

London Borough of Brent's Local Development Framework Development Policies and Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Documents Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices to Part A: Sustainability Context



June 2007

Prepared for London Borough of Brent
by
Collingwood Environmental Planning

Collingwood Environmental Planning
1E, The Chandlery
50 Westminster Bridge Road
London, SE1 7QY, UK
tel: 020 7407 8700
email: r.eales@cep.co.uk
web: www.cep.co.uk



CONTENTS

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

APPENDICES

APPENDICES TO PART A: SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT

Appendix 1: Scoping Report Consultees	3
Appendix 2: Summary of Consultees Comments on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	7
Appendix 3: Site Specific Allocations Proformas	15
Appendix 4: Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes.....	23
Appendix 5: Baseline Data.....	47
Appendix 6: Sustainability Objectives, Criteria, Indicators and Targets	99
Appendix 7: Significance Criteria	109

APPENDICES TO PART B: APPRAISAL OF THE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

(included in separate volume)

Appendix 8: Initial Sustainability Appraisal Commentary and LB Brent Responses..	115
--	-----

APPENDICES TO PART C: APPRAISAL OF THE SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS

(included in separate volume)

Appendix 9: Site Specific Allocations Included in the Issues and Options Papers	101
Appendix 10: Summary of Information Included in Proformas Filled in by LB Brent .	105
Appendix 11: Key Issues Identified for Individual Sites and SA Comment Including Mitigation and Enhancement.....	128
Appendix 12: Recommended Changes from SA Commentary and LB Brent Responses	144

ABBREVIATIONS

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report	LDF	Local Development Framework
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area	LDS	Local Development Scheme
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan	LEA	Local Education Authority
BEA	Borough Employment Area	LES	Local Employment Site
BIW	Businesses, Industry and Warehouses	LGA	Local Government Association
BREEAM	BRE (Building Research Establishment) Environmental Assessment Method	LNR	Local Nature Reserve
CEP	Collingwood Environmental Planning	LPA	Local Planning Authority
CF	Community Facilities	LIP	Local Implementation Plan
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species	MOL	Metropolitan Open Land
CO	Carbon Monoxide	NDC	New Deal for Communities
CO ₂	Carbon Dioxide	NO	Nitric Oxide
CP	Core Policy	NO ₂	Nitrogen dioxide
CST	Culture Sport and Tourism	NVQ	National Vocational Qualifications
db	Decibels	ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
DC	Development Control	OS	Open Space
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government	ONS	Office of National Statistics
DCMS	Department for Culture Media and Sport	PCT	Primary Care Trust
Defra	Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs	PM ₁₀	Particles measuring less than 10 microns
DETR	Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions	PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
DfT	Department for Transport	PPS	Planning Policy Statement
DP	Development Policy	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
EEA	Energy Action Area	SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
EEC	European Economic Community	SD	Sustainable development
EC	European Commission	SD	Sustainable design
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	SEA	Strategic Employment Area
ENV	Environment	SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
EU	European Union	SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
GPD	Gross Domestic Product	SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
GIS	Geographical Information System	SOA	Super Output Areas
GLA	Greater London Authority	SO ₂	Sulphur dioxide
GOL	Government Office for London	SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
GP	General Practitioner	SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
GQA	General Quality Assessment	SRDF	Sub Regional Development Framework
H	Housing	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
HA	Housing Association	SUDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage
Ha	Hectare	TC	Town Centre
IEA	Industrial Employment Area	TPO	Tree Preservation Order
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation	TRN	Transport
I & O	Issues and Options	UD	Urban Design
LA 21	Local Agenda 21	UDP	Unitary Development Plan
LBB	London Borough of Brent	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
LB Brent	London Borough of Brent	VAT	Value Added Tax
LBPN	London Bus Priority Network	WFD	Water Framework Directive
LCN+	London Cycle Network Plus	WLWDA	West London Waste Disposal Authority (known as WestWaste)
LDD	Local Development Document	ZED	Zero Energy Development

June 2007

APPENDICES

June 2007

APPENDIX 1

SCOPING REPORT CONSULTEES

June 2007

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**

June 2007

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	
<i>Baseline and maps:</i>	
<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>
<i>Key sustainability problems:</i>	
Consider whether any further landscape/townscape character issues / problems should be included	No changes consider necessary.
Suggested modification to sustainability objective EN5: Change to – "EN5: to maintain and enhance the <u>character and quality of landscapes and townscapes</u> "	This has been amended as suggested (See Table 8 in Part A)
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	Not applicable
<i>Access and recreation:</i>	
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	Not applicable
Environment Agency	
Review of other policies and plans – include: <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 	Regional Blue Ribbon Policy: reviewed and added to PPP list. National legislation has not been included in review as at this level.

June 2007

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>

June 2007

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>

June 2007

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

June 2007

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

June 2007

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

SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS PROFORMAS

June 2007

Site Allocation Proformas

The following proformas were used by LBB officers to consider sustainability issues of the site allocations.

