

London Borough of Brent's Draft Core Strategy Preferred Options

Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices to Part A: Sustainability Context

Incorporating an Environmental Report under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633



October 2006

Prepared for London Borough of Brent

by

Collingwood Environmental Planning

Collingwood Environmental Planning
4.2.3 The Leathermarket
Weston Street, London SE1 3ER, UK
t: 020 7407 8700
f: 020 7407 8701
e: r.eales@cep.co.uk



CONTENTS

(see separate volumes for the contents of the main SA Report)

APPENDICES

PART A: SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT

Appendix 1: Scoping Report Consultees	3
Appendix 2: Summary of Consultees Comments on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	7
Appendix 3: Appraisal Proformas.....	15
Appendix 4: Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes.....	19
Appendix 5: Baseline Data.....	43
Appendix 6: Sustainability Objectives, Criteria, Indicators and Targets	87
Appendix 7: Significance Criteria	95

APPENDICES TO PART B: APPRAISAL OF THE CORE STRATEGY (included in separate volume)

Appendix 8: Core Strategy Issues and Options.....	101
Appendix 9: Appraisal of Core Strategy Preferred Options	109

ABBREVIATIONS

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report	LGA	Local Government Association
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area	LPA	Local Planning Authority
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan	LIP	Local Implementation Plan
BEA	Borough Employment Area	MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
BREEAM	BRE (Building Research Establishment) Environmental Assessment Method	NO	Nitric Oxide
CEP	Collingwood Environmental Planning	NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species	NVQ	National Vocational Qualifications
CO	Carbon Monoxide	ONS	Office of National Statistics
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide	ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
DC	Development Control	PCT	Primary Care Trust
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government	PM ₁₀	Particles measuring less than 10 microns
Defra	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs	PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
DETR	Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions	PPS	Planning Policy Statement
DfT	Department for Transport	PTAL	Public Transport Accessibility Level
DPD	Development Plan Document	RSL	Registered Social Landlords
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry	SA	Sustainability Appraisal
EA	Environment Agency	SAP	Standard Assessment Procedure
EEC	European Economic Community	SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
EC	European Commission	SD	Sustainable development
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	SEA	Strategic Employment Area
EU	European Union	SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
GPD	Gross Domestic Product	SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
GIS	Geographical Information System	SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
GLA	Greater London Authority	SOA	Super Output Areas
GOL	Government Office for London	SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
GP	General Practitioner	SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
GQA	General Quality Assessment	SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
HA	Housing Association	SRDF	Sub Regional Development Framework
Ha	Hectare	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation	SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage
LA 21	Local Agenda 21	TPO	Tree Preservation Order
LBB	London Borough of Brent	UDP	Unitary Development Plan
LB Brent	London Borough of Brent	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
LDD	Local Development Document	VAT	Value Added Tax
LDF	Local Development Framework	WFD	Water Framework Directive
LDS	Local Development Scheme	WLWDA	West London Waste Disposal Authority (known as WestWaste)
LEA	Local Education Authority		
LES	Local Employment Site		

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

SCOPING REPORT CONSULTEES

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report Consultees

The consultees formally consulted on this Scoping Report (including as part of the SEA determination process set out in Regulation 9) as required by the SEA Regulations were:

- Countryside Agency*
- English Heritage*
- English Nature
- Environment Agency*

Other consultees included internal departments within the Council and the following external organisations:

- Government Office for London
- Greater London Authority
- London Development Agency
- London Wildlife Trust
- Adjacent London Boroughs (Barnet, Camden, Ealing, Hammersmith & Fulham, Harrow, Kensington & Chelsea and Westminster)
- Partners for Brent (the Local Strategic Partnership)
- Brent Energy Network

Those that responded are marked with an asterisk. Details of these comments are included in Appendix 2.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES COMMENTS ON SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SCOPING REPORT

Summary of Consultees Comments on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

The following table summarises how the comments and issues raised by the formal consultation on the SA Scoping Report were addressed.

(Page and section numbers refer to the SA Scoping Report (June 2005) except where otherwise stated)

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
Countryside Agency	
<p><u>Baseline and maps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EN5: Townscape and Landscape Quality. Use of map commended. Recommended to update this map if necessary. - Consider wider use / role of Landscape Character Assessment in development of LDF, and particularly monitoring. Refer to "Landscape Character Assessment: Guidance for England and Scotland" April 2002 (CAX84) and www.ccnetwork.org.uk - Consider Volume 7 of the Countryside Character (publication reference CA13). Contains character information on areas in Greater London (in particular CCAs 81, 111-115 and 119) - Consider CA maps of open countryside and registered common land – Areas 1 and 8. Due to be issued summer 2005, at www.openaccess.gov.uk - Review annual State of the Countryside Reports and related data at: www.countryside.gov.uk/evidenceandanalysis/state_of_the_countryside_reports/index.asp and www.countryside.gov.uk/EvidenceandAnalysis/dataHub/2004_dataarea/index.asp 	<p>Map of areas of low townscape quality included in Part A of SA Report (Figure 23). Update requested from LBB but not available.</p> <p>Comment passed on to the officers responsible for preparing the LDF.</p> <p>Information added to Baseline table (see Appendix 5).</p> <p>Not applicable</p> <p>Information reviewed.</p>
<p><u>Key sustainability problems:</u> Consider whether any further landscape/townscape character issues / problems should be included</p>	No changes consider necessary.
<p>Suggested modification to sustainability objective EN5: Change to – "EN5: to maintain and enhance the <u>character and quality of landscapes and townscapes</u>"</p>	This has been amended as suggested (See Table 8 in Part A)
<p>Consider whether there is any land in Brent designated as conditionally exempt from capital taxes on grounds of outstanding scenic, scientific or historic interest? For up-to-date list go to: www.hmrc.gov.uk/heritage/lbsearch.htm</p>	Not applicable
<p><u>Access and recreation:</u> Potential impacts on access land, public open land and rights of way should be fully considered. Particularly the Thames Path National Trail. Info at www.nationaltrails.gov.uk</p>	Not applicable
Environment Agency	
<p>Review of other policies and plans – include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 - Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000 - Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 - Regional Blue Ribbon Policy 	<p>Regional Blue Ribbon Policy: reviewed and added to PPP list.</p> <p>National legislation has not been included in review as at this level.</p>

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
<p>P.24 section 4.31</p> <p>Note additional important wildlife corridor running down the River Brent</p>	<p>Wildlife corridors mentioned in Section 3 (Para. 3.47) of SA Report</p>
<p>Section 4.26</p> <p>Expressed extreme concern about lack of information on fluvial and surface water flood risk in this section. Urge inclusion of information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water quality. Important to include implications of the WFD. - Fluvial flood risk. Note that areas of Brent fall within fluvial flood plains of the following rivers: River Brent, Wealdstone Brook, Wembley Brook, Mitchell Brook, Grand Union Canal, Kenton Brook and Silk Stream - Refer to PPG25. In accordance with it, any development should be resisted which has the potential to contribute to flood risk and have an adverse impact on river channel stability or damage wildlife habitats. - Consider undertaking a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) to zone development within the whole borough. Such an assessment should be undertaken in discussion with the EA. - Recommendation that new development be kept outside of the 1 in 100 year floodplain taking into account climate change. - Need to include reference to the inclusion of SUDS in new developments. Also promote the use of water conservation techniques such as grey-water reuse / rainwater harvesting should be promoted as should the development of green roofs. - Proximity of proposal to rivers and river corridors. Section needs to make reference (currently absent) to the need to preserve the integrity of rivers and their associated corridors by providing an undeveloped buffer strip between proposed developments and the brink of watercourses. For fluvial main rivers this buffer strip should be 8 metres wide measured from bank top. 	<p>Flood risk map has now been included in section 3 of Part A of main SA Report</p> <p>WFD reference has been added in section 3 of Part A</p> <p>Flood risk map included</p> <p>The requirements of PPG25 have been considered when undertaking the appraisal and will be more relevant to the appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations DPD</p> <p>Comment passed on to the officers responsible for preparing the LDF. SFRAs referred to in draft DPD.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>References to SUDS included in SA report</p> <p>This comment will be taken into account in the appraisal of the Site Specific Allocations and Development Control Policies.</p>
<p>Key sustainability issues</p> <p>Page 30</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Row 9: reference should be made to the need to restore and enhance degraded habitats in the borough – e.g. rivers and driver corridors as a means of satisfying the WFD which emphasises the need to enhance heavily modified water bodies. Examples such as the restoration of the River Brent at Tokyngton Park should be further promoted throughout the borough. - Row 12: Fluvial and Surface water flood risk should be separated into separate rows. Reference must be made to EA flood zone maps, and particularly at risk areas in the borough. 	<p>Rows 9 and 11 of Table 7 (Part A): Key sustainability problems have been modified accordingly.</p> <p>Distinction has been made between surface and river flooding in row 12 of Table 7: Key sustainability problems (Part A of main SA Report) and flood risk areas map has been included (Figure 19)</p>

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
<p>Sust. Objectives and criteria</p> <p>Page 33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resources: Section must include the reduction of fluvial and surface water flood risk as prime objectives. Preventing development in flood plains and ensuring that surface waters are disposed of sustainably will ensure that risk of flooding to additional people and property is reduced. - Biodiversity: Section should not only focus on preserving existing sites of good quality but should also seek to enhance degraded sites within the borough – in line with the WFD. - Climate change: This section should also refer to PPG25 which asks that the impact of climate change be considered when undertaking FRAs. 	<p>Flooding from all sources is included under the Climate Change objective in Table 8: Sustainability objectives and criteria of Part A of SA Report.</p> <p>This is sufficiently covered in the criteria under Biodiversity (Table 8: Sustainability objectives and criteria of Part A of SA Report)</p> <p>Not considered relevant to objectives and criteria, but considered elsewhere</p>
<p>Page 36 Section 7.6</p> <p>Refer also to fluvial flood risk as well as surface water flood risk.</p>	<p>Text not repeated in SA Report, but comments noted</p>
<p><u>Page 82 Objective 10:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The reduction of flood risk” should be a separate objective. - Row entitled “Flood risk areas” should refer to EA flood zone maps. - Last 3 rows of objective 10 should reference flood zone maps which provide information on people at risk of fluvial flooding, and refer to frequency of fluvial events. 	<p>Rather than create a new objective our appraisal framework will be assessing all Spatial Strategy policies against each sub-criteria, including flood risk reduction.</p>
<p><u>Page 86 Objective 12</u></p> <p>Should seek to enhance degraded sites in borough as well as preserving existing sites of good quality – in line with WFD</p>	<p>Felt sufficiently reflected in criteria</p>
English Heritage	
<p>Consider “<i>Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning</i>” June 2005 and “<i>Heritage Counts: State of the Historic Environment</i>” Ensure design issues are considered in the baseline – and develop monitoring indicators (qualitative as necessary). These documents should inform the update of the environmental baseline.</p>	<p>Documents reviewed and added if appropriate</p>
<p>Consider “<i>Making Design Policy Work</i>” – CABE, June 2005 – which provide guidance and good practice on the development of LDFs.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Consider the following EH documents in the development of the baseline and options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Transport and the Historic Environment</i> - <i>Streets for All</i> - <i>Regeneration and the Historic Environment</i> - <i>Local Strategic Partnerships and the Historic Environment</i> 	<p>As above</p>

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
<p><u>Review of other policies, plans and programmes</u>, should also include:</p> <p>National</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) act, 1990 - Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 - The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Nature (DCMS 2001) <p>Regional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The London Plan - Draft Sub-regional Development Framework – west London (June 2005) - Draft SPG on Sustainable Design and Construction (March 2005) <p>Local</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conservation Area Appraisals - Cultural Strategy 	As above
<p>Baseline</p> <p>Consider the following statutory designations and their settings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Heritage Sites - Listed Buildings - Scheduled Ancient Monuments - Archaeological Priority Areas - Registered Historic Parks and Gardens - Registered Battlefields - Conservation areas 	These have been included when information was available / relevant
<p>Also consider:</p> <p>Other archaeological sites, locally listed buildings, parks, character of the wider landscape, historic landscapes and potential for as yet unrecorded archaeology. Wider historic environment should be considered in assessment of future trends.</p>	As above
<p><u>Suggested information sources:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Heritage Counts: www.heritagecounts.org.uk - Greater London Sites and Monuments Record - National Monuments Record Centre, Swindon - Magic www.magic.gov.uk - English Heritage annual Buildings at Risk Register - Local Authority conservation team for locally listed buildings - Local History / studies centres 	As above
<p><u>Suggested indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of listed buildings under each grade - Number and % of listed buildings at risk - Number of scheduled ancient monuments - Number and % of archaeological sites at risk - Number of registered historic parks and gardens - Number of conservation areas - Number and % of Conservation Areas with appraisals - Impact of change on character and appearance of conservation areas - % or areas of historic buildings, sites and areas affected whether in adverse or beneficial way - Street / public realm audits, improvement works, de-cluttering works - % residents content with character and appearance of local area - Rate of loss of historic landscape features - Erosion of quality character and distinctiveness 	As above

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
<u>Key sustainability issues:</u> Consider impact / pressure of development on areas not specifically protected, but which are considered to have historic value or make	No action, it has been accounted for
<u>Suggested objectives:</u> - Preserve and enhance the character and appearance of archaeological sites, historic buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, and other culturally important features and areas, and their settings - Protect and enhance the character and appearance of townscape / landscape - Maintain and strengthen local distinctiveness and sense of place - Improve quality of the public realm, creating places that work well, are maintained and managed and are attractive to users	This is sufficiently covered by existing criteria
<u>Options:</u> Concern expressed that the issues and options for the historic environment are not clearly set out in report. Should be explicitly addressed given it is a key objective of the LDF.	This has been covered by the appraisal
Closely involve Council conservation staff in the SA process.	Noted
Brent Planning and Policy team	
General: Entire report talks about an integrated SA / SEA approach at the beginning, but only seems to talk about SAs from then on.	This is accounted for in report
Review of other policies, plans and programmes should include: - EU Directive on energy performance of buildings 2002/91/EC 16, December 2002	Added
Baseline: - Indicator IDs missing - References / sources need to be clearer. - Sustainability objective 6 linked to air quality issue. Can more linkage or reference be made? - Sustainability objective 10 - touches on potential flood risk – a potential consequence of climate change. Not enough linkage or reference to CC objective. - Sustainability objective 20 – might be helpful to write promote “ ‘sustainable’ regeneration” - Sustainability objective 22 – links to travel & air quality – links could be made more explicit	Indicator IDs are not included in final version of report Revised in baseline summary and baseline table Unclear (objective numbers changed?) Felt sufficiently covered in criteria Objective changed Agree, however the objectives are meant to highlight specific Sustainability issues. Commentary will seek to bring out issues such as this one.
Section Comments: - 4.1 – last word should be ‘affected’ not ‘effected’ - 4.23 Links with various other indicators (to their detriment). Could expand on the implications of traffic problems in damaging health, quality of life / sense of place / comfort (heavy traffic is unpleasant to have around) & biodiversity, reducing economic efficiency & potential detriment to regeneration opportunities. - 4.26 & 4.27 need explicit reference to climate change which is likely to have a significant detrimental effect	Done This has been revised in section 3 of SA Report As above

Comment	Response / Changes to SA
<p>on flooding in the Borough. Also exacerbated by trends such as increased paving of frontages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.28 / 9 could make more specific reference to health implications of poor air quality & the fact that the NC rd is the most polluted A road in London. 	As above
<p>Key sustainability problems: 15. There should be some sort of reference to or separate problem regarding renewable energy installations. There are currently only four known installations in the Borough whose outputs are unknown. All efforts should be made to encourage and increase the number of renewable energy installations in the borough.</p>	This has been highlighted in Table 7 of SA report and mainstreamed into appraisal criteria
<p>Issues and options:</p> <p>Consistency issues: Sometimes 'potential options' is used & sometimes 'options' is used, which could give the impression that some options are more likely or preferred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7.6 better to list as 'noise', 'air quality', 'contaminated land' in keeping with the rest. - Energy efficiency needs to be explicitly stated and emphasised. Higher energy efficiency needs to be required in buildings; the Building Regulations are a minimum legal requirement and cannot require higher standards according to local circumstances as planning requirements potentially could. - 7.7 Final paragraph could be slightly more clearly worded. - 7.10 Location of out of centre superstores - should there not be consideration of whether such developments are needed at all? - 7.11 1st para – should be 'especially' not 'specially' - 7.12 is it really viable to be looking into giving up areas of public space for burial sites?! Should we not perhaps be promoting more long-term sustainable options (e.g. cremation) as this is only going to be an ongoing & growing problem? - 7.14 should read 'ways of reducing', not 'ways for reducing'. Also, either commercial should be included, or just talk about maximising recycling (perhaps specifying 'including construction' so people don't just think of domestic waste). 	Text not repeated in SA Report therefore no need for change, but comments noted

APPENDIX 3

APPRAISAL PROFORMAS

Policy Appraisal Proformas

The following proforma was used by LBB officers to consider sustainability issues as they drafted DPD policies and to record the results (see Section 3 of Part A of the SA Report).

