Sustainability Appraisal

ISSUES & OPTIONS

FINAL REPORT

September 2018

SPELTHORNE
MEANS BUSINESS

Contents

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 on its approach.

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[1].

1.10 This report undertakes an appraisal of the Issues and Options in line with the Scoping Report and sets out how the potential strategic options identified to help meet the Borough's development needs perform in terms of sustainability.

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 the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018[2], 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 Spelthorne. 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.

[1] https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability_Appraisal_Scoping_Report.pdf.
[2] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2

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 key stages 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: Sustainability Appraisal Report 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 2016/17 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 set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal Scoring Mechanism

Symbol	Effects against Sustainability Appraisal objectives
+ +	Significant positive contribution towards sustainability
+	Positive contribution towards sustainability
0	The option contributes neither positively nor negatively towards SA Objective
-	Negative contribution towards sustainability
- -	Significant negative contribution towards sustainability
?	It is unclear whether there is the potential for a negative or positive effect on the SA Objective.

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 scoring of each option has been assessed based on both the number of positive and negative effects and also the significance of the effect.

3.9 The SEA Regulations require the SA report to identify the reasons for selecting the alternatives tested in light of the others available (SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8))[3]. There is generally no accepted definition of what constitutes 'reasonable alternatives', therefore it is up to the Council to decide what strategy approaches are reasonable. The alternative options for the spatial strategy take account of the Local Plan evidence base, including the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA), Green Belt Assessment, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) and the Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA).

[3] http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/pdfs/uksi_20041633_en.pdf

3.10 In determining potential spatial options, consideration has been given to land supply, the balancing of employment needs and housing targets, as well as potential environmental constraints and the implications for the Green Belt.

3.11 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

3.12 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

3.13 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

3.14 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

3.15 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, the Council would have limited influence over the planning and delivery of infrastructure to support development.

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, soil quality, flood storage capacity and landscape character. There are however benefits in terms of health and wellbeing and housing provision.

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 scores relatively well in these areas. Whilst there a number of moderate negative impacts, this option prioritises previously developed land and reduces the overall pressure on undeveloped Green Belt by considering weakly performing Green Belt on the urban fringe. 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.

4.10 Table 3 provides a summary of the Sustainability Appraisal for Options 1-4 scored against the SA objectives.

Table 3: Sustainability Appraisal Summary

SA 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.	- -	-	+ +	-	+/?
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
4. To reduce land contamination and protect soil quality and quantity.	+	+	- -	+	0
5. To reduce air and noise pollution.	-/?	-	-	-	-
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	-/?	-/?	- -/?	0
8. To protect, enhance and manage the Borough's open space and landscape character.	0	0	- -/?	0	+/?
9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport.	- -	0/+	- -	0/+	0
10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.	0	-	0	-	+
11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	-	-/?	0/?	0/?	0/?
12. To maintain and improve water quality and promote the efficient use of water.	-	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?

Next Steps

4.11 Public consultation on the Issues and Options for the Spelthorne 2035 Local Plan took place between 14th May 2018 and 25th June 2018.

4.12 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[4].

4.13 The SA will form an integral part of the process and will evolve alongside the development of the Local Plan. Higher-level appraisals will take place at the earlier stages of plan preparation and will be reviewed, with a more detailed assessment being 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 approach.

Table 4: Local Plan Timetable

Key stage	Date
Issues and Options consultation (Reg 18)	May-June 2018
Preferred Options consultation (Reg 18)	Summer 2019
Publication Local Plan consultation (Reg 19)	Winter 2019/20
Submission Date	Spring 2020
Proposed Adoption of Local Plan	Spring 2021

[4] https://www.spelthorne.gov.uk/media/17471/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report/pdf/Sustainability_Appraisal_Scoping_Report.pdf

