemes which in turn could reduce negative pollution effects. High rise development may require higher quantities of steel and concrete, however smaller units will consume less energy. There are	-	Whether development achieves high levels of energy efficiency, increases renewable energy generation and demonstrates sustainable design and construction principles is dependent on how development is implemented so this is unclear at this stage. Mixed use development through Option 4 will reduce the need to travel and has greater potential to move toward a low carbon economy. Where Green Belt is developed, new homes would be more energy efficient and	-

Objective	Do Nothing		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
					option is unlikely to result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and will disperse development around the Borough.		considered to be negative implications for waste collection and recycling with regards to high density development.		may enable on site de-centralised energy generation on a small scale. Green Belt release is likely to be closer to the urban area so emissions released from travel is likely to be less than Option 2.	
POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES	Environmental performance of houses can be mitigated through sustainable design measures. Promotion of renewable energy technologies and possible use of combined heat and power will also help to reduce emissions.									
12.To maintain and improve water quality and promote the efficient use of water.	In the absence of a plan, population is expected to rise and as such demand for water will also increase.	0	The impact on water quality and quantity is unclear at this stage and is largely dependent upon scheme specific design. Potential increased pressure on existing infrastructure and overall rise in water use. Building on brownfield land rather than greenfield there is likely to be less impact on groundwater.	-	The impact on water quality and quantity is unclear at this stage and is largely dependent upon scheme specific design. There is potential to build-in features which improve water efficiency into new development, however new infrastructure will be required to support development. Overall rise in water use.	-	The impact on water quality and quantity is unclear at this stage and is largely dependent upon scheme specific design. Increased pressure on current infrastructure in Staines. Overall rise in water use. Building on brownfield land rather than greenfield there is likely to be less impact on groundwater.	-	The impact on water quality and quantity is unclear at this stage and is largely dependent upon scheme specific design. Overall rise in water use. New water infrastructure is likely to be required in Green Belt areas.	-
POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES	No mitigation measures identified.									

+	Positive effect
0	Neutral effect
-	Negative effect
?	Unclear/unknown effect at present