DPD topic:	
Policy area:	
Name of officer completing proforma:	
Date(s) proforma completed:	
Alternatives considered: <input type="checkbox"/> Only brief description of the alternatives required <input type="checkbox"/> If an alternative / option has already been rejected, include brief reasons why (e.g. does not conform with London Plan)	
Draft policy wording:	
Summary of sustainability strengths and weaknesses <input type="checkbox"/> Use sustainability objective as a checklist <input type="checkbox"/> Complete separate proforma for different policy alternatives if appropriate (or record differences in strengths / weaknesses etc within a single proforma) <input type="checkbox"/> Identify key mitigation measures (including other policies needed) were potential negative effects / weaknesses	
Economic	
Strengths:	weaknesses:
Social	
Strengths:	weaknesses:
Environmental	
Strengths:	weaknesses:
Summary / other comments:	

APPENDIX 4

REVIEW OF RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
International			
1. United Nations World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg (September 2002). Commitments arising from Johannesburg Summit	<p>The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) represents a reaffirmation of international commitment to sustainable development coming 30 years after the Stockholm commitment to tackle environmental degradation and ten years after the Rio Summit and Declaration of 1992.</p> <p>A number of the sustainable development commitments originating from WSSD, are relevant to land use planning, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate energy into country-led poverty reduction processes; • Remove market barriers and create a level playing field for renewable energy and energy efficiency; • Greater resource efficiency (incl. decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation); • Support business innovation and take-up of best practice in technology and management; work on waste and producer responsibility. <p>Many of these commitments are followed up and elaborated in more in detail the London Plan.</p>	This is a non-binding unilateral agreement which sets the highest level international commitments for sustainable development.	<p>The DPD can assist in achieving the commitments arising from the Johannesburg Summit. The policies and supporting text may wish to reflect the goals and objectives of these commitments.</p> <p>The SA process is built upon an understanding of Sustainable Development issues. Awareness of the over-arching direction is vital to this.</p>
2. Bonn International Convention on Conservation of Migratory Species (1979).	The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (also known as CMS or the Bonn Convention) aims to conserve terrestrial, marine and avian migratory species throughout their range. It is an intergovernmental treaty, concluded under the aegis of the United Nations Environment Programme, concerned with the conservation of wildlife and habitats on a global scale. Since the Convention's entry into force, its membership has grown steadily to include 86 (as of 1 June 2004) Parties from Africa, Central and South America, Asia, Europe and Oceania.		The DPD should reflect these issues and seek to protect and conserve wild animals and migratory species. In particular policies which relate to habitats, or which may have significant impact upon land-use or habitats.
3. EC Directive on Conservation of Wild Birds.	The Birds Directive addresses the conservation of all wild birds throughout the European Union, including marine areas, and covers their protection, management, control and exploitation. It applies to the birds, their eggs, nests and habitats. It places a broad requirement on Member States to take necessary measures to maintain the populations of all wild birds at levels determined by ecological, scientific and cultural needs. In doing so, Member States must also consider economic and recreational needs.		The DPD should be aware of the main provisions of the Birds Directive as well as the wide range of other statutory and non-statutory activities which support the Bird Directive's implementation in the UK. This includes national bird monitoring schemes, bird conservation research, and the UK Biodiversity Action Plan which involves action for a number of bird species and the habitats which support them.
4. EC Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna &	The EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds (The Birds Directive, 79/409/EEC) and the EC Directive on the		The requirements of the Habitats Directive need to be fully taken into account by the

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
International			
Flora (Directive 92/43/EC) (The Habitats Directive).	Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (The Habitats Directive, 92/43/EEC). Together, they establish a legislative framework for protecting and conserving Europe's wildlife and habitats.		DPD.
5. Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (1979).	The Convention aims to ensure conservation of wild flora and fauna species and their habitats. Special attention is given to endangered and vulnerable species, including endangered and vulnerable migratory species specified in appendices. The Parties undertake to take all appropriate measures to ensure the conservation of the habitats of the wild flora and fauna species. Such measures should be included in the Parties planning and development policies and pollution control, with particular attention to the conservation of wild flora and fauna.		The DPD must have regard for the conservation of endangered and vulnerable species in the area. It should ensure that its policies are not in conflict with the protection and conservation of these species and their habitats. This is supported by the London Plan.
6. Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially Waterfowl Habitat (1971).	The Convention on Wetlands, signed in Ramsar, Iran, in 1971, is an intergovernmental treaty which provides the framework for national action and international co-operation for the conservation and wise use of wetlands and their resources.		There are no RAMSAR sites within the London Borough of Brent. However, the core practices and objectives of the Convention can be integrated into the DPD. Particular areas of importance include the Brent Reservoir.
7. United Nations Millennium Declaration (2000).	Emanating from the Millennium Declaration, the eight Millennium Development Goals bind countries to do more and join forces in the fight against poverty, illiteracy, hunger, lack of education, gender inequality, child and maternal mortality, disease and environmental degradation.	The declaration and the goals have a key focus on developing countries and issues such as poverty, gender equality and education. However the declaration also contains commitments to address a broad range of issues some of which have relevance to identifying regional actions and priorities, particularly those relating to environmental sustainability.	The DPD should be prepared with at least awareness of this declaration.
8. Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992).	The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was adopted on 9th May 1992. It set out to achieve stabilisation of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at safe levels. The text of the Kyoto Protocol was adopted at the third session of the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Kyoto, Japan, on 11 December 1997. The Kyoto Protocol finally came into force in February 2005.		The DPD can play a significant role in assisting to meet the contributions to the UK's climate change efforts. The DPD should be aware of, and seek to meet the Kyoto's commitments
9. EC Air Quality Framework Directive (Directive 96/62/EC).	The Air Quality Framework Directive stipulates that in zones and agglomerations in which levels of one or more pollutants exceed certain limit values Member States shall prepare and implement a plan or programme for attaining the limit value within the specific time limit. In zones and agglomerations, where the level of more than one pollutant is higher than the limit values, member states must provide an integrated plan covering all the pollutants concerned. The main purpose of these plans is to improve air quality.	The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy (2002) takes into account this important Directive, which was transposed into UK legislation through the Air Quality Limit Values Regulations 2001.	Local measures to manage and improve air quality are the responsibility of the Mayor and the London boroughs. The London boroughs have duties under the local air quality management system to periodically review and assess air quality in their areas against the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
International			
10. EC Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive.	The Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive was adopted by the EU Council of Ministers in May 1991. The Directive was passed into domestic UK legislation in November 1994.		The DPD should be aware of the Directive's requirements, but where relevant it will have been taken into account in the London Plan.
11. EC Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC).	In 1991 Europe adopted the Nitrates Directive (91/676/EC). It is an environmental measure designed to reduce water pollution by nitrate from agricultural sources and to prevent such pollution occurring in the future		The DPD should be aware of the Directive's requirements, but where relevant it will have been taken into account in the London Plan.
12. EC Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).	This directive seeks to establish a structured framework for action in the field of water policy.		The DPD should be aware of the Directive's requirements, but where relevant it will need to be taken into account in the review of the London Plan – consider implication for the Borough of the forthcoming River Basin Management Plan and liaise with the Environment Agency.
13. EC Directive to Promote Electricity from Renewable Energy (2001/77/EC).	This Directive on 'the promotion of electricity produced from renewable energy sources in the internal electricity market' addresses an obligation to member states to establish a programme to increase the gross consumption of renewable energy based electricity ("green electricity") by 2010.		The DPD should be aware of the Directive's requirements, but where relevant it will have been taken into account in the London Plan.
14. EC Waste to Landfill Directive (93/31/EC).	The objective of the Directive is to prevent or reduce as far as possible negative effects on the environment from the landfilling of waste, by introducing stringent technical requirements for waste and landfills.	The objective of the Directive is to prevent or reduce as far as possible negative effects on the environment from the landfilling of waste, by introducing stringent technical requirements for waste and landfills.	The DPD will need to consider the spatial planning implications of the needs of managing waste in accordance with the Directive as required by the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy (see below).
15. (Renewed) European Sustainable Development Strategy 2006 (European Commission)	This document aims to support and promote actions to enable the EU to achieve continuous improvement of quality of life for both present and future generations. http://ec.europa.eu/sustainable/sds2005/index_en.htm		The DPD should be prepared with at least awareness of this strategy.
16. European Spatial Development Perspective 1999 (EC)	The aim of this document is 'to work towards a balanced and sustainable development' and ensure the three fundamental goals of European policy are achieved equally in all the regions of the EU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'economic and social cohesion; • conservation and management of natural resources and the cultural heritage; • more balanced competitiveness of the European territory'. 		The DPD should be prepared with at least awareness of this document.
17. European Biodiversity Strategy 1998 (EC)	This strategy aims to anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity at the source.		The DPD should be prepared with at least awareness of this strategy.
18. EC Directive on energy performance of buildings 2002/91/EC 16, December 2002	This Directive aims to increase energy performance of public, commercial and private buildings in Member States. It builds on several previous Directives: the Boiler Directive (92/42/EEC), the Construction Products Directive (89/106/EEC) and the buildings provisions in the SAVE Directive (93/76/EEC).		The DPD should be reflect this Directive in preparing policy related to sustainable design and construction etc.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
National			
19. Securing the Future. The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, March 2005	<p>The Government's new highest level sustainable development strategy.</p> <p>Sets out a new purpose and principles for sustainable development and new shared priorities agreed across the UK, including the Devolved Administrations.</p> <p>The strategy contains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new integrated vision building on the 1999 strategy – with stronger international and societal dimensions • Five principles – with a more explicit focus on environmental limits • Four agreed priorities – sustainable consumption and production, climate change, natural resource protection and sustainable communities • A new indicator set, which is more outcome focused, with commitments to look at new indicators such as on wellbeing. 		While much of the national sustainable strategy will be beyond the scope of the DPD it remains important for it to reflect the new national strategic priorities and principles.
20. Defra (July, 2004). Making Space for Water: Developing a new Government Strategy for Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management in England. A Consultation Exercise. And First Response, DEFRA, March 2005	<p>DEFRA held a three month consultation on a new cross-Government strategy for flood and coastal erosion risk management during Autumn 2004. The Government's First Response to Making space for water has now been published (March 2005). A summary of the consultation responses and an updated Regulatory Impact Assessment have also been produced.</p> <p>The First Response sets out the strategic direction of travel on key issues. For those areas of complex policy that it cannot resolve, it sets out the programme of work required to achieve this. The Response also sets out the aim of the new strategy: <i>To manage the risks from flooding and coastal erosion by employing an integrated portfolio of approaches which reflect both national and local priorities, so as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>to reduce the threat to people and their property; and</i> • <i>to deliver the greatest environmental, social and economic benefit, consistent with the Government's sustainable development principles.</i> <p><i>To secure efficient and reliable funding mechanisms that deliver the levels of investment required to achieve the vision of this strategy.</i></p>	The new strategy will require a holistic approach to flood risk management, incorporating the implications of climate change, better management of risk through flood risk assessments at all levels and a new PPS to improve the effectiveness of PPG25.	The DPD will need to not only reflect existing policy in PPG25, but also the evolving strategy.
21. Department for Transport (2004). The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030.	The Future of Transport White Paper looks at the factors that will shape travel and transport over the next thirty years and sets out how the Government will respond to the increasing demand for travel, maximising the benefits of transport while minimising the negative impact on people and the environment.	Much of this will be taken on board in The Mayor's Transport Strategy Revision.	Draw on Mayor's Transport Strategy Revision.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
National			
22. Defra National Air Quality Strategy for England; Wales; Scotland and Northern Ireland; 2000.	<p>The Strategy aims to map out; as far as is possible; the future of ambient air quality policy in the UK in the medium term.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Delivering Cleaner Air, Sets out the policy framework and responsibilities for Government; local authorities; industry; business and individuals</p> <p>The role of land use planning and transport planning are seen as particularly important. Example measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local traffic reduction targets • Low emissions zones • Green transport plans • Parking controls and management 	<p>The DPD should be aware of the focus of national guidance; and not conflict / challenge existing targets or objectives. The need to manage / control air pollution may place a constraint on the scope of the DPD</p>	<p>In so far as it is appropriate to the scope of the DPD it should incorporate such measures. At the minimum the DPD must not be at conflict with the needs of reducing air pollutants.</p> <p>DPD should consider the role of transport plans; emissions zones and other management measures within Brent.</p>
23. DETR and CABE (2000). By design: Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice.	<p>This guide aims to encourage better design and is intended as a companion to the PPGs/PPSs. It has been written to stimulate thinking about urban design, not to tell the reader how to design. The central message is that careful assessments of places, well-drafted policies, well-designed proposals, robust decision-making and a collaborative approach are needed if better places are to be created. The guide is relevant to all aspects of the built environment, including the design of buildings and spaces, landscapes and transport systems.</p>		<p>The DPD should draw on the principles and process of urban design set out in this guide. Given the amount of redevelopment going on in Brent this document is considered to be important.</p>
24. DCLG Neighbourhood Renewal Unit A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan; 2001.	<p>Vision: within 10 to 20 years, no-one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live. People on low incomes should not have to suffer conditions and services that are failing, and so different from what the rest of the population receives.</p> <p>Two long-term goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In all the poorest neighbourhoods, to have common goals of lower worklessness and crime, and better health, skills, housing and physical environment. • To narrow the gap on these measures between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country. 		<p>The DPD should reflect this strategy and the commitment to neighbourhood renewal and an end to disadvantage should provide an underlying goal for the DPD.</p>
25. Communities Plan (Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future); 2003.	<p>The Communities Plan establishes a long-term programme of action for delivering sustainable communities in England.</p> <p>It aims to tackle housing supply issues in the South East; low demand in other parts of the country; and the quality of public spaces. It marks a step change in policies for delivering sustainable communities for all. The main elements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable communities. • Step change in housing supply. • New growth areas. • Decent homes; including the need to bring council homes up to a decent standard. 	<p>It is important the DPD do not conflict with this national programme of action.</p>	<p>The DPD should be aware of the elements of the Communities Plan and follow the relevant principles.</p>

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
National			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the local environment; particularly the public realm. 		
26. Guidance on Tall Buildings; 2003 CABE and English Heritage.	The purpose of this guidance is to provide advice and guidance on good practice in relation to tall buildings in the planning process and to highlight other related issues which need to be taken into account. Local authorities should use it as a basis for their own consideration of such projects and as a starting point when preparing local policies.		Where appropriate the DPD should follow guidance on tall buildings and incorporate into principles / objectives.
27. UK Climate Change Programme, 2006 (Defra)	The Climate Change Programme is designed to deliver the UK's Kyoto Protocol target of reducing emissions of the basket of six greenhouse gases by 12.5 per cent below base year levels over the commitment period 2008-2012, and move the UK close to the domestic goal to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20 per cent below 1990 levels by 2010. It also aims to put the UK on a path to cutting carbon dioxide emissions by some 60 per cent by about 2050, with real progress by 2020.		The DPD can play a significant role in reducing CO2 emissions. The DPD should be aware of, and contribute to meeting UK's commitment.
28. Decent homes and decent communities, DCLG, 2006	The government has a target to ensure that, social homes meet minimum standards of decency, and that 70 per cent of vulnerable households in the private sector have decent homes.		DPD should take these targets into account.
29. DCLG, Planning and access for disabled people: a good practice guide	This guide encourages local planning authorities and developers to consider access for disabled people, and stresses the importance of early consultation with disabled people, when formulating development plans and preparing planning applications.	The guide explains the relevant legislation and policy frameworks, shows how local planning authorities can put in place appropriate planning policies and development control processes, and suggests ways in which these can be implemented and enforced effectively	Access for disabled people should be taken into account in DPD.
30. DCLG, Safer Places, the Planning System and Crime Prevention, 2004	This is a good practice guide for planners, architects and developers to make streets, homes, and parks safer places. The guide encourages greater attention to crime prevention principles and to the attributes of safer places, and is intended as a starting point for planners.		DPD should include policies that help to reduce crime through better planning.
31. DCLG, Diversity and Equality in Planning, A good practice guide, 2005	This guide encourages planners to take diversity into account in their planning documents. It intends to help planners to better understand the important role that planning can play in supporting the Government's commitment to tackling disadvantage by reviving the most deprived neighbourhoods, reducing social exclusion, and supporting society's most vulnerable groups		DPD should take this guide into account.
32. DCLG, The Planning Response to Climate Change, advice on better practice, 2004	This document provides advice on the planning response to climate change. It is recognised that planning practice on adaptation to climate change impacts is still developing. It is hoped that the advice will stimulate planners to look for new strategies to respond to the changing climate in partnership with developers and the wider community.		DPD should include policies to adapt to climate change

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
National			
33. DCLG, Community Involvement in Planning: the Government's Objectives, 2004	This paper sets out the Government's general objectives for community involvement in planning		DPD should take this paper into account.
34. Environment Agency, Water Resources for the future: a strategy for England and Wales, 2001 and Annual Review 2005	This document is the Agency's water resources strategy for England and Wales. It provides the principles and a broad overview of the actions that the Agency considers necessary to manage water resources over the next 25 years The EA publishes annual reviews on the progress of the strategy.		DPD should include measures to reduce water demand and conserve water resources
35. DTI Energy white paper: our energy future: creating a low carbon economy, 2003	This white paper defines a long-term strategic vision for energy policy combining environmental, security of supply, competitiveness and social goals. It looks ahead to 2050 to set the overall context. It also sets out the challenges faced on the environment, the decline of indigenous energy supplies and the need to update energy infrastructure and the policies we need to pursue over the next twenty years and beyond to meet these challenges.		DPD should include measures to reduce energy consumption
36. Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2004) Review of heritage protection: the way forward	This Review contains a summary of responses to the consultation paper "Protecting our historic environment: Making the system work better" which set out ideas for improving the system for protecting buildings, above and below ground archaeology and other land-based heritage assets. It also sets out a series of measures by which the Government aims to achieve effective and lasting reform.		DPD should take this review into account.
37. Department of Health (2004) Choosing Health White Paper	This white paper sets out the key principles for supporting the public to make healthier and more informed choices in regards to their health. The Government will provide information and practical support to get people motivated and improve emotional wellbeing and access to services so that healthy choices are easier to make.		DPD should take this white paper into account and include policies that help people achieve a healthy lifestyle
38. English Heritage, Transport and the Historic Environment, 2004	This policy statement sets out the broad principles of English Heritage's vision for long-term national transport policy. Its main objectives are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To encourage a switch to less damaging forms of transport and promote planning policies that help to reduce the need to travel • To seek imaginative solutions to transport problems including the solutions offered by different forms of transport • To ensure that transport appraisal properly assesses the impacts on the historic environment on an appropriate level of detail 		DPD should include policies that seek to reduce the need to travel and encourage the use of means of transport other than the car.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
National			
39. English Heritage, Regeneration and the Historic Environment, 2005	Mixed use, high-density, human-scale historic neighbourhoods are a model for new sustainable communities' This guidance provides a checklist for successful historic environment regeneration schemes.		DPD policies should aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment
40. English Heritage, Countryside Agency, English Nature and Environment Agency, Environmental quality in Spatial Planning, Incorporating the natural, built and historic environment, and rural issues in plans and strategies, 2005	This is a joint guidance document in achieving environmental quality through spatial planning. It updates previous documents produced by each organisation, and complements recent guidance produced by ODPM following the publication of PPS11 (Regional Spatial Strategies) and PPS12 (Local Development Frameworks).	Included are comprehensive checklists to scope, proof and check both Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional Studies, and Local Development Frameworks. These are intended to be comprehensive in terms of what the four agencies would like to see included in plans and strategies.	DPD should take this guidance document into account
41. Making Design Policy Work: how to deliver good design through your local development framework CABE, June 2005	This guidance sets out five fundamental factors for good local design policies. It explains where different types of policy can fit into the different local development plan documents, and suggests key objectives for a range of design policies from landscaping to architecture		Good design should be integrated in DPD