Appendix 1: Sustainability Framework

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
1. To provide sufficient high quality housing to enable people to live in a home suitable to their needs and which they can afford.	Will it provide housing to help meet identified needs? Will it reduce the number of homes with Category 1 hazards as defined in the Housing, Health and Safety Rating System? Will it improve affordability? Will it provide specialist accommodation for elderly/disabled persons?	• Total housing completions by size, type and tenure. • Number of households on the housing register. Plot requirements on the self-build register. • Lower quartile property price compared against lower quartile workplace earnings.
2. To facilitate the improved health and well-being of the whole population and reduce inequalities.	Will it improve access to or provide healthcare and/or cultural and community facilities? Will it help to meet Accessible Natural Greenspace standards (ANGst)? Will it improve access to or provide green/blue infrastructure/ leisure/ recreation facilities? Will it improve highway safety for road users, cyclists and pedestrians? Will it contribute toward a safe & secure built environment? Will it help to address pockets of deprivations and child poverty? Will it reduce recorded levels of crime?	• Percentage of people whose health is classed as not good. • Life expectancy Adult & child obesity levels. • IMD Health Rankings Motorists/pedestrian/cyclists – number killed and/or seriously injured (KSI) per 100,000 population. • Amount and quality of green infrastructure/recreation space by type (ha) or leisure facilities. • Accessibility to Hospitals & GP Surgeries. • Capacity of Health Facilities. • Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANGst) Targets. • Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD). • Number of developments implementing ‘Secured by Design’.

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
3. To increase resilience to climate change, including reducing the risk and minimising the harm from flooding	Will it reduce the number of properties at risk from all forms of flooding? Will it reduce the severity of a flood event? Will it increase the number of properties linked to sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)?	• Number of properties at risk from flooding. • Number of properties with flood mitigation installed. • Number of properties built with SuDS installed.
4. To reduce land contamination and protect soil quality and quantity	Will it maintain the area of grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land? Will it remediate contaminated land and/or improve soil quality? Will it achieve efficiency in land use and avoid development of greenfield land over the redevelopment of previously developed land and buildings? Will it reduce the amount of derelict and/or underused land and/or vacant/unfit properties? Will it promote higher density development in appropriate locations?	• Amount of contaminated land remediated. • Area of grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land permanently lost to development (ha). • Percentage of development built on previously developed land. • Average density on sites with 10 or more dwellings (Dwellings per Ha.).
5. To reduce air and noise pollution	Will it improve air quality, in particular concentrations of NO2 and PM2.5? Will it reduce the number of properties or sites affected by poor air quality? Will it reduce the number of residential properties affected by and exposed to noise? Will it reduce congestion leading to pollution?	• Annual average of NO2 and PM2.5, within AQMAs relative to national standards. • The number of properties and land affected where levels of NOx or PM2.5 exceed national targets. • The monitoring of LEQ noise levels around airports. • Number of non-airport related noise complaints received per annum. • Will it meet noise standards?
6. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species	Will it maintain or enhance designated sites? Will it maintain/enhance numbers of priority species or the extent and condition of priority habitats	• Abundance and richness of fauna. • Extent and condition of SPA/Ramsar sites. • Extent and condition of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) meeting PSA targets.

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
	identified in Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and the Borough as a whole? Will it avoid the fragmentation of designated and priority habitats? Will it contribute towards achieving net gains in biodiversity? Will it help to deliver any identified Nature Improvement Areas? Will it protect the Borough's green/blue infrastructure and enhance connectivity?	• Extent and condition of priority species and habitats identified in Biodiversity Opportunity Areas in Spelthorne. • Number, area and condition of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) and Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) within Spelthorne. • Extent and condition of historic grassland and floral species. • Number of Biodiversity improvement/enhancement schemes implemented per annum.
7. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.	Will it conserve or enhance heritage assets, the historic environment and their settings? Will it improve the quality of the historic environment? Will it provide increased access to and enjoyment of the historic environment? Will it ensure that development is well-designed and is well-related to the surrounding townscape?	• Number of listed buildings, ancient monuments and conservation areas. • Statutory or locally listed buildings or structures at risk. • Statutory or locally listed buildings or structures demolished. • Scheduled ancient monuments at risk. • Number of archaeological finds. • Conservation area appraisals and level at risk.
8. To protect, enhance and manage Borough's open space and landscape character.	Will it protect and enhance landscape character? Will it ensure the quality of and provision of suitable open space, where need is identified?	• Quality and quantity of open space provision • Areas with landscape assessment
9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport.	Will it avoid contributing to congestion on the highway network? Will it promote more sustainable modes of travel? Will it provide improved access to public transport services and facilities? Will it provide opportunities for integrated Transport? Will it promote travel to work/school by foot, cycle or public transport?	• Traffic counts • Travel to work by mode • Number of schools/businesses with travel plans implemented • Number of highway/cyclist/pedestrian improvement schemes implemented • Number of electric vehicle charging points installed.