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
PPGs and PPSs			
42. DCLG PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development Replaces PPG1.	Seeks to ensure that sustainable development (as defined in 1999 UK strategy <i>A Better Quality of Life</i>) is the core principle underpinning planning. As such it sets a high level context for all community related plans.	Potential constraint / conflict in meeting social / housing objectives of DPD while ensuring effective environmental protection / natural resource use – the DPD should be aware of and account for this risk.	The DPD should reflect these high level aims for sustainable communities
43. DCLG PPG3: Housing. Note should also be made of the recent ODPM guide: Better places to live by design: a companion guide to PPG3 (2004).	This PPG provides guidance on a range of issues relating to the provision of housing.		Development principles should seek to realise / complement the aims of this national PPG. As this represents national guidance on housing provision / planning – the DPD should be aware of and reflect these guidelines in its scope and principles.
44. DCLG PPG4: Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms.	Provides guidance on a range of issues relating to industrial and commercial development and small firms. It seeks to put increased emphasis on the need for development plans to take account of both the locational demands of business and wider environmental objectives.		The DPD should draw on this detailed guidance.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
PPGs and PPSs			
45. DCLG PPS6: Planning for Town Centres.	Sets out the Government's broad policy objectives relevant to planning for town centres in England; and its proposed planning policies that will help deliver these objectives. These policies are firmly based on the principles of sustainable development and the need to sustain and enhance the role of town centres for the benefit of all. Also provides guidance on how to manage town centres. The Government's key objective for town centres is to promote vital and viable city; town and other centres.	Note that regeneration is not a sufficient reason for retail proposals out of centres in draft PPS6.	The DPD should reflect and be aware of these aims.
46. DCLG PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.	This draft PPS sets out the Government's broad policy objectives in relation to biodiversity and geological conservation in England, and its proposed planning policies that will help deliver these objectives. These policies are firmly based on the principles set out in " <i>Working with the grain of nature - a biodiversity strategy for England</i> " (Defra 2002). The broad aim of the England strategy is that planning, construction, development and regeneration should have minimal impacts on biodiversity and enhance it wherever possible.	The DPD should not conflict with this aims and objectives of this PPS, which may place certain constraints on development.	The DPD should seek to achieve these objectives and must adhere to the principles set out. These are relevant given the pressure and scarcity of habitat and greenspace within the borough.
47. DCLG PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management.	Regional planning bodies and planning authorities should prepare and deliver planning strategies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, addressing waste as a resource and looking to disposal as the last option but one which must be adequately catered for; • enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of their communities; • help implement the national waste strategy, and supporting targets, and are consistent with obligations required under European legislation; • help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment and ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its place of production; • reflect the concerns and interests of local communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and business and encourage competitiveness; • protect green belts but recognise the particular locational needs of some types of waste management and that the wider environmental and economic benefits of sustainable waste management are material considerations that should be given significant weight in determining whether proposals should be given planning permission; • ensure the layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management. 		Mainly relevant for West London waste DPD, but DPD should take this guidance into account where relevant

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
PPGs and PPSs			
48. DCLG PPS12: Local Development Frameworks.	PPS12 sets out the Government's policy on the preparation of local development documents which will comprise the local development framework. The local development framework is a 'portfolio' of documents, the local development documents which collectively delivers the spatial planning strategy for the local planning authority's area.		Fundamentally linked to procedures and requirements of developing the DPD.
49. DCLG PPG13: Transport.	Key objectives are to integrate planning and transport at the national; regional; strategic and local level to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and for moving freight. Promote accessibility to jobs; shopping; leisure facilities and services by public transport; walking and cycling; and reduce the need to travel; especially by car. 	Key focus should be on linking accessibility (which is aim of sustainable communities) to transport – by maximising opportunities and ease of access through non-motorised transport. Synergistic with objectives to reduce social exclusion and income disparities. The link between movement; transport and crime / fear of crime reduction is important for Brent.	The DPD principles/objectives should reflect these objectives. Access to public transport; priority of people over traffic and walking and cycling particularly relevant to Brent.
50. DCLG PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment.	Provides a full statement of Government policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings; conservation areas; and other elements of the historic environment. It explains the role of the planning system in their protection.		The protection of the historic environment will need to be taken fully into account both in the formulation of authorities' planning policies and in development control.
51. DCLG PPG16: Archaeology and Planning.	Sets out national policy on archaeological remains on land; and how they should be preserved or recorded both in an urban setting and in the countryside. It gives advice on the handling of archaeological remains and discoveries under the development plan and control systems; including the weight to be given to them in planning decisions and the use of planning conditions.		Provides advice on archaeology and planning which should be adhered to in the DPD.
52. DCLG PPG17: Planning for Open Space; Sport and Recreation.	Open spaces and recreational facilities are important contributing factors in making an area somewhere people want to live and work; and can also contribute to local identity and community cohesion.	Improved open spaces is an important issue for Brent.	All elements of the DPD should be consistent with the protection; enhancement and inter-connection of open spaces. These aims should be incorporated into the DPD principles.
53. DCLG PPS22: Renewable Energy and supporting guidance.	This PPS reflects the Government's key energy objective to put the UK on a path to cut its carbon dioxide emissions by some 60% by 2050, with real progress by 2020, and to maintain reliable and competitive energy supplies. The Government has also set a target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010 and the Energy White Paper set out the aspiration to double that figure to 20% by 2020	Consider the inclusion of specific principles / policies in relevant DPD relating to renewable energy provision.	The DPD should adhere to principles set out in this PPS and consider them in meeting DPD objectives
54. DCLG PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control	Appendix A contains a number of matters which should be considered in the preparation of development plan documents and may also be material in the consideration of individual planning applications where pollution considerations arise.		The DPD should make explicit use of this PPS, and include appropriate policies and proposals for dealing with the pollution, for example in dealing with the contamination and the remediation of land so that it is suitable for the proposed development/use.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
PPGs and PPSs			
55. DCLG PPG24: Planning and Noise.	Outlines guidance for local authorities in England on how to use their planning powers to minimize the adverse impact of noise. Outlines the considerations to be taken into account in determining planning applications for noise-sensitive developments and for those activities; which generate noise; and advises on the use of conditions to minimize the impact of noise.		In a densely populated area with high traffic planning to mitigate against noise impact is of high importance.
56. DCLG PPG25: Development and Flood-risk.	<p>PPG explains how flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process in order to reduce future damage to property and loss of life.</p> <p>It sets out the importance the Government attaches to the management and reduction of flood risk in the land-use planning process; to acting on a precautionary basis and to taking account of climate change.</p> <p>The planning system should ensure that new development is safe and not exposed unnecessarily to flooding by considering flood risk on a catchment-wide basis and; where necessary; across administrative boundaries. It should seek where possible to reduce and certainly not to increase flood risk.</p>		<p>Where flooding is a current or potential issue (given development proposals and climate change impacts) the DPD should reflect this guidance on flood risk.</p> <p>See also comments above relating to Making Space for Water.</p>

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
57. The Mayor's London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London; 2004.	The London Plan sets out strategic planning policies for London. As such the London plan is the key planning document for the capital.		<p>The DPD should be in conformity with the London Plan and should reflect its strategic planning objectives.</p> <p>DPD should also take into account the proposed early and further alterations to the London Plan, especially the criteria based policies. (currently under consultation)</p>
58. Entec UK Sustainability Appraisal of the London Plan, Final Report, April, 2004.	This report sets out the results of the final iteration of the Sustainability Appraisal that was undertaken in November/December of 2003.	Contains a source of useful information on objectives, issues of importance etc.	Note as part of the SA.
59. A Sustainable Development Framework for London. London Sustainable Development Commission; June 2003.	Sets out an overarching framework for sustainable development for the city. Framework consists of a vision; overall objective and framework objectives. These are under four themes: Taking responsibility; developing respect; getting results and managing resources.		This is a key contextual document. The DPD and SA should reflect the vision and objectives of this high-level sustainability document.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
60. The Mayor's Transport Strategy Revision (2004) and Transport Strategy Implementation Targets (2004).	The Transport Strategy supports the aims of the emerging London Plan (the Mayor's Spatial Development Strategy), in promoting London's economic and social development and improving the environment. The Strategy will increase the capacity, reliability, efficiency, quality and integration of London's transport to provide the world class system the Capital needs. The second document adds some targets and reflects changes since the publication of the Mayor's Strategy.	Relevant targets include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic volumes: Achieving zero growth in outer London town centres • Modal shift (New target): TfL and boroughs are to maintain or increase the proportion of personal travel made by means other than car • Walking (New target): TfL and boroughs to achieve an increase of at least 10% in journeys made on foot for person in London between 2001-2015 • Cycling (New target): TfL and boroughs to achieve an increase of at least 80% in cycling in London between 2001-2011 	This Strategy's objectives, policies and proposals are integrated within the London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy). Brent Council is required to produce a Business Plan and LIPs to set out how they will implement this Strategy which need to be reflected in the DPD.
61. Sustaining Success: The Mayor's new Economic Development Strategy.	Central aim is to ensure cross cutting sustainable development themes including health and equality of opportunity are built into economic analyses and proposals. Key goals / investment themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment in infrastructure and places • Investment in people • Investment in knowledge and enterprise • Investment in marketing and promotion 		The DPD should consider the cross cutting issues included in the strategy and incorporate them within development principles.
62. Connecting with London's Nature. The Mayor's Biodiversity Action Plan.	The Biodiversity Strategy provides a strategic framework within which the London Biodiversity Action Plans sit. Action plans will be among the principal means of implementing the Mayor's strategic agenda. Objectives for biodiversity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity for people – to ensure all Londoners have access to wildlife and natural green spaces. • Nature for its own sake – to conserve London's plants and animals and their habitats. • Economic benefits – to ensure the economic benefits of natural green space and greening are fully realised. • Functional benefits – to ensure the city enjoys the functional benefits biodiversity can bring • Sustainable development – biodiversity conservation as an essential element of sustainable development 		The DPD should reflect the objectives included in the BAP. The importance placed on green space in Brent should be explicitly addressed in DPD policy. The DPD should seek to promote the importance of nature / biodiversity.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
63. Design for Biodiversity; 2003. London Development Agency with English Nature; GLA and the London Biodiversity Partnership.	Provides general guidance for developers on biodiversity. Describes drivers and processes and contains case studies of how nature conservation priorities have been achieved in development.	Potential for constrain / conflict between development proposals and habitat / biodiversity – which guidance seeks to limit and mitigate against	Where appropriate direct reference should be made to the planning guidance included in this guide.
64. Souder City: the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy; 2004.	Outlines proposals / strategy to tackle the 'forgotten pollutant' – Noise – and seeks to view it on a similar footing as townscape and landscape. Seeks to lead the way in developing new ways of dealing with city noise; at a time when international pressure is growing to take more action.		The DPD should be proactive in approach to managing ambient noise and reflect the issues and priorities identified in this strategy.
65. Cleaning London's Air; The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy; 2002.	The aim is to improve London's air quality to the point where pollution no longer poses a significant risk to human health. The Strategy sets out policies and proposals to move towards this.		The DPD should be aware of and contribute to the aims of the strategy. Brent Council is required to have regard to this Air Quality Strategy and should ensure that the DPD is in general conformity with it. As road traffic is main source of air pollution in London, consider the role of the DPD in changing transport patterns / modes / use; and in encouraging behaviour which will result in lower emission.
66. Green Light to Clean Power. The Mayor's Energy Strategy; 2004.	The Strategy sets out the Mayor's proposals for change in the way energy is supplied and used within London over the next ten years and beyond. Long-term vision is a sustainable energy system in London by 2050 – with a key target of CO ₂ emissions reductions of more than 60% relative to 2000 values.		This strategy will be important to a number of topics throughout the DPD. Energy efficiency in building and construction; and the encouragement of renewables should be incorporated into the DPD principles and policies.
67. Integrating renewable energy into new developments: toolkit for planners, developers and consultants. The Mayor's London Energy Strategy, 2004	This toolkit will inform a SPG to the London Plan on renewable energy and parts of it are expected to be annexed to the SPG.		This toolkit should inform several DPD policies, for instance those on Sustainable Construction and Climate Change, and be promoted to developers as good practice
68. Rethinking Rubbish in London. The Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy; 2003.	Sets out current and future waste situation in London; and proposes a policy framework to achieve vision initially up to 2005/06 but with longer vision to 2020: "By 2020; municipal waste should no longer compromise London's future as a sustainable city."		This strategy should be reflected in the DPD, although the majority of policies on waste and spatial planning are proposed to be dealt with in a West London waste DPD.
69. London: Cultural Capital – Realising the potential of a world class city. The Mayor's Culture Strategy; 2004.	The Mayor's Culture Strategy has four key objectives; supported by a number of detailed policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellence – to enhance London as a world-class city of culture • Creativity – to promote creativity as central to the success of 	This strategy does make reference to Wembley which is a major site for development with a nationally important cultural development.	The DPD should reflect the importance of culture in its policies. Cultural diversity has been viewed as limited in some areas of Brent. This strategy identifies that the Mayor

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
	<p>London</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access – to ensure that all Londoners have access to culture in the city • Value – to ensure that all London gets the best value out of its cultural resources <p>Underpinning each of these objectives is the principle of diversity.</p>		wishes to realise the potential of Wembley as a nationally and internationally significant sports, leisure and business location.
70. London's Warming – The Impacts of Climate Change on London, Technical Report, 2002.	This study aimed to provide an overview of the existing information on the impacts of climate change on the environment and the economy and, to elucidate the social impacts of climate change largely based on existing reviews, research and monitoring studies within and outside of London. The study findings are discussed in context with existing policies and strategies for London.	Provides advice to local authorities how they can address climate change issues within their plans and strategies.	Contains useful baseline information.
71. London's Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESA), the London Skills Commission.	Contains a number of strategic objectives and priority actions.	The strategic objectives and priorities for action may provide a useful source of further information when addressing employment issues.	Contains useful information.
72. London Development Agency. West London Tourism Strategy and Action Plan (March 2005)	Overarching aim is to deliver the Mayors vision for a strong, well supported tourism industry, by encouraging more London visitors to the west.		The DPD should reflect this document and take on board ways in which to encourage tourism for its economic benefits, but within sustainability limits.
73. The Mayor's Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment. SPG April 2004.	<p>Gives advice on how to promote and achieve an inclusive environment in London. The SPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides detailed guidance on the policies contained in the London Plan regarding the promotion of an inclusive and accessible environment. • Provides LPAs with advice on how to implement these policies • Explains principles of inclusive design and how to apply them • Gives ideas to designers on technical advice and guidance • Gives disabled people and understanding of what to expect from planning in London • Identifies national legislation and policy guidance relevant to an inclusive and accessible environment 		Accessibility is a key issue for Brent. Specific guidance and advice should be drawn upon in preparing the DPD and in subsequent DPDs and SPDs which should make explicit reference to the SPG.
74. The Mayor's Draft SPG on Industrial Capacity, September, 2003	The objectives of this SPG are to supplement and to provide detailed guidance as to how the broad policies of the DLP should manage industrial development capacity		This SPG should be used as a key reference in addressing industrial capacity in the DPD.
75. The Mayor's SPG on Housing 2005	The purpose of this SPG is to give guidance on the application and implementation of policies on affordable housing in the London Plan. It does not set out any new policies; objectives or targets but is designed to help LPAs when reviewing UDPs; LDDs and planning applications.		This SPG should be used as a key reference in defining DPD affordable housing policy / principles, along with the London Plan and its alterations.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
76. Adapting to Climate Change: a checklist for development. Guidance on designing developments in a changing climate, 2005 GLA	Checklist and guidance for new developments to adapt to climate change. The document is mainly aimed at developers but it is expected to be useful for others including planners.		The checklist includes several issues for new developments that are relevant to DPD including flood risk locations, site layout, drainage, water, outdoor spaces and connectivity and should be promoted to developers in the DPD as good practice.
77. General Conformity with the London Plan: Principles and Procedures, GLA, 2006	The purpose of this guidance is to provide information and advice on the implementation on the London Plan through the statutory requirement for LDDs to be in general conformity with the London Plan.		The DPD should be in conformity with the London Plan and should reflect its strategic planning objectives.
78. Water Action Framework Draft	Currently in preparation		Likely to be significant for future DPDs depending on timing
79. Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Draft	Currently in preparation		As above
80. The London Plan, Sub-Regional Development Framework, West London, 2006	The West London Sub Regional Development Framework (SRDF) covers 6 West-London boroughs including Brent. Its purpose is to provide guidance on the implementation of policies in the London Plan.		The document sets out 54 actions designed to achieve implementation of the London Plan and to provide guidance and a check-list of matters that need to be developed at the local level through LDFs.
81. London View Management Framework, Draft SPG, 2005	This draft SPG provides guidance on the policies regarding the protection of strategic views contained in the London Plan.		No strategic views in Brent, but principles may be relevant.
82. London Housing Board (2005) London Housing Strategy 2005-2016	This strategy has been developed with the purpose of aligning the London Housing Strategy with the London Plan and to cover the same time span		This strategy includes a series of targets that should inform DPD policies on 'Meeting housing needs'
83. Sustaining success: the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, 2005	This strategy aims to support the development of London's economy and businesses within the context of fair and sustainable economic development.		This strategy should inform several policies including those under 'Strong local economy' in the DPD.
84. Making London better for all children and young people: the Mayor's children and young people's strategy (2004)	This strategy aims to make London a more child friendly city		This strategy should influence a number of policies included in the DPD as it deals with several relevant issues such as reducing child poverty, improving safety of public transport and open spaces, creating new places for play and making cycling and walking easier
85. GLA Draft SPG Industrial Capacity	This draft SPG supports the implementation of the London Plan's policies on Strategic Employment Locations. It also provides guidance for Boroughs for the enhancement, protection or release of the remaining industrial land		The DPD should take this draft SPG into account , especially when formulating policies related to employment land and industrial development
86. London Assembly, The Blue Ribbon Network, The heart of London 2006	This document revisits the Blue Ribbon Network proposals in the London Plan to see how they can be implemented in order to place the waterways of London at the heart of planning policies	London Boroughs should assess compliance with the Blue Ribbon Network policies of proposed developments close to waterways	The DPD should promote the principles set out in the Blue Ribbon Network document in issues affecting development close to the River Brent and other waterways such as the Grand Union Canal.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
87. Adjoining Borough Strategies and DPD e.g. London Boroughs of Harrow, Ealing, Barnet, Westminster, Kensington and Chelsea, and Hammersmith	See individual strategies and DPD as they emerge.		Consider in relation to impact of policies on adjoining boroughs and the impact of their policies on Brent.
88. LBB Regeneration Action Plan 2004 – 2006.	The Action Plan sets a clear agenda for regeneration in Brent over the next three years, making it clear what activity is being proposed, who will have responsibilities to deliver it and what contribution it will make to our overall Strategic Objectives.		The DPD can play a major role contributing towards regeneration for Brent. The strategic objectives of this plan should be incorporated.
89. LBB Crime, Disorder and Misuse of Drugs Strategy 2005-2008.	Specific objectives and targets include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce crime by 20% in total across the 10 different crime types by March 2008, compared to 2003/04. Fear of crime –to reduce the number of people who feel threatened by crime in their area “a great deal” and “a fair amount” from 66% (in 2004) to 50% in 2007. 		The DPD should consider the role of spatial planning in addressing and responding to the issues and targets contained in this strategy.
90. LBB Council’s Corporate Strategy 2002 – 2006, Building a Better Borough.	Corporate Strategy 2002-06 is built on five cross-cutting themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting children and young people Promoting quality of life and the green agenda Regeneration and priority neighbourhoods Tackling crime and community safety Achieving service excellence. 		The values and issues within this strategy should be incorporated within the overall objectives of the DPD.
91. LBB Community Plan 2003-2008: A Plan for Brent (To be replaced by Brent Community Strategy 2006-2010).	Brent’s first community plan; produced in response to the requirements of the Local Government Act 2000. The plan represents a combined statement of the needs and priorities of local people.		The DPD and SA should consider and reflect where appropriate the priorities of local people for the future of Brent included in this plan.
92. LBB Land Decontamination Strategy (ongoing).	This strategy lays out how Brent will inspect and deal contaminated land. The strategy sets out how the Local Government will fulfil the requirements of the 1995 Environment Act regarding contaminated land.		The DPD should incorporate relevant aspects of this Strategy in seeking the remediation and re-use of contaminated land.
93. LBB Air Quality Action Plan; 2005-2010.	The plan describes what can be done to deal with air quality in Brent. It includes both new measures identified during the development of the plan as well as actions included in national legislation and other plans including the Mayor of London’s. The plan identifies measures to improve air quality across Brent and groups them into a series of categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting cleaner modes of transport 		DPD should take into account the measures included in this plan, particularly in the AQMA, including in policies relating to the number, type, location and design of development.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic reduction and tackling through traffic • Promotion of cleaner fuel technology • Measures concerning local industries • Improving Eco-efficiency of current and future developments, including • properties owned or run by the Council • Actions to be taken corporately, regionally and in liaison with the Mayor 		
94. LBB Parks Strategy 2004 – 2009.	<p>This Strategy sets out a clear policy framework for Brent Parks over the next five years and links to the community strategy process. It also provides a structure to ensure that the wider Council's priorities are achieved. Contains a number of objectives organised under three themes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of parks • Funding • Maintenance 		Open space and parks are of particular importance in Brent and large parts of the borough have a deficiency of open space. This strategy should be referred to when addressing open space policy in the DPD.
95. LBB Biodiversity Action Plan; 2001.	<p>A partnership of local groups and organisations co-ordinated by Brent Parks Service.</p> <p>Lists 6 species and 30 habitats for which action plans have been prepared. Refer to action plan website for full list of species and habitats: http://www.ukbap.org.uk/lbap.aspx?id=394</p>		The DPD should reflect where appropriate the actions and priorities for species and habitats covered by the Biodiversity Action Plan; and be sensitive to biodiversity issues generally.
96. LBB Sport and Physical Activity Strategy 2004 – 2009.	<p>The following factors are identified as being particularly important in the strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting the health benefits of an active lifestyle • Increasing awareness of sports opportunities • Ensuring sports facilities are fit for purpose • Reducing barriers to participation and ensuring equity in sport • Supporting and developing local sports clubs • Increasing sports opportunities for young people 		DPD should incorporate where appropriate the measures included in this strategy, especially those regarding the provision of sport facilities.
97. LBB Playing Pitch Strategy 2003-2008; May 2004.	<p>The Strategy guides the planning and provision of playing fields for the main team sports in Brent up to 2008 and follows sport England guidelines. Includes a detailed analysis of the current state of pitch supply and use. It also predicts future demand – to assess adequacy of current facilities and establishes an action plan for the period up to 2008.</p>	Open space for recreation can play an important role in health; well-being and community spirit.	The DPD should reflect the need for and benefits of playing field and account for future demand as appropriate / relevant.
98. LBB Draft Municipal Waste Strategy – 2006.	<p>Discusses waste management in Brent in the context of national (Waste Strategy 2000) and regional (Mayor's Waste Strategy for London) waste management strategic objectives as well as the 2002 WLWA waste strategy.</p> <p>Brent's Strategy Framework comprises 7 main areas of action</p>		The DPD should reflect these action areas, and seek to avoid any potential conflict with them through its objectives and principles, although the majority of policies on waste and spatial planning are proposed to be dealt with in a West