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
	Will it provide for disabled access to all transport options?	
10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.	Will it support a stable labour market and contribute towards skills improvement and employment opportunities? Will it support or promote inward investment and business growth? Will it retain the most sustainably located employment sites? Will it maintain or increase the total quantity and/or quality of commercial floorspace? Will it promote mixed use development? Will it promote or enhance the viability, vitality and attractiveness of town or local centres?	• IMD employment and education rankings. • Working age population which are economically active. • Educational attainment levels NVQ level 3 and above. The net change in the number of VAT registrations and de-registrations. • Commercial floorspace levels and vacancies. • Area of employment sites lost to other uses (ha). Amount of retail/commercial leisure floorspace implemented (sqm). • Amount of retail/commercial leisure floorspace lost to other uses within town/local centres (sqm). • Footfall numbers
11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Will it promote energy efficiency and/or renewable or low carbon technologies? Will it promote sustainable methods of construction and design? Will it promote the reuse and recycling of demolition waste?	• CO2 Emissions (total and per capita). • Number of commercial premises built to BREEAM 'Very good' or better. • Installed renewable/low carbon energy capacity (MW/h). • Amount of demolition waste reused or recycled per annum (tonnes).
12. To maintain and improve water quality and promote the efficient use of water	Will it protect and improve the quality of all water sources? Will it increase water efficiency? Will it promote greywater recycling/rainwater harvesting? Will it protect and improve hydro-geomorphology and the overall ecological status of the watercourses?	• Percentage of river and groundwater units in the plan area whose biological and/or chemical quality is rated as good. • Household consumption of water per day. • Number of dwellings completed which exceed. Building Regulations standards for water efficiency. • Commercial consumption of water per day.

Objective	Decision Aiding Questions	Indicators
		• Number of commercial developments completed with water efficiency measures implemented.

Appendix 2: Full Assessment of Sustainability Appraisal

SA Objective	Commentary	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.	The **Do Nothing** option would lead to an insufficient supply of housing land and could result in sites being determined by appeal. This would give no control over the location of development or over phasing. The type of homes required and sufficient affordable housing may not be provided. **Option 1** would allow Spelthorne to meet all of its housing need in the urban area and would recycle land whilst also tackling hazardous 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. Pursuing **Option 2** would allow Spelthorne to potentially meet all of its housing and Gypsy & Traveller need in terms of both quantity and type, as well as increasing affordability. This option would however avoid tackling hazardous homes with a focus on the Green Belt. Green Belt release is likely to only yield housing in the medium and long term. **Option 3** would significantly increase densities and building height in Staines. Tower blocks would be required to meet the quantity of units needed, however this would not provide the sufficient type of homes required for different groups. 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 would have significantly higher development costs, which could reduce supply. It is not yet known if **Option 4** would allow Spelthorne to meet all of its need, however it would provide the right mix of homes for different groups in the Borough. This option would allow Spelthorne to tackle hazardous homes and increase the affordability of units due to the reduced viability and decontamination costs in the Green Belt.	- -	-	+ +	-	+/?
Potential mitigation measures	Adoption of standards with regards to accessibility and adaptable dwellings may help to overcome issues of housing mix.					
2. To facilitate the improved health and well-being of the whole population and reduce inequalities.	A **Do Nothing** option would mean that the Local Plan would not have control over the provision of new facilities and could not plan for the increase in pressure. Access to urban greenspace is reduced in **Option 1,** however whilst it will be re-provided in the Green Belt it may be less accessible. Higher density living without access to urban greenspaces, less private amenity space as well as smaller room sizes may be detrimental to wellbeing. Where existing leisure facilities remain in the urban area, access could potentially be improved, however capacity is likely to reduce and pressure increase. **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 overall deprivation and poverty in Spelthorne by delivering more homes, as well as potentially addressing overcrowding and under-occupation, however may not tackle existing deprivation in urban areas. Option 2 however would disperse traffic and could potentially decrease the opportunity for walking. Development 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. **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.	-	- -	0/?	- -	+