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
	for the period to 2006: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the performance of existing waste schemes • Extend the Green Box where appropriate • Provide a variant of the Green Box service to estates • Introduce the collection of organic waste for central composting • Establish a Waste Management Site incorporating Recycling Facilities including some bulk storage, Civic Amenity functions, and a base for future Waste Collection Operations. • Carry through procurement of services beyond 2007 • In its role as a WPA ensure that sufficient land resources are available by safeguarding existing waste sites and identifying new sites. In addition to waste covered by this strategy this process needs to take into account all other waste arising in Brent. 		London waste DPD.
99. Action Plan 2001 for a Sustainable Brent (LA 21).	Local Agenda 21 in Brent aims to promote changes in behaviour of all individuals so that we can help improve the environment through everyday practises and the way we go about our everyday lives. The action plan outlines community initiatives and projects in Brent which fulfil sustainability criteria to show how schools, communities, individuals and businesses can promote sustainability and responsible citizenship.		The LIP set out how the borough will implement the Mayor’s Transport Strategy and provides a mechanism for ensuring delivery of well-integrated transport improvements for the borough and for monitoring progress. The DPD should incorporate policies appropriate to spatial planning which support the priorities of the LIP which include safety and security, reducing traffic congestion, improved bus services, accessibility and local area initiatives.
100. LBB Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for Brent (Draft submitted to the Mayor for Approval)	This production of this plan is a statutory requirement under the GLA Act. The Plan will detail the Borough’s policies and strategies with regard to transportation matters.	LIP includes proposals to improve walking routes and crossings, encourage residents to walk more, improve access and accessibility to local services, identify suitable cycle parking sites and improvement of rail and underground access, amongst others.	The DPD should incorporate policies appropriate to spatial planning which support the priorities of the LIP which include safety and security, reducing traffic congestion, improved bus services, accessibility and local area initiatives.
101. LBB A Regeneration Strategy for Brent 2001-2021	Vision: A Brent fully integrated into the city – a single urban Borough which makes a full and positive contribution to the London economy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brent’s communities will enjoy a high quality of life and will be fully able to participate in society. • The Borough will have a reputation for high quality services focussed on tackling and preventing social exclusion. • Unemployment will be below the London average, and everybody will have access to high quality education, health 		Sets the high-level Borough vision and context for the DPD.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
	provision and affordable homes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas where currently deprivation is most concentrated will be physically, socially and economically reconnected with London as a whole. • Brent will provide a home of choice for its diverse populations and businesses. • At the core of Brent will be a landmark international development at Wembley, providing a source of pride, identity, wealth and aspiration for the Borough as a whole. 		
102. Nature Conservation in Brent. London Ecology Unit (2000).	Several parts of the Borough have significant nature conservation value, with many other areas offering great potential for further creation of wildlife habitats. The Council's nature conservation policies in the UDP are based on information contained in the Ecology Handbook No 31, 'A Nature Conservation Strategy for the London Borough of Brent'. Sites of wildlife conservation value are classified by the London Ecology Unit (LEU) as sites of Metropolitan, Borough (Grade I and Grade II) or Local Nature Conservation Importance or sites which form a Wildlife Corridor. Nearly all sites were surveyed. This document is currently being updated.	The Council's current nature conservation policies in the UDP are based on information contained in the Ecology Handbook.	The DPD should reflect the contents of the Ecology Handbook and the updated version and seek opportunities to conserve and enhance existing habitat as well as seek opportunities to create habitat and reduce areas of deficiency.
103. London Borough of Brent Statement of Licensing Policy, 2005	Licensing Act 2003 transfers responsibility of issuing licensing for the sale and supply of alcohol and provision of entertainment and late night refreshments to Local Authorities. The four objectives of this statement are: Prevention of crime and disorder; prevention of public nuisance; public safety; and protection of children from harm		
104. LBB School Organisation Plan 2005-2010	The SOP is the starting point for the School Organisation Committee (SOC) in considering statutory proposals for changes to schools. Purpose of the SOP is to set out clearly how the Local Education Authority (LEA) plans to meet its statutory responsibility to secure sufficient education provision within its area in order to promote higher standards of attainment.		It is important for the DPD to be aware of the SOP findings and principles when developing policies which relate to or could affect schools / education.
105. Brent SPGs and SPDs SPG 01 Making a Planning Application SPG 02 Commenting on a Planning Application SPG 03 Forming an access onto a road SPG 04 Design Statements	Each SPG/SPD will be relevant to different sections or policies within the DPD		Consider existing policy context provided by SPGs/SPDs as drafting different sections or policies within the DPD. Consider need to update them / create SPDs from SPGs to reflect latest policy position and latest good practice.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
<p>Local / Borough</p> <p>SPG 05 Altering and Extending your Home</p> <p>SPG 07 Shop fronts and Shop Signs</p> <p>SPG 08 Advertisements (other than shops)</p> <p>SPG 10 Community Safety - building or refurbishing domestic or commercial properties</p> <p>SPG 12 Access for disabled people: designing for accessibility</p> <p>SPG 13 Layout standards for access roads</p> <p>SPG 14 Childcare facilities</p> <p>SPG 16 Special Standards for Hassop Road</p> <p>SPG 17 Design Guide for New Development</p> <p>SPG 18 Employment Development</p> <p>SPG 19 Sustainable Design, Construction & Pollution Control</p> <p>SPG 20 Buildings in Gardens within Conservation Areas</p> <p>SPG 21 Affordable Housing</p>			
<p>106. LBB Brent Sustainable Design, Construction and Pollution Control, Supplementary Design and Planning Guidance 19 (SPG 19)</p>	<p>The purposes of the guidance are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to developers, on ways of meeting Policies BE12 and other policies in the Adopted UDP, aimed at securing more sustainable development in Brent; • Encourage developers and building professionals to consider sustainability from the earliest stages of the design process, and to go beyond minimum standards; • Raise awareness among local residents, businesses and other Council units, by highlighting the expectations and features of current best practice in sustainable design, construction and pollution control. 		<p>The DPD should include the policy context for the guidance on sustainable design and construction included in the SPD and where appropriate reflect current good practice where it has subsequently evolved, including that proposed by the Mayor's SPG and London Plan alterations.</p>

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
107. LBB Brent Cultural Strategy 2006-2009	The strategy provides an overview of culture in Brent and outlines a series of priorities for the area in the coming years. It also outlines Brent's vision of culture as a key factor in ensuring community cohesion in one of the most diverse boroughs in Europe. The term 'Culture' includes: Arts, creative activity, sports, libraries, museums, heritage, architecture/design of the public realm, children's play, parks and other forms of recreation.		The DPD should seek ways of contributing to achieving the objectives of this strategy.

APPENDIX 5

BASELINE DATA

Social baseline characteristics and trends

Sustainability Objective 1: To reduce poverty and social exclusion (S1)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators			Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Index of Multiple Deprivation</p>	<p>Brent, IMD 2004:</p> <p>Average score: 25.95 (out of 100, where 1 is the least deprived and 100 the most) Rank of average score: 81 (of 354*, where 1 is most deprived) Rank of average rank: 62 Rank of income scale: 22 Rank of employment scale: 39</p> <p>*Local Authorities</p> <p>Note: Rank / score is across each of the 'domains' (indicators): income, employment, health, education, housing and services, crime and living environment</p> <p>(English Indices of Deprivation 2004, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, ODPM, 2004)</p> <p>There are 174 Super Output Areas (SOAs) in Brent, and 14 of those are in the top 10% most deprived in the country. These areas are located in the following wards: Stonebridge, Harlesden, Kensal Green, Willesden Green and Kilburn.</p> <p>Government Office for London http://www.gov-london.gov.uk/boroughinfo/borough.aspx?bid=4</p> <p>See Figure 3 in Section 3 of Part A</p>	<p>IMD 2004:¹</p> <p>Lewisham: 57 Greenwich: 41 Haringey: 13 Newham: 11 Southwark: 17 Lambeth: 23 Tower Hamlets: 4 Hackney: 5 Islington: 6 Ealing: 99</p> <p>(rank of 354 local authorities where 1 is most deprived)</p>	<p>Rank of Av. Score:</p>	<p>Rank of Av. Rank:</p>	<p>IMD 2000 (rank of average ward scores):</p> <p>Brent: 68 (of 354, where 1 is most deprived)</p> <p>Lewisham: 53 Greenwich: 44 Haringey: 20 Newham: 5 Southwark: 14 Lambeth: 42 Tower Hamlets: 1 Hackney: 4 Islington: 11 Ealing: 106</p>		<p>As a Borough and at the aggregated 'rank of average score' level, Brent has a level of deprivation comparable or lower than many comparable inner London boroughs.</p> <p>However income and employment deprivation are an issue at the Borough level (shown by lower rank than average for these scales).</p> <p>Equally the disparities between different wards in the Borough are dramatic. 14 SOAs in Brent are in the top 10% most deprived in the UK.</p> <p>Deprivation, exclusion and inequalities form a key sustainability issue for the Borough.</p>

¹ The choice of deprivation 'domains' (income and employment) and comparator boroughs follows those used by Brent in its 2003 report 'Brent Summary – Key Statistics, Information and Summary', Brent February 2003.

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Average household income</p>	<p>Brent, 2004 Average household income: £21,552 (excluding benefits) (Brent Housing Needs Survey, 2004, cited in AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>Average household income is £21,752 in Brent North and falls to £17,193 in Brent South giving them the respective rankings of 41st and 67th lowest in London's 71 constituencies (Barclays Bank press release, 8/12/2005, cited in AMR 2004-5).</p>	<p>London, 2004</p> <p>Average household income £6,000 less than London average (Brent Housing Needs Survey, 2004, cited in AMR 2004-5)</p>			<p>These data emphasise the intra-borough disparities which exist.</p> <p>The lowest earning ward in the Borough has income levels half of those in the highest earning ward.</p> <p>Disparity in social and economic conditions is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Percentage households with no employed adults with dependent children</p>	<p>Brent, Census 2001: 7.4%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>London, 2001: 6.6%</p> <p>England and Wales, 2001: 4.9%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>London 2004 In 2004, workless households with dependent children comprised 25% of all London's households. This rate has remained constant since 1999. The rate rises to 35% in Inner London and drops to 19% in Outer London. The national average is 15%.</p> <p>(London SD Commission report on London's Quality of Life Indicators, 2005)</p>			<p>The percentage of households with no employed adults with dependent children is higher in Brent than either the London or England averages.</p> <p>Social and economic disparity with other areas is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Percentage of children living in poverty (after housing costs)</p>	<p><i>Brent</i>, 2004-5</p> <p>Data on child poverty are based on a survey that does not allow breakdowns below regional level. However, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has put together local data using another measure – the percentage of children living in families claiming out of work benefits. This does not count all people who are poor, but is a good indicator of how bad poverty is in different areas.</p> <p>There are 4 wards in Brent where the percentage of children on benefits is at least twice the national average of 21%:</p> <p>Stonebridge: 50.8% Harlesden: 45.2% Kilburn: 43.9% Willesden Green: 42.7%</p> <p>(Source: http://www.jrf.org.uk/child-poverty/documents/London.doc)</p>	<p><i>London</i></p> <p>Data from DWP, 2004-2005</p> <p>Percentages of children living on low incomes (below 60% median, or “in poverty”) in 2004/5, net of housing costs.</p> <p>Great Britain: 27%</p> <p>London: 41%</p> <p>The target was to reduce this by a quarter from 1998/9 to 2004/5.</p> <p>In Great Britain, child poverty fell by 16% (from 33% to 27% of children)</p> <p>In London, child poverty rose by 4% (from 39% to 41% of children)</p> <p>Nationally, 21% of children are on families on benefits.</p> <p>Within London:</p> <p>There are 105 local wards where the percentage of children on benefits is at least twice the national average</p> <p>(Source: http://www.jrf.org.uk/child-poverty/documents/London.doc)</p>	<p>The target was to reduce this by a quarter from 1998/9 to 2004/5.</p> <p>In Great Britain, child poverty fell by 16% (from 33% to 27% of children)</p> <p>In London, child poverty rose by 4% (from 39% to 41% of children)</p> <p>(Source: http://www.jrf.org.uk/child-poverty/documents/London.doc)</p>		<p>Although there is no available data on child poverty for Brent, the surrogate measure (% of children on benefits) shows that four wards in Brent have considerable levels of child poverty.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Brent, 2000 Brent Energy Network's spring 2000 Domestic Energy Survey findings have led to an estimate of 18% of borough residents suffering from fuel poverty.</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, January 2001)</p>		<p>UK 2004 Defra estimate the numbers number of households in fuel poverty in the UK as: 1996: 4.3 millions 2002: 1.4 millions = 5.7%</p> <p>(% for 2002 Calculated based on Census 2001 estimates that the number of UK households with residents was 24.5 millions)</p> <p>(Defra Fuel poverty monitoring indicators, 2004. http://www.dti.gov.uk/energy/consumers/fuel_poverty/monitoringindicators2004.pdf)</p>		<p>UK Eradicating fuel poverty by 2016</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/energy/fuelpov/pdf/fuelpovstrat-4thannualreport.pdf</p>	<p>Although percentage figure for UK is calculated using data from different sources, and cannot therefore be deemed accurate, it is likely to be within the correct order of magnitude.</p> <p>In 2000 the level of fuel poverty was considerably above the national average.</p>

Sustainability Objective 2: To improve the health of the population (S2)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Self assessment of health over last 12 months</p>	<p>Brent, Census 2001: Good: 70% Fairly good: 21.3% Not good: 8.6%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>England and Wales, 2001 Good: 68.6% Fairly good: 22% Not good: 9.2%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>			<p>Brent levels are comparable with National.</p>
<p>Perception of factors impacting on health</p>	<p>Brent, 2002 Residents identifying factors as having bad effect on health or quality of life: Crime: 32% Violent crime: 23% Road traffic: 20% Environmental pollution: 19% Drug problems (in area): 16%</p> <p>(Living in Brent 2002 a Representative View. A MORI study for Brent Borough Council)</p>				<p>High incidence and fear of crime is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Participation in sport (excludes walking)</p>	<p>Borough level data not identifies</p>	<p>2002: London: 44%</p> <p>North East: 37% North West: 41% Yorks and Humber: 41% East midlands: 42% West midlands: 39% East of England: 45% South East England: 46% South West: 50%</p> <p>(Sport England Research Briefing Note: Participation in Sport 2002)</p>	<p>1996: London: 45%</p> <p>North East: 41% North West: 47% Yorks and Humber: 43% East midlands: 44% West midlands: 42% East of England: 51% South East England: 50% South West: 46%</p>	<p>England</p> <p>70% target by 2020 (http://www.shu.ac.uk/cgi-bin/news_full.pl?id_num=PR561&db=04)</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Number of sports facilities by type</p>	<p>Brent</p> <p>Indoor sports: Vale Farm Sports Centre – 25m pool and teaching pool, 5 badminton courts/sports hall, squash courts, dojo and meeting rooms. Council owned: Charteris Sports Centre – 3 badminton courts, weight / fitness area. Bridge Park Community Leisure Centre – 5 badminton courts/sports hall, dance studio, fitness studio / weights room. Willesden Sports Centre – under renovation.</p> <p>Source: A Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity in Brent</p>				

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Access to public open spaces	<p>Brent 2001 40% of Brent's domestic properties are in <i>open space deficiency areas</i>:</p> <p>These are residential areas more than 400 metres from a public open space of over 2 hectares.</p> <p>Spatial inequality affects access to public open spaces, with large areas such as Fryent Country Park and the Welsh Harp in the north of Brent while southern areas have insufficient land for recreation and sport (AMR 2004-5).</p> <p>See Figure 6 in Section 3 (Part A) for areas of open space deficiency.</p>				<p>Though no comparator data has been identified a figure of 40% is considered to be relatively high.</p> <p>Quality of access to open spaces and parks is a key sustainability issue.</p> <p>There are also disparities between north and south Brent.</p>
Main mode of travel to work	<p>Brent, 2001: Underground: 26% Train: 6% Bus: 13% Walk: 6% Car: 34% Other: 6%</p> <p>(Brent Summary Key Statistics, February 2003)</p>	<p>London, 2001: Underground: 10% Train: 7% Bus: 18% Walk/cycle: 23% Car/taxi: 42%</p> <p>(Transport for London Statistics: http://www.transportforlondon.gov.uk/tfl)</p>	<p>Brent, 1991: Underground: 25% Train: 4.5% Bus: 12.5% Walk: 9% Car: 36% Other: 6%</p>	<p>The London Cycling Action Plan: 80% increase in cycling levels in the Capital by 2010 and a 200% increase by 2020, compared to cycling levels in 2000.</p> <p>(Brent Draft LIP of the Mayor's Transport Strategy)</p>	<p>Relatively high use and dependence on public transport, and particularly underground.</p> <p>Low car use is a positive factor against most sustainability criteria, however ensuring adequate access to public transport and ease of movement is a key sustainability issue.</p>
Health inequalities	<p>Male life expectancy increases by each northward Bakerloo line station. Northwick Park male residents have 10 extra years compared with Harlesden. (Brent Primary Care Trust, 2004 cited in AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>'Health Profile for Brent 2006' : (comparison with England)</p>	<p>Life expectancy for males is close to English average and higher for women. There are fewer deaths from smoking and cancers. More infant deaths, more road injuries. More people recorded with diabetes. Alcohol related hospital stays below average. Children's tooth decay more common.</p> <p>Life expectancy significantly lower than the English average in two wards in the South.</p> <p>http://www.communityhealthprofiles.info/profiles/00AE-HP.pdf</p>			

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Access to GP or primary care professional	<p><i>Brent</i> 2002/03 Practices with appointment systems in place to see a GP: 92.9%</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Practices with an appointment to see a primary care professional within 1 working day: 57.1% Practices with an appointment to see a GP within 2 working days: 73.8% Practices with an appointment system in place to see a primary care professional: 90.5% Practices participating in Primary Care Access Survey: 53% <p>Brent PCT online: http://www.brentpct.org/html/Publications_959.htm</p> <p>Figure 4 (Section 3, Part A) illustrates that in some areas of Brent there are a very large number of households served per GP.</p>		<p><i>Brent</i> 2000-2004 Net increase of 1930m² floorspace in health facilities 2000 – 2004; Net decrease of 14,750m² hospital space 2000 – 2004</p> <p>Brent PCT online: http://www.brentpct.org/html/Publications_959.htm</p>	<p>Targets from Brent PCT (indicator numbers from column 2):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 100% 90% 90% 100% 	

Sustainability Objective 3: To improve the education and skills of the population (S3)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Secondary: % Children obtaining at least 5 GCSEs at grades A* - C	<p><i>Brent LEA</i> average, 2005: Level 2, 5 or more grades A*-C: 57.4%</p> <p>DfES: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performance/tables</p> <p>Refer to maps 4 and 5</p>	<p><i>England</i> average, 2005 Level 2, 5 or more grades A*-C: 56.3%</p>	<p><i>Brent</i>, 2001 Level 2: 49.7%</p> <p><i>England</i>, 2001 Level 2: 51.6%</p>		<p>Educational attainment at Level 2 / GCSE level are comparable with national averages.</p>
Primary: Key Stage 2 performance (% achieving level 4+)	<p><i>Brent LEA</i> average, 2005: English: 78% Maths: 73% Science: 79%</p> <p>DfES: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performance/tables</p>	<p><i>England</i> average, 2005 English: 79% Maths: 75% Science: 86%</p>	<p><i>Brent</i>, 2002 English: 74.9% Maths: 76% Science: 85.5%</p> <p><i>England</i>, 2002 English: 75% Maths: 73% Science: 86%</p>		<p>As above except in Science where the average for 2005 is lower than the national average and the 2002 Brent average.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Enrolments on adult education courses per 1000 population</p>	<p>Brent, 1999-2000 38.5</p> <p>(Nomis Labour Market Profile for Brent. www.nomisweb.co.uk, accessed: April 2005)</p>	<p>London, 1999-2000 72</p> <p>National, 1999-2000 61</p>	<p>Brent 1998-99: 42 1997-98: 47</p> <p>London 1998-99: 62 1997-98: 61</p>		<p>The percentage taking part in adult education is well below London and national averages and has fallen in the Borough since 1997.</p> <p>Educational attainment is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Education (NVQ equivalent) qualifications of working age residents</p>	<p>Brent 2005 (Jan-Dec) NVQ4+: 28.3% NVQ3+: 44.4% NVQ2+: 55.8% NVQ1+: 61.6% Other: 27.3%</p> <p>No Qualifications: 13.4%</p> <p>(Nomis Labour Market Profile for Brent. www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p> <p>See Figures 7 and 8 (Section 3, Part A)</p>	<p>London, 2005 (Jan-Dec) NVQ4+: 33.3% NVQ3+: 46.7% NVQ2+: 59.9% NVQ1+: 70.4% Other: 16.4% No Qualifications: 14.3%</p> <p>Great Britain, 2005 (Jan-Dec) NVQ4+: 26.5% NVQ3+: 44.4% NVQ2+: 62.9% NVQ1+: 77.2% Other: 8.8% No Qualifications: 14.3%</p>	<p>Brent 2003-04 NVQ4+: 26.0% NVQ3+: 37.4% NVQ2+: 48% NVQ1+: 56.5% Other: 27.3%</p> <p>No Qualifications: 16.2%</p> <p>London, 2003-04 NVQ4+: 30.8% NVQ3+: 45% NVQ2+: 59% NVQ1+: 69.7% Other: 16.4% No Qualifications: 13.9%</p> <p>Great Britain, 2003-04 NVQ4+: 25.2% NVQ3+: 43.1% NVQ2+: 61.5% NVQ1+: 76% Other: 8.8% No Qualifications: 15.1%</p>		<p>At higher NVQ levels (3 and 4) Brent data is comparable with London and GB.</p> <p>However at lower NVQ levels and particularly 1, attainment levels are relatively low.</p> <p>The percentage of people with no qualifications is slightly lower than the London and Great Britain averages.</p> <p>Educational attainment is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments																								
Access to secondary schools. Secondary schools capacity	<p>Brent is a net exporter of statutory school age pupils: in March 2003, 3172 pupils:</p> <p>4660 pupils living outside the authority attended Brent schools 7832 Brent residents attended schools outside the borough.</p> <p>Existing capacity: 7.9% (5.9% when schools over capacity are taken into account)</p> <p>(Brent Schools Organisation Plan 2003-2008)</p>	<p>Forecast growth 2000-2005 and surplus / deficit of 11-16 places in 2005 – adjacent boroughs</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Growth:</th> <th>Surplus / deficit of places:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Barnet</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>-559</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Camden</td> <td>2.5%</td> <td>-163</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Westminster</td> <td>8.1%</td> <td>-164</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kensington</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>-256</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hammersmith</td> <td>6.9%</td> <td>+65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ealing</td> <td>9.2%</td> <td>-250</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Harrow</td> <td>2.2%</td> <td>+349</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Growth:	Surplus / deficit of places:	Barnet	5.2%	-559	Camden	2.5%	-163	Westminster	8.1%	-164	Kensington	9.9%	-256	Hammersmith	6.9%	+65	Ealing	9.2%	-250	Harrow	2.2%	+349			There is a forecast deficit in adjacent borough's schools. The projected shortfall of school places is a key sustainability issue.
	Growth:	Surplus / deficit of places:																											
Barnet	5.2%	-559																											
Camden	2.5%	-163																											
Westminster	8.1%	-164																											
Kensington	9.9%	-256																											
Hammersmith	6.9%	+65																											
Ealing	9.2%	-250																											
Harrow	2.2%	+349																											
Primary school capacity	<p>Brent Primary school capacity: 2626 11% capacity</p> <p>(Brent Schools Organisation Plan 2003-2008)</p>																												
Access to libraries	No data identified. A map of library locations is available, but does not identify ease or otherwise of access and use.																												

Sustainability Objective 4: To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home (S4)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Population Size and Growth	<p>Brent, 2004</p> <p>All people: 267,700 Males: 134,300 Females: 133,400</p> <p>(Nomis Labour Market Profile for Brent. www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>		<p>Brent, 2001 The 2001 Census showed that the population of Brent increased for the first time in 50 years. Increasing by 8.4% from a population of 243,025 in 1991 to 263,466 in 2001.</p> <p>The Census 2001, a Profile for Brent</p>		<p>If population increase trends continue this will mean increased pressure on existing facilities and services such as schools, health and transport.</p> <p>Provision of and access to essential services and amenities is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Population density: people per hectare	<p>Brent, 2004 = 61 persons per hectare.</p> <p>This may be a misleading indicator at ward level due to distribution of park-land / open space.</p>	<p>Outer London = 35 persons per hectare Inner London = 78 persons per hectare.</p>	<p>Brent = 55 people per hectare in 1991 (AMR 2004-5)</p>		
Age structure: population by age group	<p>Brent, 2001(%)s 0 to 4: 6.19% 5 to 15: 13.61% 16 to 19: 5.07% 20 to 44: 43.96% 45 to 64: 19.69% 65 and over: 11.48%</p> <p>Brent's average age at the time of the 2001 Census was 35.4</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>The 'age pyramid' of Brent has been included in Section 3, Part A (Figure 9)</p>	<p>London 2001 0 to 4: 6.67% 5 to 15: 13.53% 16 to 19: 4.66% 20 to 44: 42.72% 45 to 64: 20% 65 and over: 12.43%</p> <p>The average age in England and Wales at the time of the 2001 census was 38.6</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>Brent, 1991 0 to 4: 6.8% 5 to 9: 6.5% 10 to 14: 6.0% 15 to 19: 6.0% 20 to 24: 9.7% 25 to 29: 10.9% 30 to 34: 8.5% 35 to 39: 6.9% 40 to 44: 6.3% 45 to 49: 5.5% 50 to 54: 5.4% 55 to 59: 5.0% 60 to 64: 4.4% 65 and over: 9.4%</p>		Comparable with London averages. Brent has slightly higher number in the 20-44 age group.
Population by ethnic group	<p>Brent, 2001: White: 45.27% Mixed: 3.72% Asian/Asian British: 27.73% Black/Black British: 19.86% Chinese/other: 3.41%</p> <p>Based on the 2001 Census, 5,633 (2.1%) Brent residents have moved into the borough from outside the UK, this is the second highest figure out of all the Outer London Boroughs.</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>See a graphical representation of these figures in Section 3, Part A (Figure 10)</p>	<p>London, 2001: White: 71.15% Mixed: 3.15% Asian/Asian British: 12.08% Black/Black British: 10.92% Chinese/other: 2.69%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>Brent, 1991 White: 50.7% Mixed: NA Asian/Asian British: 21.6% Black/Black British: 15.1% Chinese/other: 3.8%</p>		Brents' diversity represents a cultural / community asset.

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Average house prices by type</p>	<p>Brent, April- June 2006 Detached: £557,788 Semi: £363,586 Terraced: £311,737 Flat: £205,757</p> <p>All properties: £280,803</p> <p>(Land Registry – http://www.landreg.gov.uk/propertyprice/in teractive)</p>	<p>Greater London, April- June 2006 Detached: £600,218 Semi: £348,620 Terraced: £336,077 Flat: £270,146</p> <p>All properties: £317,678</p> <p>(Land Registry)</p> <p>England and Wales, April- June 2006 All properties: 199,184</p> <p>(Land Registry)</p>			<p>In common with London averages, house prices in Brent are considerably higher than the England and Wales average.</p> <p>The relative (to incomes) cost of housing is a major issue for the Borough and the lack of affordable housing is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Affordability of housing: Ratio of average house price to gross household income</p>	<p>Brent, 2003: 6.02 (Affordability differences by area for working households buying their homes, 2003 update. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2003: http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/024.asp)</p> <p>Brent 2005 Between 1999-2004 household incomes rose by 8.5% whilst house prices have risen by 300% in the last decade.</p> <p>(Brent Housing Strategy Statement 2005)</p>	<p>England average: 4.11 London average: 4.69</p> <p>Lewisham: 4.81 Greenwich: 3.98 Haringey: 4.42 Newham: 5.30 Southwark: 5.41 Lambeth: 4.41 Tower Hamlets: 4.87 Hackney: 5.02 Islington: 5.28 Ealing: 5.34</p> <p>In July 2003 the average house price in London was £241,818 – some 45% more than the national average and an increase of 9.4% over the previous year.</p> <p>(London Key Facts, LGA 2004)</p>			<p>As above</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Housing stock by tenure</p>	<p>Brent 2001 Owner occupied: 55.9% Rented from Council: 10.6% Rented HA / RSL: 13.3% Rented private: 17.0% Other rented: 3.1% (All rented=44.1%)</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>Within the priority neighbourhoods of South Kilburn, St Raphaels/Brentfield, Roundwood, Church End, Stonebridge and Harlesden under a third of residents own their own homes compared to a Borough average of around 55%.</p> <p>(Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021)</p> <p>For maps showing tenure in the Borough see Figures 11, 12 and 13 in Section 3 of Part A.</p>	<p>Outer London 2001 Owner occupied: 68% Rented from Council: 11.6% Rented HA / RSL: 6.6% Rented private: 11.3% Other: 2.5%</p> <p>Greater London 2001 Owner occupied: 56.6% Rented from Council: 17.1% Rented HA / RSL: 9.1% Rented private: 14.3% Other: 2.9%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>Brent 1991 Owner occupied: 57.7% Rented from Council: 17.6% Rented HA / RSL: 7.2% Rented private: 17.5% Other rented: NA (All rented=42.3%)</p>		<p>Borough levels of owner occupation lower than London averages. However large disparity exists within borough: in certain wards social housing / renting is predominant form of tenure.</p> <p>Poor housing conditions, lack of affordable housing and overcrowding, particularly in southern wards is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Housing / dwelling type</p>	<p>Brent 2001 Detached: 6.47% Semi: 27.6% Terrace: 18.87% Flat : 46.85% Temporary: 0.12%</p> <p>Note: 'flat' includes purpose built, converted and flats in commercial buildings.</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>	<p>Outer London 2001 Detached: 8.81% Semi: 28.24% Terrace: 29.27% Flat : 33.55% Temporary: 0.11%</p> <p>Greater London 2001 Detached: 6.04% Semi: 19.13% Terrace: 25.93% Flat : 48.8% Temporary: 0.11%</p>			<p>-</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Household Size: No of people living in property</p>	<p>Brent 2001 Average size: 2.61 Rooms / h-hold: 4.63 H-holds with occupancy ratio –1 or less: 23.95%</p> <p>Note: an occupancy ratio of –1 implies there is one room too few and that there is overcrowding in the household.</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>Figure 12 in Section 3 of Part A shows average household sizes by ward.</p>	<p>Outer London 2001 Average size: 2.43 Rooms / h-hold: 4.99 H-holds with occupancy ratio –1 or less: 12.35%</p> <p>Greater London 2001 Average size: 2.35 Rooms / h-hold: 4.68 H-holds with occupancy ratio –1 or less: 17.32%</p> <p>Brent has the third highest household size in England and Wales and second highest level of overcrowding in London.</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>			<p>Household sizes and overcrowding levels are higher than London averages, and both important issues.</p>
<p>Household composition</p>	<p>Brent 2001 Single person head: 29% Married person head: 29.2% Single pensioner: 10.9% All pensioner h-hold: 16.1% Lone parents: 12.8% H-holds dependent children: 33%</p> <p>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p>		<p>Brent 1991 Single person head: 30.2% Married person head: 48.9% Single pensioner: 11.9% All pensioner h-hold: 18.2% Lone parents: 5.8% H-holds dependent children: 31.2%</p>		<p>There has been a marked fall in the number of married person headed households.</p> <p>May be due to a number of demographic factors, however changing household needs should be accounted for in SA and DPD.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Condition of housing stock: Unfit dwellings by tenure</p>	<p>Brent, 2001 Local authority: 2.7% Housing assoc: 3.8% Private: 15% Total: 12%</p> <p>London Divided: Income inequality and poverty in the capital. GLA, November 2002</p> <p>Brent, 2001 15.9% of dwellings are classified as unfit for habitation whilst a further 19.1% are deemed to be in a very poor state of repair.</p> <p>(Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021)</p>	<p>Neighbouring Boroughs, 2001</p> <p>Barnet: Local authority: 0.2% Housing assoc: 0% Private: 5.5% Total: 4.8%</p> <p>Camden: Local authority: 2.6% Housing assoc: 7.8% Private: 17.3% Total: 11.9%</p> <p>Harrow: Local authority: 1.3% Housing assoc: 0% Private: 4.0% Total: 3.7%</p> <p>Ealing: Local authority: 2.0% Housing assoc: 1.7% Private: 6.0% Total: 5.2%</p> <p>London Divided: Income inequality and poverty in the capital. GLA, November 2002</p>			<p>Poor housing conditions, lack of affordable housing and overcrowding, particularly in southern wards.</p>
<p>Additional home provision, new home completions (UDP Indicator)</p>	<p>Brent 1997-2004</p> <p>Completed housing and additional housing: 4,087 new self-contained homes 1,558 new non self-contained homes 720 formerly vacant dwellings Total: 6,365 (AMR 2004-2005)</p>			<p>Current UDP target 1997-2016: Provision of at least 13,510 additional homes, including 9,650 self contained dwellings</p>	<p>As above</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Affordable housing provision	<p>Brent 1997-2004 2091 self-contained dwellings 710 non- self contained homes 2876 total additional homes</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>It is estimated that there is a shortfall of affordable housing in the Borough of 3,382 homes per year, which represents a total of 16,910 dwellings to 2010. (Brent Housing Strategy Statement 2005)</p>			UDP Target: 4800 affordable home completions 1997-2016	As above
Vacant homes	<p>Brent, 2003 Housing Service indicated a total of 4,272 empty homes in 2003, of which 3,304 had been empty for longer than six months.</p> <p>(UDP Annual Monitoring Report 2004)</p>				As above
% of housing built on previously developed land (UDP Indicator)	<p>Brent 2003 - 2005 2003-2004 fiscal year return: 99.56% 2004-2005 fiscal year return: 100%</p>			UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010	
Homelessness Acceptances	<p>Brent 2003/04 Decisions: 2666 Acceptances: 933</p> <p>(Brent Affordable Housing Development Team, RSL Key Facts, April 2004)</p>		<p>Brent 2002/03 Decisions: 2524 Acceptances: 1085</p> <p>Brent 2000/02 Decisions: 2539 Acceptances: 1263</p>		

Sustainability Objective 5: To provide everybody with good quality surroundings (S5)

Also refer to Objective 13: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
% Vacant Floorspace in Primary Shopping Frontages by ward	<p>Brent 2003 Wembley: 8.5% Kilburn: 0% Cicklewood: 2.2% Burnt Oak: 13.6% Willesden: 6.2% Kingsbury: 1.3% Harlesden: 2.4% Sudbury: 11.7% Wembley Park: 0% Preston Road: 0% Queens Park: 9% Neasden: 8.5% Colindale: 3.2% Ealing Road: 4.2% Kenton: 11.1% Kensal Rise: 13.5%</p> <p>(Annual Monitoring Report 2004-5)</p>		<p>Brent 1997 Wembley: 10.7% Kilburn: 12.2% Cicklewood: 5.1% Burnt Oak: 6% Willesden: 10.8% Kingsbury: 15.6% Harlesden: 12.9% Sudbury: 11.7% Wembley Park: 0% Preston Rd: 4.2% Queens Park: 6.4% Neasden: 10.6% Colindale: 0% Ealing Road: 4.2% Kenton: 17.2% Kensal Rise: 16.8%</p>	<p>UDP Target: National Average by 2010</p>	<p>Levels of vacant floorspace have fallen in some wards but risen in others.</p> <p>Disparity within the Borough is a key issue.</p>
Public parks / Open Spaces	<p>Brent, 2003: District parks: 3 Local parks: 9 Small local parks: 44 Sports grounds: 11 Pocket parks / play areas: 25 Country Park and Nature Reserve: 2</p> <p>(Brent Parks Strategy, 2004)</p> <p>Figure 6 (Section 3, Part A) shows open space areas in the Borough.</p>			<p>UDP Target: No net decrease 2000-2010</p>	
Noise nuisance	<p>Brent</p> <p>Figure 14 in Section 3 of Part A shows noise complaints per hectare and housing density in Brent.</p>				

Sustainability Objective 6: To reduce crime and anti-social activity (S6)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Fear of crime	<i>Brent</i> , 2004 66% of residents feel threatened a 'great deal' by crime in their area (Brent's Crime Audit questionnaire, 2004, cited in AMR 2004-5)			Brent's Crime Strategy aims to reduce the figure (of residents that feel threatened 'a great deal') to 50% by 2007 (AMR 2004-5)	Fear of crime is a key sustainability issue
Levels of crime	<i>Brent</i> , Apr 2004- Mar 2005 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 34.2 Sexual offences: 1.1 Robbery: 7.7 Burglary: 14.9 Vehicle and other theft (includes theft from and of a vehicle): 41.6 (Crime Statistics for England and Wales www.crimestatistics.org.uk) Figure 15 in Section 3 (Part A) compares levels of crime in Brent versus national averages. Figure 16 shows street crime levels in the Borough.	<i>England and Wales</i> , Apr 2004- Mar 2005 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 19.6 Sexual offences: 1.2 Robbery: 1.6 Burglary: 13 Vehicle and other theft (includes theft from and of a vehicle): 38.3 (Crime Statistics for England and Wales www.crimestatistics.org.uk)	<i>Brent</i> , 2000-2001 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 22.9 Sexual offences: 1.3 Robbery: 7.7 Burglary: 13.3 Theft of motor vehicle: 6.8 Theft from motor vehicle: 11.5 (The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.) <i>England and Wales</i> , 2000-2001 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 11.4 Sexual offences: 0.7 Robbery: 1.8 Burglary: 7.6 Theft of motor vehicle: 6.4 Theft from motor vehicle: 11.9 (The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent)		Other than sexual offences, all crime rates are above the national average within Brent. Violent crimes, robbery and burglary are particularly high. The high incidence of crime is a key sustainability issue.