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	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, however 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 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.	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. Without a Local Plan under **Do Nothing**, developers will still be required to take full account of flood risk and therefore it is likely that flood risks would be minimalised. 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. **Option 2** would allow more SuDS to be included, subject to viability and space allowances. Absorbent land and flood storage capacity will be reduced which will cause negative impacts. Impacts are largely dependent upon specific development locations, which is unknown at this stage. **Option 3** will increase the number of people living in the highest risk flood zones but will allow flood mitigation strategies to be implemented. **Option 4** will still mean that some land in flood zones is developed, particularly in Staines, but may reduce the need to build on areas with the highest level of risk in the Green Belt. Effects are somewhat unknown at this stage due to the specific design of schemes but could incorporate SuDS.	-	-	0/?	- -	-/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. **Option 1 and 3** would reuse previously developed land and would provide the opportunity for land remediation. These options would also reduce the need for greenfield **Option 2** would require significant greenfield land for 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. **Option 4** would focus on previously developed land both in the urban area and Green Belt. Option 4 would provide remediation opportunities. There would however be some loss of greenfield land.	+	+	- -	+	0

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
Potential mitigation measures	Opportunities to prevent new areas of contaminated land being created.					
5. To reduce air and noise pollution.	A **Do Nothing** option would mean that 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. **Option 1 and 3** 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 will be living in closer proximity to one another. There is potential for more sustainable modes of transport but requires a modal shift. **Option 2** could increase the need to travel if new facilities are not provided as part of schemes, 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 4** would allow development to be sustainably managed through a focus on development in urban areas and on some Green Belt close to the urban area. 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. The overall rise in population in relation to this strategy is likely to exacerbate pollution.	-/?	-	-	-	-
Potential mitigation measures	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 premanent green attenuation barriers near roads and potentially sensitive areas.					
6. To conserve and enhance biodiversity, habitats and species.	**Do Nothing** - 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. Unplanned development may negatively impact vulnerable habitats. **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 4. There could however be some fragmentation of urban habitats. Option 1 could secure biodiversity improvements and upgrades in the Green Belt but this would not outweigh the absolute loss and damage to 'urban habitats'. **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. This option would however reduce the impact to urban habitats. 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 areas of biodiversity 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.	0	-	- -/?	0	0

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	This option would use the least amount of land for development. There would however be some negative impacts on urban habitats in Staines. **Option 4** would only develop pockets of Green Belt and would conserve biodiversity across the rest of the Borough, with opportunity for biodiversity enhancements. By focusing on previously developed land, urban habitats could be preserved. This option would disperse the impact across the Borough and would mean that a reasonable amount of land would be used. Specific development locations unknown.					
Potential mitigation measures	Scheme-specific design may overcome any issues relating to biodiversity and promote measures to improve local biodiversity, such as providing strategic green links throughout the Borough to enhance local ecology.					
7. To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.	**Do Nothing** - 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 negatively impact conservation areas but this is dependent upon specific development locations.	0	-/?	-/?	- -/?	0
Potential mitigation measures	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.					
8. To protect, enhance and manage the Borough's open space and landscape character.	A **Do Nothing** option would mean that in the future many of the landscape characteristics in the Borough will remain largely unchanged. However future development and supporting infrastructure have the potential to affect the Borough's landscape. **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 in the Green Belt. **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 through **Option 3** the Borough's landscape character is largely preserved elsewhere, however there may be more pressure on existing open space. **Option 4** would result in weakly performing Green Belt being developed, therefore this would focus on areas which are potentially less open, but would still result in development of the countryside. This option would however also focus on brownfield land and reduce the overall impact on landscape. There may be an opportunity to provide	0	0	- -/?	0	+/?

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	compensatory improvements in the Green Belt through this option. Dependent upon the specific location of development so further work is required					
Potential mitigation measures	Design measures may help to reduce negative impacts on landscape character.					
9. To promote sustainable modes of travel and improve accessibility to public transport.	**Do Nothing** - 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 movements on the local/strategic road network. **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 facilities. Development at key transport nodes could prevent unsustainable travel patterns but there is a risk of increased out commuting. **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 reduce opportunities 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 scheme. **Option 3** could facilitate better public transport and could also encourage walking/cycling, with the most people in the most sustainable location. There could however be more pressure on the road infrastructure in Staines. The focus on residential development would however lead to more out commuting for work and use of other facilities. This could also lead to a lack of opportunity to improve infrastructure outside of Staines. **Option 4** 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 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.	- -	0/+	- -	0/+	0
Potential mitigation measures	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.					
10. Maintain high levels of employment and economic growth which is inclusive and sustainable across the Borough.	**Do Nothing** - 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 with more in-commuting. There is however an upward trend in educational achievement and workplace earnings in Spelthorne. There is also lower unemployment than the national level which is likely to continue. **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, preserving existing employment sites. **Option 3** would preserve the status of Staines as the Borough's largest town and would increase the vitality of its shopping areas. This option also exploits potential Heathrow growth opportunities but would reduce employment sites in Staines. **Option 4** would allow for more mixed use development and could incorporate commercial uses to enable growth. Option 4 would allow Heathrow growth opportunities to be exploited in Staines and would also reduce pressure on existing employment sites by dispersing development. **This option, along with option 1 and 3** also provides potential regeneration opportunities for urban areas, especially Staines, which could increase commercial appeal.	0	-	0	-	+

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	All options would increase the Borough's population and so would increase labour supply, although possibly to a lesser extent through options 3 and 4. House building can provide local training opportunities, although this could be more limited for high rise development which often requires specialist construction.					
Potential mitigation measures	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.					
11. To promote the efficient use of resources and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	**Do Nothing** - Even in the absence of a plan, population is predicted to rise and the number of households increase. There may however be less opportunity to incorporate mitigation measures into sporadic developments. Household waste levels are expected to rise. 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 for O**ptions 1, 2, 3 and 4**. All options are expected to lead to greater greenhouse gas emissions for the Borough overall. Through **Option 1** 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. There could be more car travel out of Spelthorne for work. The loss of urban green spaces could negate adaptation schemes. **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 option is unlikely to result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and will disperse development around the Borough. **Option 3** could 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 will provide self-insulation, whilst smaller units will consume less energy. There are considered to be negative implications for waste collection and recycling with regards to high density development. The lack of supporting highway infrastructure will increase emissions from congestion. **Option 4 -** Mixed use development will reduce the need to travel and has greater potential to move towards a low carbon economy. Where Green Belt is developed, new homes would be more energy efficient and 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.	-	-/?	0/?	0/?	0/?
Potential mitigation measures	Environmental performance of houses can be mitigated through sustainable design and construction 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.	Do Nothing - In the absence of a plan, population is expected to rise and as such demand for water will also increase. For O**ptions 1, 2, 3 and 4** the impact on water quality and quantity is unclear at this stage and is largely dependent upon scheme specific design. **Option 1** - 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. **Option 2** - 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 and potential negative impact on groundwater. This option would result in the highest number of homes being built so the greatest water requirement.	-	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?

SA Objective	Commentary	Do Nothing	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
	Option 3 is likely to lead to increased pressure on current infrastructure in Staines, however would not substantially increase pressure in other areas of Spelthorne. Overall rise in water use. Building on brownfield land rather than greenfield there is likely to be less impact on groundwater. **Option 4** - Overall rise in water use. New water infrastructure is likely to be required in Green Belt areas but water efficiency measures could be built in. There would be increasing pressure on infrastructure in the urban area.					
Potential mitigation measures	No mitigation measures identified.					