Sustainability Objective 7: To encourage a sense of local community; identity and welfare (S7)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Percentage of residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live	<p>Brent, 2002 Satisfied: 74% Dissatisfied: 17%</p> <p>(Living in Brent 2002 a Representative View. A MORI study for Brent Borough Council)</p>	<p>London</p> <p>In 2003, 71% of Londoners were very or fairly satisfied with London as a place to live, with 78% very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood. The figures for 2002 were 69% and 80% respectively</p> <p>(GLA Mori Poll: Annual London Survey, 2003). http://www.mori.com/polls/2003/gla-dec.shtml)</p>	<p>Brent, 2000 Satisfied: 72% Dissatisfied: 16%</p>		Comparable with London averages.
Net change in floorspace in D2 community use	<p>Brent, 2004-5</p> <p>4120m² of new community floor space was created in 2004-05</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>		<p>Brent 1994-1999 Overall net decrease of 920m²</p> <p>2000-2004 Overall net increase of 24,710m²</p> <p>(UDP Annual Monitoring Report 2004)</p>	UDP Target: No net loss 2000-2010	
Percentage involved in volunteering over last 3 years	-	<p>London 2001</p> <p>39% Londoner's participated in formal volunteering (at least once in the last 12 months) identical to the England average.</p> <p>(2001 Home Office Citizenship Survey 'People, families and communities: active participation in communities'. Home Office Research Study 270. http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hors270.pdf)</p>			

Sustainability Objective 8: To improve accessibility to key services especially for those most in need (S8)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Access to non-car transport	<p><i>Brent</i></p> <p>Brent has two radial routes and one orbital route forming part of the 900 km London Cycle Network Plus (LCN+) that is due for completion in 2010.</p> <p>The implementation of the London Bus Priority Network (LBPN) has resulted in major benefits in Brent particularly on the Edgware Road and Harrow Road corridors.</p> <p>(Brent Draft LIP of the Mayor's Transport Strategy)</p> <p>See the following Maps in Section 3, Part A: Figure 5 showing cycle routes and cycle parking in Brent. Figure 17, public transport accessibility and the location of railways and underground Figure 18 showing bus priority and cycle route network</p>				
Access to Services (% having difficulty with access) Access to: Post office Food shop GP Primary school	No data identified				Provision of and access to essential services and amenities is a key sustainability issue.
Number of childcare places available per 1,000 population of children under 5 not in early education	<p><i>Brent</i></p> <p>Over 110 day nurseries, pre-school playgroups & toddler groups within Brent. (Brent LEA)</p> <p>Increase in childcare/nursery floorspace 2004-2005: 2100 m²</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>		<p>Net increase in childcare facility floorspace 1994-2004; 3,890m²</p> <p>(Brent LEA)</p>		Provision of and access to essential services and amenities is a key sustainability issue.

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
% Population living within 200m of open space	Identical to Open Space indicator and access map under Sustainability Objective 2				
Area of outdoor sports land for community use (hectares per 1000 population)	<p>Brent, 2003:</p> <p>Football: 0.21 Cricket: 0.06 Rugby: 0.009 Gaelic football: 0.023 Hockey: 0.015</p> <p>Total: 0.33</p> <p>Brent Playing Pitch Strategy 2003-2008, Brent Parks Service, May 2004</p>				

Environmental Baseline Characteristics and trends

Sustainability Objective 9: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (EN1)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Traffic reduction levels – traffic levels per annum (UDP indicator)	<p>Brent 1997-2004 Between 1997 and 2004 Brent has recorded a 80 million Km, or 8.6%, increase in traffic flow.</p> <p>(Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05)</p>	<p>For the first 2 years of the period 2001 to 2011 where Brent's revised target of "a noticeable reduction in traffic growth" should apply, there was a significant increase in the rate of growth over the previous 3 years, although this stabilised to zero growth from 2003-2004. In comparison, the overall Greater London growth has remained relatively low at a rate of only 3% from 1997 to 2004.</p> <p>(AMR 2004-05)</p>	<p>The current trend is for traffic levels to continue to grow with increasing car ownership and consequent decreasing average journey speeds (LBB, Draft LIP)</p>	<p>Brent UDP Target: 10% reduction 1997-2008</p> <p>"noticeable reduction in growth" target up to 2011 (AMR, 2004-5)</p>	<p>Noise nuisance and vibration from major road routes, poor air quality, ease of movement and pressure on biodiversity and habitats are all critical sustainability issues.</p>
Transport modal split	<p>See Sustainability Objective 22</p>			<p>London</p> <p>Use of public transport per head to grow faster than use of private vehicle.</p> <p>50% increase in public transport capacity by 2021</p> <p>(London Plan Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)</p>	
Road noise	<p>Noise disturbance and related maps are included below</p> <p>London Noise Map http://www.noisemapping.org/frames/Map.asp provides overview maps of noise (road/postcode based search)</p> <p>Shows that all major roads in the Borough are a source of severe localised noise pollution.</p>				<p>Noise nuisance and vibration from major road routes in the Borough is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Sustainability Objective 10: To improve water quality; conserve water resources and provide for sustainable sources of water supply (EN2)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Chemical / biological river water quality	<p>The River Brent (which is a main river) runs through the borough, as well as several tributaries including the Wealdstone Brook, Mitchell Brook and the Wembley Brook. The borough is also crossed by the Grand Union Canal in the south.</p> <p>Water quality is generally only 'fair' or 'poor' using the Environment Agency's General Quality Assessment (GQA) classification and many watercourses suffer from pollution and sewerage misconnections.</p> <p>Data is available from Environment Agency</p> <p>http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/maps/960669/?version=1&lang=e</p> <p>The River Brent has been divided into three stretches for the Water Framework Directive classification. All three are considered to be 'at risk' of not achieving the environmental standards of the WFD and have been provisionally classified as 'heavily modified' water bodies.</p> <p>Data is available from the Environment Agency</p> <p>http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?extraClause=RIVER_NAME-'Brent'</p>			Water Framework Directive target of 'good status' for all water bodies by 2015.	Water quality and pollution are key issues for the watercourses running through Brent.
Domestic water use	No data identified	<p>165 litres per capita in London compared to 150 l/per capita (national average) and 120 litres in Copenhagen or Berlin.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal of the London Plan (First Review) Scoping Report, January 2006</p>			

Sustainability Objective 11: To improve air quality (EN3)

Also refer to Objective 9: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment (as driver for air pollution)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Air quality monitoring results (based on results from the 5 monitoring stations in Brent Borough)</p>	<p>Brent, 2004 CO: 1 Station Target achieved: NA NO₂: 4 Station Annual mean achieved: YES (1 station) / NA (2 stations) NO (1 station) Ozone: Days moderate or above: 7 (1 station) Target achieved: YES PM₁₀: Days moderate or above: 5-165 (4stations) Targets achieved: YES (2 stations), NO (2 stations) SO₂: Days moderate or above: 0 (3 stations) Target achieved: NA (3 stations)</p> <p>Air Quality in London 2004, Kings College London, Environmental Research Group, 2004</p> <p>See also Figure 21 in Section 3 of Part A.</p>		<p>Brent, 2003 CO: Days moderate or above: 0 (1 station) Target achieved: YES NO₂: Days moderate or above: 1 (3 stations) Targets achieved: YES (1 station) / NA (2 stations) Ozone: Days moderate or above: 54 (1 station) Target achieved: NO PM₁₀: Days moderate or above: 12-25 (3 stations) Targets achieved: YES (1 station), NO (2 stations) SO₂: Days moderate or above: 1 (3 stations) Target achieved: YES (1 station), NA (2 stations)</p> <p>Air Quality in London 2003, Preliminary Report, Kings College London, Environmental Research Group</p>		<p>Air quality in Brent exceeds national standards on occasions. This is the case of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and particulate matter up to 10 micrometers in size (PM₁₀). In Brent, the primary source for these and other pollutants is road traffic.</p> <p>(LBB Air Quality Action Plan 2005-2010)</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Days when air quality is moderate or higher (UK national SD indicator)</p>	<p>Brent, 2003: 60 Regional Quality of Life 2003, Defra, 2004</p>	<p>Other London, 2003: N. Kensington: 59 Camden: 23 Marylebone Rd: 104 Haringey: 19 London A3: 33 Bexley: 77 Eltham: 65 Hillingdon: 45 England urban: 51 Regional Quality of Life 2003, Defra, 2004</p>	<p>2002: Brent: 24 N. Kensington: 16 Camden: 3 Marylebone Rd: 57 Haringey: 10 London A3: 1 Bexley: 34 Eltham: 24 Hillingdon: 11 England urban: 19</p>		<p>Number of days slightly above national urban average. Trend 2002 –2003 shows large increase, though this may be influenced by atmospheric and meteorological factors. Poor air quality, particularly along roads is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Air Quality Management Area/s</p>	<p>Brent, 2001 The Council has approved that AQMAs be declared in the following areas: The entire area south of the North Circular Rd All road corridors to the north of the North Circular road: Bridgewater Road, Ealing Road, Harrow Road, Watford Road, Kenton Road, Kingsbury Road, Edgware Road, Blackbird Hill, Forty Avenue, Forty Lane and East Lane. (Indicators for a sustainable Brent, 2001) See Figure 20 in Section 3 of Part A for Brent's Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)</p>				<p>Poor air quality, particularly along roads is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Sustainability Objective 12: To conserve and enhance biodiversity (EN4)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Area (Hectares) of Nature Conservation Importance in Brent	<p><i>Brent</i>, 2001</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest: 38 Ha</p> <p>Borough grade 1 and Metropolitan Nature Conservation areas: 214 Ha</p> <p>Borough grade 2 and Local Nature Conservation areas: 131 Ha</p> <p>Wildlife Corridors: 215 Ha</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, 2001)</p> <p>Figure 22 in Section 3 of Part A shows areas of nature conservation in Brent</p>				<p>Significant areas of the Borough are protected or in need of protection for nature conservation reasons.</p> <p>The pressure on biodiversity and habitats and lack of greenspace is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)</p>	<p>Brent, 2000: Sites of Metropolitan Importance: 3 sites, 169 hectares Sites of borough importance: Grade I: 6 sites, 124 hectares Grade II: 15 sites, 99 hectares Sites of local importance: 17 sites, 44 hectares</p> <p>Brent Biodiversity Action Plan, Brent Parks Services and Brent Environmental Services, 2001</p>			<p>Brent Biodiversity Action Plan Targets: A: Maintain, and improving the wildlife status of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance in the Borough. B: Reduce Areas of Wildlife Deficiency in the Borough. Targets to be achieved through management of the Council's own land; encouraging good practice by other land managers; and through planning policy</p> <p>London, No net loss over the London Plan period</p> <p>(London Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006)</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Local Biodiversity Action Plan</p>	<p>Brent, 2000: <u>Species:</u> Amphibians: Great Crested Newt Mammals: Pipistrelle Bat Local Species: Cardamine impatias, Hay meadow species, Meniola jurtina, Sanguisorba officinalis</p> <p><u>Habitats</u> 6 Priority Habitats, 15 Local Habitats and 9 Broad Habitats are also identified under the Brent Biodiversity Action Plan</p> <p>Brent Biodiversity Action Plan, Brent Parks Services and Brent Environmental Services, 2001</p>				<p>As above</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Tree coverage and Tree Protection Orders</p>	<p>Brent According to the 1984-85 Wildlife Habitat Survey, Brent ranks 22nd among 33 London Boroughs in terms of woodland cover.</p> <p>There were between 25,000 and 27,000 street trees surveyed in 1992. Since then, 180 trees have been lost each year through vandalism, old age, disease, driveway construction, subsidence claims and action by statutory bodies (utilities – gas, water, electricity, telecommunications etc). There has been no systematic tree replacement programme.</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, 2001)</p> <p>Brent, 2005 Tree protection orders:</p> <p>307 Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). 9 new TPOs were made in the period April 2004 to March 2005 which includes some 30 individual trees and many trees in groups and areas (AMR, 2004-5).</p>				<p>As above</p>

Sustainability Objective 13: To maintain and enhance the character and quality of landscapes and townscapes (EN5)

Also refer to Objective 5: To provide everybody with good quality surroundings

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Townscape considered to be of low townscape quality (UDP indicator)	A map of areas of low townscape quality has been included in Section 3 of Part A (Figure 23)			UDP Target: 10% decrease 2000-2010	There are significant areas of the Borough deemed to be of low townscape quality, though these tend to be clustered in particular areas / wards. The mixed quality of the built environment and need for improved architectural design quality is a key issue.
Percentage new homes built on previously developed land	Brent 2004-5 100% of housing developments built on previously developed urban land (AMR, 2004-5)		1992-1999: Between 1992-1999, approximately 60% of all housing developments were built on previously developed urban land in Brent. Indicators for a sustainable Brent, January 2001		Links to biodiversity and greenspace issues / indicators.
Percentage vacant properties	Vacant homes and vacant shopping frontages contained under Objectives S4 and S5 above				
Countryside character areas	Brent is part of the Countryside Character Area of Greater London (CCA 112), originally a gently terraced landform and now almost completely obscured by urban development (Volume 7 of the Countryside Character (publication reference CA13) no. 112)				

Sustainability Objective 14: To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets (EN6)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Number and condition of listed buildings and monuments	<p>Brent Brent has 2 Grade I listed building and 7 Grade II* listed buildings</p> <p>(http://www.brent.gov.uk/planning.nsf/c394c6e175c80f1080256623005fc322/a674f1dcc8ba5caa8025697b00379168!OpenDocument)</p>				Given likely developments in the Borough, there is a need to preserve and enhance built heritage and the historic and archaeological environment against the pressures of redevelopment.
Conservation areas	Figure 24 (Part A, Section 3) shows conservation areas in Brent				
Listed buildings at risk	<p>Brent, 1999 English Heritage maintains a register of statutory listed buildings that are 'at risk' through neglect and decay, or vulnerable to becoming so. Very few buildings were on this register in 1999, but it included the Grade I Old St Andrews Church, which has been vulnerable to vandalism, and the derelict Palace of Arts and Dollis Hill House. As a matter of urgency Brent is preparing action plans for the buildings.</p> <p>Brent UDP, chapter 5 Built Environment</p>				As above
Loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments and their settings	No data identified				
Number of archaeological sites of interest	<p>Brent: 24 sites</p> <p>Museum of London catalogue of London archaeological sites. http://mol.nethostinguk.com/laarc/laarc_s_help2.html#geography</p>	<p>Other London Boroughs: Lewisham: 54 Greenwich: 68 Haringey: 13 Newham: 32 Southwark: 454 Lambeth: 274 Tower Hamlets: 228 Hackney: 73 Islington: 146 Ealing: 35</p>			As above

Sustainability Objective 15: To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change (EN7)

Refer also to Objective 9: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Overall improvement in domestic energy efficiency 1996-2003	Brent: 24.9% Ninth progress report for 1996-2005, Home Energy Conservation Act 1995 (Defra, 2006)	Comparison authorities 1996-2005: Lewisham: 19.2% Greenwich: 20.5% Haringey: 22.7% Newham: 23.5% Southwark: 17.3% Lambeth: 17.8% Tower Hamlets: 8.2% Hackney: 16.9% Islington: 23.1% Ealing: 11.6%	Brent 1996-2002: 13.1% 1996-2003 15.9% 1996-2004 15.9%		Energy use and efficiency is a key sustainability issue and relates to issues of climate change, fuel poverty, income and health.
Number of developments meeting 'Good' or 'Very Good' BREEAM / EcoHomes Standard or incorporating renewable energy (UDP Indicator)	40 major applications have been evaluated through Brent's Sustainability Checklist process. Of these, 36 have had conditions and/or S106 terms requiring implementation of a range of measures and 'Very Good/Excellent' ratings to be achieved on the Building Research Establishment (BRE) sustainability assessments. (AMR, 2004-5).			UDP Target Net Increase	
Domestic energy efficiency – SAP ratings and National Homes Energy Ratings	No data identified				

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Domestic CO2 emissions</p>	<p>Brent, 2003 Domestic CO2 emissions were estimated at 661,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide during 2003, or an average of 2.5 tonnes a year per capita.</p> <p>(Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)</p>	<p>UK, 2003</p> <p>Estimated domestic CO2 emissions: 2.8 tonnes per capita</p> <p>Greater London, 2003</p> <p>Estimated domestic CO2 emissions: 2.6 tonnes per capita</p> <p>(Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)</p>	<p>Brent, 2000 Brent Energy Network conducted a domestic survey in 2000. They calculated that the domestic energy sector emitted about 696,800 tonnes of carbon dioxide during the year ending in March 2000, or an average of 7 tonnes a year per household.</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, January 2001)</p>		<p>Domestic CO2 emissions in Brent are similar to those of Greater London and the UK averages.</p> <p>There was a small decrease in emissions since 2000.</p>
<p>CO2 emissions from all sources</p>	<p>Brent, 2003</p> <p>Estimated CO2 emissions (tonnes):</p> <p>Industry and commercial: 578,000 Domestic: 661,000 Road transport: 275,000 Land use change: 0 Total: 1,514, 000 Per capita: 5.7</p> <p>(Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)</p>	<p>Greater London, 2003</p> <p>Estimated CO2 emissions (tonnes) per capita: 6.9 (Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)</p> <p>Other London boroughs, 2003</p> <p>Estimated CO2 emissions (tonnes) per capita</p> <p>Lewisham: 5.6 Greenwich: 5.8 Haringey: 5.5 Newham: 6.5 Southwark: 7.3 Lambeth: 5.7 Tower Hamlets: 11.2 Hackney: 4.4 Islington: 7.8 Ealing: 5.7</p> <p>(Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)</p>		<p>London</p> <p>To reduce emissions to 23% below 1990 levels by 2016</p> <p>(London Plan Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)</p>	<p>Total estimated per capita emissions in Brent in 2003 were lower than the Greater London average and that of several London boroughs.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
% Energy from renewable resources	Brent, 2004-2005 There are currently a few small scale renewable energy schemes in the Borough. (See Table 3, p. 18 AMR 2004-5)			Brent 10% by 2016 AMR 2004-5	
Flood risk areas	Specific localised flooding is an issue in the Borough particular at times of increased run-off. The Brent Council website identifies four problem areas / issues: Welsh Harp, River Brent, Wealdstone Brook and surface water. (http://www.brent.gov.uk/services.nsf/0/3bbed5d8f558ab1080256e6a005627c7?OpenDocument)			London No net loss of functional floodplain (London Plan, Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)	Flooding and flood risks particularly in relation to the Welsh Harp Reservoir and River Brent is a key sustainability issue.
Flood risk zones	Environment Agency produces flood risk maps. http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/maps/960669/?version=1&lang=e See Figure 19 for a map of flood risk zones in Brent				Flooding and flood risks particularly in relation to the Welsh Harp Reservoir and River Brent is a key sustainability issue.
Numbers of people and properties affected by fluvial flood events	No data identified				
Frequency of fluvial flood events	No data identified				
Development in the floodplain	No data identified				

Sustainability Objective 16: To minimise the production of waste and use of non-renewable materials (EN8)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Household waste collection and composition</p> <p>% waste: - recycled - composted - land-filled</p>	<p><i>Brent</i> Apr-Dec 2005 Recycled (tonnes): Kerbside collection: 5336 Organic waste: 8716 Bring bank sites: 1786 Civic amenity site: 1274 Recycling: 21%</p> <p>Brent's recycling rate http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste</p>		<p><i>Brent</i> 2002-2003: Total household waste: 119,269 tonnes Total non-household waste: 7,474 tonnes Total municipal waste: 126,743 tonnes Household recycled: 7,725 tonnes Municipal waste recycling: 6.1%</p> <p>www.capitalwastefacts.com 2003-2004: Recycled: 8,820 tonnes (0.024 tonnes/household) Composted: 1,084 tonnes Tonnes not recycled: 105,693 (0.26 tonnes/household) Recycling: 8.6%</p> <p>Brent Recycling Performance Data Chart: http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste</p>	<p>National Targets: 2000 waste strategy: – Recover value from 45% of municipal waste and to recycle 30% of household waste by 2010 – Enable 25% of household waste to be recycled or composted by 2005-6 – Reduce landfill for industrial and commercial waste to 85% of 1998 level by 2005</p>	<p>Local pressures and national / regional policy is driving the need to manage waste more effectively.</p> <p>The critical need to minimise waste arisings and deal with waste locally and in a sustainable manner is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Population with access to recycling facilities</p>	<p>Brent, 2004-5 Total properties collected from: 102,625 Households with kerbside recycling collections: 76,000 = 74% have kerbside collection.</p> <p>http://www.capitalwastefacts.com</p>	<p>Greater London 2003/2004</p> <p>Number of households: 3.1 million Households with kerbside recycling collections: 2.137 million = 69% have kerbside collection</p> <p>http://www.capitalwastefacts.com</p>	<p>Brent, 2000-2001 Total properties collected from: 102,737 Households with kerbside recycling collections: 72,781 = 71% have kerbside collection.</p> <p>Brent Recycling Performance Data Chart: http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste</p>		<p>As above</p>
<p>Waste generation</p>	<p>Brent, 2004-5</p> <p>Summary of waste arisings:</p> <p>Municipal waste: 131,000 tonnes of which household waste accounted for 117,000 tonnes.</p> <p>Waste generated per household: 1121 kg</p> <p>West London Waste Authority and Constituent Boroughs (2005) Draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy)</p>	<p>West London Waste Authority, 2004-5</p> <p>Waste generated per household: 1195 kg</p>	<p>Municipal waste arisings in West London increased up to 2001/2 and have decreased in the last four years. This decrease reflects a decrease in civic amenity (CA) site and non-household waste arisings. However, household waste generation is on the increase. It is thought unlikely that this decrease will continue in future, without targeted waste reduction and reuse programmes. Household waste constitutes 85% of all municipal waste.</p> <p>(West London Waste Authority and Constituent Boroughs (2005) Draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy)</p>		
<p>Consumption of aggregates per capita</p>	<p>No data identified</p>				

Sustainability Objective 17: To conserve and enhance land quality and soil resources (EN9)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Sites and Nature of Contaminated Land	<p>Brent 2005 Contaminated land covers approximately a quarter of the land in Brent. A Contaminated Land Database has been compiled and includes 10, 300 sqkm of land with historical industrial uses, including in-filled land of which the origin is unknown, which may have generated the contamination of 1599 sites.</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>Approximately 360 hectares of industrial land may be potentially contaminated</p> <p>http://www.brent.gov.uk/Services.nsf/0ef29c57553ef690802568f00065fea4/51f6a0a6ca2c7bb380256d660049a684!OpenDocument</p> <p>Figure 25 shows areas of potentially contaminated land in Brent (Section 3, Part A)</p>			Net decrease (AMR 2004-5)	
Loss of greenfield land	<p>Brent 2000-2005</p> <p>Net loss of 2.7 ha of open space to development</p> <p>(Total open space in Brent: 412 ha)</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>		<p>Brent 1993-1999</p> <p>Net loss of 38.5 ha</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>	No net loss of open space (AMR 2004-5)	
Stock / Area of Vacant and Brownfield Land	<p>No data identified</p> <p>Information requested</p>				
% of housing built on previously developed land (UDP Indicator)	Refer to indicator under Objective 4			UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010	

Economic Baseline Characteristics and Trends

Sustainability Objective 18: To encourage sustainable economic growth (EC1)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Uses of land in employment use across the borough	<p><i>Brent</i> 2006</p> <p>There are a total of 432 ha of land accounted for in Brent's Borough's Strategic Employment Areas (SEAs), Borough Employment Areas (BEAs) and identified Local Employment Sites (LESs). Of those 104.7 ha is in industrial, 118.9 in warehousing and 43.9 ha is in office use.</p> <p>URS (2006) LBB Employment Land Demand Study</p>		<p>Brent, 2000</p> <p>Of a total of 437.4 in SEAs, BEAs and LESs, 117 ha were in industrial, 128.9 in warehousing and 50.2 in retail use.</p> <p>Between 2000 and 2006, there was a decrease of 10.5%, 7.8% and 12.5% of land in industrial, warehousing and retail use respectively in SEAs, BEAs and LESs. Conversely, during the same period there was an increase of land in residential use of 12.9% in SEAs, BEAs and LESs.</p> <p>URS (2006) LBB Employment Land Demand Study</p>		<p>Development pressures are likely to increase potential conflict between opposing land uses, particularly between housing needs and the protection of employment land.</p> <p>This is a key sustainability issue.</p>
Vacant Employment Land	See above and refer to indicator under objective EC3			UDP Target: 25% reduction by 2008	

Sustainability Objective 19: To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment (EC2)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Number of Businesses, Business composition and Jobs	<p>Brent, various years The number of businesses per 1000 of the population: 38.4</p> <p>From 1994-2004 there was a 16.6% increase in stock (VAT registrations and de-registrations)</p> <p>Average business size (2004 employees per business): 8.9</p> <p>(Economic and Social Bulletin for Brent May 2004. Policy and Research Unit)</p>	<p>London, various years The number of businesses per 1000 of the population: 47.4</p> <p>1994-2004 there was a 19.4% increase in stock (VAT registrations and de-registrations) for London</p> <p>Average business size (2004 employees per business): 10.7</p>			<p>The number, size and growth of business is below the London average.</p> <p>These data may be misleading however given large demographic divergence across the capital.</p>
Economic Activity of population	<p>Brent, 2001 Employed: 56.9% Unemployed: 5% Economically active student: 3.6% Economically inactive student: 8.3% Retired: 9.6% Looking after home/family: 6.8% Sick / disabled: 4.7% Economically inactive: 5.1%</p> <p>The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent</p>	<p>England and Wales, 2001 Employed: 60.6% Unemployed: 3.4% Economically active student: 2.6% Economically inactive student: 4.7% Retired: 13.6% Looking after home/family: 6.5% Sick / disabled: 5.5% Economically inactive: 3.1%</p> <p>The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.</p>			<p>Data shows lower levels of employment and higher incidence of unemployment than in England and Wales.</p> <p>Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.</p>
Change in claimant count unemployment rate	<p>Brent, May 2006 Borough Count: 7,806 Borough rate: 4.3% (Economic and Social Bulletin for Brent, Policy and Research Unit, May 2006)</p> <p>Brent East: 4.5% Brent North: 2.5% Brent South: 5.9%</p> <p>(nomisweb.com)</p> <p>Unemployment rates range from 9.1% in Harlesden to 2.7% in Queensbury (AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>Figure 26 illustrates unemployment levels by ward (Section 3, Part A)</p>	<p>London, June 2006 Claimant count unemployment rate: 3.4%</p> <p>In 2001/02, the unemployment rate for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups was 11.7%, compared to 5.1% for White groups, a ratio of 2.3. This means that BME groups are more than twice as likely to be unemployed in London than White groups</p> <p>UK, June 2006 2.6%</p> <p>ONS Labour Force Survey. http://www.statistics.gov.uk</p>	<p>Brent: For the year to April the unemployment count increased by 3.9% (Economic and Social Bulletin for Brent, Policy and Research Unit, May 2006)</p> <p>March 2004 Borough Count: 8213 Borough rate: 4.5%</p> <p>Brent East: 4.6% Brent North: 2.7% Brent South: 6.1%</p> <p>(Economic and Social Bulletin for Brent, Policy and Research Unit, May 2004)</p>		<p>Data shows clear North – South split within Borough. Unemployment rate is twice as high in the South of Brent than the North.</p> <p>Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.</p>

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Long-term unemployment (percentage of unemployed who have been out of work for over one year)</p>	<p>Brent, June 2006</p> <p>21.7% of long-term unemployment</p> <p>Source: claimant count (nomisweb.co.uk)</p> <p>Brent is ranked as the 39th most employment deprived district in the country</p> <p>(IMD 2004)</p>	<p>June 2006</p> <p>London</p> <p>19.5 long-term unemployment</p> <p>UK</p> <p>15.7%</p> <p>Source: claimant count (nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>2001</p> <p>The proportion of unemployed residents designated as long term unemployed (claiming benefits for more than 52 weeks) was over a third higher than the UK average. Brent was ranked as the 32nd most employment deprived district in the country and within the top 10% most deprived.</p> <p>(Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021)</p>		<p>Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Occupation of those currently in employment</p>	<p>Brent, 2004</p> <p>Full time: 74%</p> <p>Part time: 26%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 10.7%</p> <p>Construction: 5%</p> <p>Services: 84.2%</p> <p>Tourism related: 5.5%</p> <p>Nomis Brent Labour Market Profile (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>London, 2004</p> <p>Full time: 73.7%</p> <p>Part time: 26.3%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 5.5%</p> <p>Construction: 3%</p> <p>Services: 91.2%</p> <p>Tourism related: 8.5%</p>			<p>Full time / part time ratio same as London.</p> <p>However greater share in manufacturing and construction employment, and lower percentage in services.</p>
<p>Barriers to finding work</p>	<p>Brent, 2002</p> <p>Not enough jobs: 15%</p> <p>Need child care: 15%</p> <p>Not enough well paid jobs: 13%</p> <p>Lack of skills / quals: 12%</p> <p>Few jobs suitable: 9%</p> <p>Don't know: 40%</p> <p>(Living in Brent 2002 a Representative View. A MORI study for Brent Borough Council)</p>				<p>Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>% People in Work-less Households</p>	<p>No data identified</p>	<p>More than 25% of London's children live in a household where no one works, compared with 18% in the UK as a whole</p> <p>Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021</p>			

Sustainability Objective 20: To reduce disparities in economic performance and promote regeneration (EC3)

Also refer to Objective 1: To reduce poverty and social exclusion

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Ratio of most to least deprived wards	Refer to objective 1 – particularly map showing relative deprivation across wards.				
Area of land redeveloped in important regeneration areas: Park Royal Wembley (UDP indicator)	Data on these areas is included in the UDP Annual Monitoring Report 2004, however hard to represent in simple (indicator) format. UDP suggested source: Planning database – acolaid			UDP Target: 20Ha by 2010	
Vacant land and properties and derelict land	Brent, 2006 Vacant premises: 24.5 ha Vacant land: 49.1 ha (of a total of 432.2 ha of Employment land) LBB Industrial Land Use Survey 2006 (cited in URS (2006) LBB Employment Land Demand Study)		Brent, 2000 Vacant premises: 21.9 ha Vacant land: 38.8 ha (of a total of 437.4 ha of Employment land) Brent Employment Land Survey Study 2001 (cited in URS (2006) LBB Employment Land Demand Study)	UDP Target: 25% reduction in derelict land by 2008	The area of land occupied by vacant premises and vacant land has increased by 12% and 27% respectively between 2000 and 2006.

Sustainability Objective 21: To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment (EC4)

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area	<p>Brent, 2004 VAT registrations: 1,150 (13.5%) VAT de-registrations: 1,140 (13.3%)</p> <p>Percentage change in VAT registered business over year: +0.009%</p> <p>VAT registrations and de-registrations: http://www.sbs.gov.uk/default.php?page=/analytical/statistics/vatstats.php</p>	<p>London, 2004: VAT registrations: 12.4% VAT de-registrations: 11.4% Percentage change in VAT registered business over year: +0.98%</p> <p>England and Wales, 2004: VAT registrations: 10.1% VAT de-registrations: 9.4% Percentage change in VAT registered business over year: +1.6%</p>	<p>Brent, 2003 VAT registrations: 1,160 (13.7%) VAT de-registrations: 1,060 (12.5%)</p> <p>Percentage change in VAT registered business over year: +0.94%</p> <p>VAT registrations and de-registrations: http://www.sbs.gov.uk/default.php?page=/analytical/statistics/vatstats.php</p>		Borough showed a very small rise in 2004. However ensuring opportunities are suitable and accessible to local people remains a key issue.
New Business Surviving 3 Years Business start ups and closures	No data identified				
% Business Investment from Outside Borough	No data identified				

Sustainability Objective 22: To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth (EC5)

Refer also to Objective 8: To improve accessibility to key services especially for those most in need, and Objective 9: To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Transport connectivity / transport facilities	See the following Maps in Section 3, Part A: Figure 5 showing cycle routes and cycle parking in Brent. Figure 17, public transport accessibility and the location of railways and underground Figure 18 showing bus priority and cycle route network				Poor transport infrastructure and ease of movement particularly given relatively low levels of car ownership is a key sustainability issue.
Access to public transport	See Figure 17 (Section 3, Part A)				
Proportion of retail / leisure floorspace approved in areas of very good / good / moderate public transport accessibility	Brent , 2004-5 % approved applications at PTAL levels: Low: 16% Moderate: 59% Good: 17% Very good: 8% 84% in moderate to very good PTAL locations PTAL – Public Transport Accessibility Level (AMR 2004-5)		Brent, 2004 % approved applications at PTAL levels: Low: 24.5% Moderate: 23.4% Good: 25.9% Very good: 26.2% 75.5% in moderate to very good PTAL locations PTAL – Public Transport Accessibility Level UDP Annual Monitoring Report, 2004	UDP Target: 90% in moderate to very good PTAL locations 2000-2010.	Low levels of car ownership mean that accessibility by public transport and/or foot / bike is very important.
% new retail / leisure floorspace planning permissions in/adjoining town centres	Brent , 1994-2004 In town centre: 46% Adjoining town centre: 21% Out of town: 33% (AMR, 2004-5)				As above

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Commuting by mode (mode of travel to work and school)</p>	<p>Brent 2001 Means of travelling to work (question in Census) Underground: 26% Train: 7% Bus: 13% Walk: 7% Car: 34% Other: 6%</p> <p>Note: these data do not sum to 100% as does not include those who work mainly from home.</p> <p>The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.</p>	<p>London 2001 Underground: 18.8% Train: 12.2% Bus: 11.1% Walk: 8.4% Car: 36% Other: 4.9%</p> <p>National Statistics, Neighbourhood Statistics (based on Census 2001). http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/Reports/eng/TableViewer/wdsview/download.asp</p> <p>London: In 2001, 50% of London children walked to school, 22% travelled by car and 20% caught the bus. Nationally, fewer children walk to school (48.5%) and more are driven to school by car (28.5%)</p> <p>National Travel Survey, Department for Transport. http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/page/dft_transstats_028347.hcsp</p>	<p>Brent 1991 Underground: 25% Train: 4.5% Bus: 12.5% Walk: 9% Car: 36% Other: 6%</p> <p>Note: these data do not sum to 100% as does not include those who work mainly from home.</p> <p>The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.</p>		<p>Relatively high use and dependence on public transport, and particularly underground.</p> <p>Low car use is a positive factor against most sustainability criteria, however ensuring adequate access to public transport and ease of movement is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Peak / Off peak traffic speeds / flows</p>		<p>Greater London, various years Average traffic speeds (mph) Morning peak 1983-90: 16.5 1990-97: 15.7 2000-03: 15.0</p> <p>National Travel Survey, Department for Transport. http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/page/dft_transstats_028347.hcsp</p>	<p>Brent 2001-2018 Average inbound traffic flows on the borough's key roads between 8-9am are predicted to increase by roughly 10% between now and 2018.</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, 2001)</p>		

APPENDIX 6

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, CRITERIA, INDICATORS AND TARGETS

Sustainability Objectives, Criteria, Indicators and Targets

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
Social			
Prosperity and Social Inclusion S1. To reduce poverty and social exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce poverty and social exclusion in those areas most affected? Will it improve affordability of essential services? 	Population and demographics (age structure etc.)	
		Index of Multiple Deprivation	
		Average household income	
		Percentage households with no employed adults with dependent children	
		Percentage of children living in poverty (after housing costs)	
		% Households Experiencing Fuel Poverty	UK Eradicating fuel poverty by 2016
Health S2. To improve the health of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve access to high quality health facilities? Will it encourage healthy lifestyles and provide opportunities for sport and recreation? Will it reduce health inequalities? Will it reduce death rates? 	Self assessment of health over last 12 months	England 70% target by 2020
		Participation in sport (excludes walking)	
		Number of sports facilities by type	
		Access to public open spaces	
		Main mode of travel to work	London Cycling Action Plan: 80% increase in cycling levels in the Capital by 2010 and a 200% increase by 2020, compared to cycling levels in 2000. (Brent Draft LIP of the Mayor's Transport Strategy)
		Access to GP	Targets from Brent PCT
		1. Practices with an appointment to see a primary care professional within 1 working day	1. 100%
		2. Practices with an appointment to see a GP within 2 working days: 73.8%	2. 90%
		3. Practices with an appointment system in place to see a primary care professional: 90.5%	3. 90%
		4. Practices participating in Primary Care Access Survey: 53%	4. 100%
No of GPs per 1000 population			
Education and Skills S3. To improve the education and skills of the population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve qualifications and skills of the population? Will it improve access to high quality educational facilities? Will it help fill key skill gaps? 	Secondary: % Children obtaining at least 5 GCSEs at grades A* - C	
		Primary: Key Stage 2 performance (% achieving level 4+)	
		Enrolments on adult education courses per 1000 population	
		Education (NVQ equivalent) qualifications of working age residents	
		Access to secondary schools.	
		Secondary schools capacity	
		Primary school capacity	
		Access to libraries	
Housing S4. To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it increase access to good quality and affordable housing? Will it encourage mixed use and range of housing tenure? Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? 	Population density: people per hectare	
		Average house prices by type	
		Affordability of housing: Ratio of average house price to gross household income	
		Household Size: No of people living in property	
		Condition of housing stock: Unfit dwellings by tenure	

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce homelessness? 	Additional home provision, new home completions (UDP Indicator) Affordable housing provision / completions Vacant homes % of housing built on previously developed land Homelessness Acceptances Number / percentage increase in housing development / completions	Current UDP target 1997-2016: Provision of at least 13,510 additional homes, including 9,650 self contained dwellings UDP Target: 4800 affordable home completions 1997-2016 UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010
Quality of surroundings S5. To provide everybody with good quality surroundings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live; encouraging 'ownership'? Will it improve residential amenity and sense of place? Will it reduce actual noise levels? Will it reduce noise concerns? 	Population density % Vacant Floorspace in Primary Shopping Frontages by ward % residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhoods as a place to live Public parks / Open Spaces % population living within 200m of open space Noise complaints Road / ambient noise mapping	UDP Target: National Average by 2010 UDP Target: No net decrease 2000-2010
Crime Prevention and Community Safety S6. To reduce crime and anti-social activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce actual levels of crime? Will it reduce the fear of crime? 	Fear of crime Level of crime	Brent's Crime Strategy aims to reduce the figure (of residents that feel threatened 'a great deal') to 50% by 2007 (AMR 2004-5)
Community Identity S7. To encourage a sense of community; identity and welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage engagement in community activities? Will it foster a sense of pride in area? Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions? Will it improve ethnic relations? Will it encourage communications between different communities in order to improve understanding of different needs and concerns? Will it encourage people to respect and value their contribution to society? 	Percentage of residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live Net change in floorspace in D2 community use	UDP Target: No net loss 2000-2010
Accessibility S8. To improve accessibility to key services especially for those most in need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve accessibility to key local services? Will it improve the level of investment in key community services? Will it make access more affordable? Will it make access easier for those without access to a car? 	Number of childcare places available per 1,000 population of children under 5 not in early education Access to Services (% having difficulty with access). Access to: Post office; Food shop; GP; Primary school Surveys of access / ease of access Area of outdoor sports land for community use (hectares per 1000 population) % Population living within 200m of open space	

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
		Access to non-car transport	
Environmental			
Traffic EN1. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce traffic volumes? Will it increase the proportion of journeys using modes other than the car? Will it encourage walking or cycling? 	Traffic reduction levels – traffic levels per annum (UDP indicator)	UDP Target: 10% reduction 1997-2008 “noticeable reduction in growth” target up to 2011 (AMR, 2004-5)
		Transport modal split	London Use of public transport per head to grow faster than use of private vehicle. 50% increase in public transport capacity by 2021 (London Plan Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)
		Access to public transport	
		PTAL score for new development	
		Road noise	
Water Quality & Resources EN2. To improve water quality; conserve water resources and provide for sustainable sources of water supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve the quality of inland water? Will it reduce water consumption? 	Chemical / biological river water quality	Water Framework Directive target of ‘good status’ for all water bodies by 2015.
		Flood risk areas	London No net loss of functional floodplain (London Plan, Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)
		Frequency of fluvial flood events	
		Development in the floodplain	
		Domestic water use	
Air Quality EN3. To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve air quality? Will it help achieve the objectives of the Air Quality Management Plan? Will it reduce emissions of key pollutants? 	Air Quality Management Area/s	
		Air quality monitoring results (based on results from the 5 monitoring stations in Brent Borough)	
		Days when air quality is moderate or higher (UK national SD indicator)	
Biodiversity EN4. To conserve and enhance biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance habitats of borough or local importance habitats and create habitats in areas of deficiency? Will it conserve and enhance species diversity; and in particular avoid harm to protected species? Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest? Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management? Will it encourage protection of and increase number of trees? 	Tree coverage and Tree Protection Orders	
		Area (Hectares) of Nature Conservation Importance in Brent	
		Townscape considered to be of low townscape quality (UDP indicator)	UDP Target: 10% decrease 2000-2010
		Percentage new homes built on previously developed land	
		Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) / Meeting Brent BAP targets	Brent Biodiversity Action Plan Targets: A: Maintain, and improving the wildlife status of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance in the Borough. B: Reduce Areas of Wildlife Deficiency in the Borough. Targets to be achieved through management

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
			of the Council's own land; encouraging good practice by other land managers; and through planning policy London, No net loss over the London Plan period (London Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006)
		Meeting Brent BAP targets	
Landscape & Townscape EN5. To maintain and enhance the character and quality of landscapes and townscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it improve the landscape and ecological quality and character of open spaces? Will it enhance the quality of priority areas for townscape and public realm enhancements? Will it minimise visual intrusion and protect views? Will it decrease litter in urban areas and open spaces? 	% vacant properties	
		Number and condition of listed buildings and monuments	
		Conservation areas	
Historic Environment & Cultural Assets EN6. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect and enhance Conservation Areas and other sites; features and areas of historical and cultural value? Will it protect listed buildings? Will it help preserve and record archaeological features? 	Listed buildings at risk	
Climate Change EN7. To reduce contributions to climate change and reduce vulnerability to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption? Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources? Will it reduce emissions of ozone depleting substances? Will it minimise the risk of flooding from rivers and watercourses to people and property? Will it reduce the risk of damage to property from storm events? 	Domestic energy efficiency – SAP ratings and National Homes Energy Ratings	
		Number of developments meeting 'Good' or 'Very Good' BREEAM / EcoHomes Standard or incorporating renewable energy (UDP Indicator)	UDP Target Net Increase
		Domestic CO2 emissions	
		CO2 emissions from all sources	<i>London</i> To reduce emissions to 23% below 1990 levels by 2016 (London Plan Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)
		% Energy from renewable resources	10% by 2016 AMR 2004-5
Household waste collection and composition	<i>National Targets:</i> 2000 waste strategy: – Recover value from 45% of municipal waste and to recycle 30% of household waste by 2010 – Enable 25% of household waste to be recycled or		
		% waste: - recycled - composted - land-filled	

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
			composted by 2005-6 – Reduce landfill for industrial and commercial waste to 85% of 1998 level by 2005
		Flood risk areas	London No net loss of functional floodplain (London Plan, Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)
		Frequency of fluvial flood events	
		Development in the floodplain	
		Population with access to recycling facilities	
Land and Soil EN9. To conserve and enhance land quality and soil resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it minimise development on greenfield sites? Will it ensure that where possible; new development occurs on derelict; vacant and underused previously developed land and buildings? Will it ensure land is remediated as appropriate? Will it minimise the loss of soils to development? Will it maintain and enhance soil quality? Will it reduce the risk of subsidence? 	Sites and Nature of Contaminated Land	Net decrease (AMR 2004-5)
		% of housing built on previously developed land (UDP Indicator)	UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010
		Stock / Area of Vacant and Brownfield Land	
		Loss of greenfield land	No net loss of open space (AMR 2004-5)
Economic			
Growth EC1. To encourage sustainable economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage new business start-ups and opportunities for local people? Will it improve business development and enhance productivity? Will it improve the resilience of business and the local economy? Will it promote growth in key sectors? Will it promote growth in key clusters? Will it enhance the image of the area as a business location? 	Number of Businesses, Business composition and Jobs	
		Uses of land in employment use across the borough	
Employment EC2. To offer everybody the opportunity for rewarding and satisfying employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce short and long-term local unemployment? Will it provide job opportunities for those most in need of employment? Will it help to reduce long hours worked? Will it help to improve earnings? 	Change in claimant count unemployment rate	
		Long-term unemployment (percentage of unemployed who have been out of work for over one year)	
		% People in Work-less Households	
Regeneration EC3. To reduce disparities in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote regeneration; reducing disparity with surrounding 	Vacant land and properties and derelict land	UDP Target: 25% reduction in derelict land by 2008
		Ratio of most to least deprived wards	

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
economic performance and promote sustainable regeneration	areas?	Area of land redeveloped in important regeneration areas: Park Royal Wembley	UDP Target: 20Ha by 2010
Investment EC4. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage indigenous business? Will it encourage inward investment? Will it make land and property available for business development? 	% Business Investment from Outside Borough	
		Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area	
		New Business Surviving 3 Years Business start ups and closures	
Efficient Movement EC5. To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce commuting? Will it improve accessibility to work by public transport; walking and cycling? Will it reduce journey times between key employment areas and key transport interchanges? Will it facilitate efficiency in freight distribution? 	Proportion of retail / leisure floorspace approved in areas of very good / good / moderate public transport accessibility	UDP Target: 90% in moderate to very good PTAL locations 2000-2010.
		PTAL score for new developments	
		% new retail / leisure floorspace planning permissions in/adjoining town centres	
		Commuting by mode (mode of travel to work and school)	
		Peak / Off peak traffic speeds / flows	
		Transport connectivity / transport facilities	
		Surveys of perceptions	
		Access to public transport	

APPENDIX 7

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Significance Criteria

Background and preamble

A set of 'generic' significance criteria was developed to provide guidance to help in scoring significance when completing the SA matrices, see overleaf. Perhaps more importantly the criteria provide a degree of transparency as to the reasoning behind allocating individual scores, such that anyone reading the SA Report should be able to understand the rationale underlying the score, even if they do not entirely agree with the score given.

It is important to recognise that the creation of pre-determined significance criteria is not a substitute for applying expert judgement:

- Completeness will never be possible, nor appropriate. Significance criteria are broad, and provide guidance to arriving at significance judgements rather than offer an accurate scale or series of thresholds. Such thresholds may be possible, but only in specific cases or projects and at small geographical scales, where, for example specific impacts and receptors can be both identified and understood.
- Significance criteria will be case and location specific. Separate criteria will need to be developed in all SA and SEA examples.
- Expert judgement and local knowledge will remain a key and fundamental aspect of appraisal and significance scoring. Even when a scale or set of significance criteria have been developed, a series of judgements will still be required to decide the likely level of the effect(s) of a particular policy drawing on the evidence base available.
- Given this, differences of opinion and inconsistency remain possible. In particular the complexity surrounding predicting the effects of implementing a particular policy will remain even where significance criteria are introduced. Indirect, cumulative and long-term effects are still likely to lead to uncertainty, and different appraisers may still assign divergent scores in the same circumstances.

The generic significance criteria described here were developed further for each sustainability objective used in the SA of the Draft Core Strategy to make them applicable to the Brent context, and can be provided on request. By way of illustration, the description of what would constitute a 'major positive' effect in the case of the sustainability objective S1 '*To reduce poverty and social inclusion*' is as follows:

- The policy or option is likely to significantly reduce disparity and inequality within Borough, especially between the most deprived areas (Harlseden, Willesden, Kilburn and Crickelwood) and those less deprived. In the long term it may lead to the alleviation of certain inequalities.

- It is likely to reduce significantly the number of households suffering from fuel poverty. The long-term effects are likely to lead to the eradication of fuel poverty in vulnerable households in the borough by 2010 and by 2016, as far as reasonably practical, for no person in England to be in fuel poverty (Fuel Poverty in England: The Government's Plan for Action).
- Much improved access and affordability of essential services will be created.
- The policy or option is likely to create significant and suitable employment opportunities for local people.

Note that the criteria for a particular significance of effect category (major positive, minor positive, neutral etc) are not meant to be exhaustive. They are intended to provide guidance on the scores assigned during the appraisal, to ensure transparency and consistency of scoring. A score can be assigned without all the criteria within a significance of effect category being met – it would generally be assigned if one or more of the categories are met. They are not intended to be used as checklist, which suggests a level of accuracy in scoring which is simply not possible in the majority of cases.

Generic significance criteria

Score	Description	General Comments ²
Major Positive (++)	<p>An option, policy or project very likely to lead to a significant opportunity / improvement, or a series of long-term improvements, leading to large-scale and permanent benefits to the sustainability objective being appraised.</p> <p>A major positive effect is also likely to have cumulative and indirect beneficial impact and / or improve conditions outside the specific policy or project area – will have positive transboundary effects.</p>	<p>Major positive scores must be justified with description of the impacts likely to lead to a major beneficial effect.</p> <p>Significant effects are those which either impact a large amount on a specific receptor or group or potentially have smaller impact but on a particularly sensitive or important receptor or group.</p> <p>Significance may also relate to existing targets set locally, regionally or nationally, such as for waste management, air pollution, educational achievement etc.</p> <p>Through reference to the baseline the likelihood, scale, time-frame and permanence of effects can be recorded.</p>
Minor Positive (+)	<p>An option, policy or project likely to lead to moderate improvement in both short and long-term, leading to large scale temporary, or medium scale permanent benefits to the objective being appraised.</p> <p>Even where beneficial effects are felt to be temporary, they should not be easily reversible (to detriment of objective) in the long-term.</p> <p>A minor positive effect is likely to halt or reverse historic negative trends.</p>	<p>Minor positive scores should be justified with description of the impacts likely to lead to a beneficial effect.</p> <p>Commentary may be appropriate on how a minor-positive policy or option could be strengthened and / or any uncertainties and factors which have led to a minor as opposed to major positive effect being recorded.</p>
Neutral (0)	<p>An option, policy or project which is unlikely to have any beneficial or negative impact / effect on the objective being appraised in either the short, or long-term.</p> <p>This may include the continuation of a current trend – thus the condition of an issue may continue to decline / improve, however the appraiser's judgement is that the policy is having no effect on the current trend.</p>	<p>Neutral scoring should only be used where it is very likely that the effect will be neither positive, nor negative.</p> <p>Where positive and negative effects are likely to cancel each other out this should be recorded as 'mixed' see below, rather than neutral.</p> <p>A neutral score is not the same as 'uncertain', where an appraiser is not sure if an effect is likely to be positive or negative, or 'mixed', where the appraiser feels that the effects are likely to be both positive and negative (see below for more detail).</p>
Minor Negative (-)	<p>An option, policy or project likely to lead to moderate damage / loss in both short and long-term, leading to large-scale temporary, or medium scale permanent negative impact on the objective.</p> <p>An option, policy or project which may also have limited cumulative and indirect detrimental impact and / or limited degradation of conditions outside the specific policy or project area.</p>	<p>To be scored minor negative, effects should be considered able to be mitigated through policy.</p> <p>Commentary should be provided on how minor negative effects can be mitigated and / or reversed.</p>

² These comments should be reflected across the application of the criteria for each objective.

Score	Description	General Comments ²
	<p>A minor negative effect is likely to halt or reverse historic positive trends.</p> <p>It is also likely that it will be possible to mitigate or reverse a minor negative effect through policy or project intervention.</p>	
<p>Major Negative (-)</p>	<p>An option, policy or project likely to lead to significant or severe damage / loss, or a series of long-term negative effects, leading to large-scale and permanent negative impacts on the sustainability objective being appraised.</p> <p>An option, policy or project which may also have significant cumulative and indirect detrimental impact and / or degrade conditions outside the specific policy or project area – will have negative transboundary effects.</p> <p>An option, policy or project which is likely to threaten environmental thresholds / capacities in areas already under threat.</p> <p>The detrimental effects of the option, policy or project will be hard to reverse and are unlikely to be easily mitigated through policy or project intervention.</p> <p>Any damage or detrimental effect in or to environmentally sensitive areas, issues or landscapes which are recognised and / or protected locally, regionally, nationally or internationally should be scored as a major negative.</p>	<p>Major negative scoring should be considered where effects are irreversible and difficult to mitigate.</p> <p>Significant effects are those which either impact a large amount on a specific receptor or group or potentially have smaller impact but on a particularly sensitive or important receptor or group.</p> <p>Where effects are uncertain, but there is some probability of a significant negative impact, a precautionary approach to scoring will be applied.</p> <p>Major negative scores should be recorded without taking into account potential for mitigation, since there is no guarantee that any mitigation measures (policies) will be implemented or successful. In all cases where major negative scores are assigned, policy improvement recommendations should be made.</p>
<p>Mixed (e.g. +/-, +/- - etc.)</p>	<p>The effect is likely to be a combination of beneficial and detrimental effects, particularly where effects are considered on sub-issues, areas or criteria.</p> <p>For example a project may enhance the viability of certain protected species or habitats (such as native woodlands), but through this damage existing (non-native) habitats which may themselves be important.</p>	<p>Such mixed and effects will be hard to predict, but could be significant in the long-term, or when taken with other effects (cumulative).</p> <p>A mixed effect score may also be combined with an uncertain score (?) where the relative balance of effects, or the nature of the effects remains uncertain.</p>
<p>Uncertain (?)</p>	<p>The effect of a policy, project or option cannot be, or is not, known or is too unpredictable to assign a conclusive score. The appraiser is not sure of the effect.</p> <p>Where the effect is genuinely uncertain an uncertain score should be assigned rather than attempt to give a positive, negative or neutral score. Uncertainty should be acknowledged rather than attempt spurious accuracy, which is likely to result in greater divergence amongst different appraisers.</p>	<p>This may be the case where a policy covers a range of issues, or where the manner in which a policy is implemented will have a material impact on the effects it will have.</p> <p>Equally it may be the case that there is insufficient evidence, information or expertise to come to a satisfactory conclusion about whether an effect is likely to be positive or negative.</p> <p>In these circumstances commentary should be provided as to how the policy may be improved / clarified to ensure a positive effect.</p>