Employment sites (retail / industrial/ offices, etc)

Site(s) name:		Site no:
Description of location:		
Description of possible use of site:		
Is there an SPD or other design guidance proposed for the site? If yes, which?		
Is the site part of a cluster of sites/ in close proximity to other sites/ likely to affect other sites? If yes, which sites (name and number)?		
Grid reference:		Size of site (ha):
Ward name:		Area Planning Team:
Name of officer completing site proforma:		
Date(s) site proforma completed:		
Economic		Comments
Is the site in or within easy access of the most deprived wards?		
Is the site in an area that is a priority for regeneration or within a Strategic Employment Location (SEL)/ Industrial Employment Area (IEA)?		
If the site includes retail: is the site located in a town centre or edge-of-centre location? If yes, which?		
Social		
Will the site result in the loss of open space?		
Is the site within 200m of a bus stop or 400m from a train station?		
PTAL Score of site		
Environmental		
Will the site affect an SSSIs or other site of nature conservation importance (e.g. metropolitan/borough importance)?		
Is the site within Zone 2 or Zone 3 of the floodplain? If yes, which?		
Does the site affect a listed building, conservation area etc?		
Is the site located within an existing MOL boundary?		
Is the site on previously developed land or greenfield land?		
Is the site contaminated/ does it require remediation?		
Further technical comments:		
Summary:		

June 2007

Housing sites

Site(s) name:		Site no:
Description of location:		
Description of possible use of site:		
Is there an SPD or other design guidance proposed for the site? If yes, which?		
Is the site part of a cluster of sites/ in close proximity to other sites/ likely to affect other sites? If yes, which sites (name and number)?		
Grid reference:		Size of site (ha):
Ward name:		Area Planning Team:
Name of officer completing site proforma:		
Date(s) site proforma completed:		
Economic		Comments
Is the site in an area that is a priority for regeneration?		
Social		
Will the site result in the loss of open space?		
Is the site within an area of open space deficiency?		
Is the site within 200m of a bus stop or 400m from a train station?		
PTAL Score of site		
Distance to a GP		
Is the site within the catchment of a primary school?		
Is the site within the catchment of a secondary school?		
Environmental		
Will the site affect an SSSIs or other site of nature conservation importance (e.g. metropolitan/borough importance)?		
Is the site within Zone 2 or Zone 3 of the floodplain? If yes, which?		
Does the site affect a listed building, conservation area etc?		
Is the site located within an existing MOL boundary?		
Is the site within an Air Quality Management Area?		
Estimated day time maximum noise levels ¹ in the vicinity of the site		
Estimated night time maximum noise levels in the vicinity of the site		
Is the site on previously developed land or greenfield land?		
Is the site contaminated/ does it require remediation?		
Further technical comments:		
Summary:		

¹ See noise maps at <http://www.noisemapping.org/> .

WHO guidelines on community noise in specific environments (cited in the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, 2004) Daytime outdoor living areas max. 55 dB, night time outside bedrooms max. 45 dB

June 2007

Mixed sites (including housing and employment)

Site(s) name:		Site no:
Description of location:		
Description of possible use of site:		
Is there an SPD or other design guidance proposed for the site? If yes, which?		
Is the site part of a cluster of sites/ in close proximity to other sites/ likely to affect other sites? If yes, which sites (name and number)?		
Grid reference:		Size of site (ha):
Ward name:		Area Planning Team:
Name of officer completing site proforma:		
Date(s) site proforma completed:		
Economic		Comments
Is the site in or within easy access of the most deprived wards?		
Is the site in an area that is a priority for regeneration or within a Strategic Employment Location (SEL)/ Industrial Employment Area (IEA)?		
Social		
Will the site result in the loss of open space?		
Is the site within an area of open space deficiency?		
Is the site within 200m of a bus stop or 400m from a train station?		
PTAL Score of site		
Road distance to a GP		
Is the site within the catchment of a primary school?		
Is the site within the catchment of a secondary school?		
Environmental		
Will the site affect an SSSIs or other site of nature conservation importance (e.g. metropolitan/borough importance)?		
Is the site within Zone 2 or Zone 3 of the floodplain? If yes, which?		
Does the site affect a listed building, conservation area etc?		
Is the site located within an existing MOL boundary?		
Is the site within an Air Quality Management Area?		
Estimated day time maximum noise levels ² in the vicinity of the site		
Estimated night time maximum noise levels in the vicinity of the site		
Is the site on previously developed land or greenfield land?		
Is the site contaminated/ does it require remediation?		
Further technical comments:		
Summary:		

² See noise maps at <http://www.noisemapping.org/> .

WHO guidelines on community noise in specific environments (cited in the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, 2004) Daytime outdoor living areas max. 55 dB, night time outside bedrooms max. 45 dB

June 2007

Community sites

Site(s) name:		Site no:
Description of location:		
Description of possible use of site:		
Is there an SPD or other design guidance proposed for the site? If yes, which?		
Is the site part of a cluster of sites/ in close proximity to other sites/ likely to affect other sites? If yes, which sites (name and number)?		
Grid reference:		Size of site (ha):
Ward name:		Area Planning Team:
Name of officer completing site proforma:		
Date(s) site proforma completed:		
Economic		Comments
Is the site in or within easy access of the most deprived wards?		
Is the site in an area that is a priority for regeneration or within a Strategic Employment Location (SEL)/ Industrial Employment Area (IEA)?		
Social		
Will the site result in the loss of open space?		
Is the site within an area of open space deficiency?		
Is the site within 200m of a bus stop or 400m from a train station?		
PTAL Score of site		
Environmental		
Will the site affect an SSSIs or other site of nature conservation importance (e.g. metropolitan/borough importance)?		
Is the site within Zone 2 or Zone 3 of the floodplain? If yes, which?		
Does the site affect a listed building, conservation area etc?		
Is the site located within an existing MOL boundary?		
Is the site with an Air Quality Management Area?		
Estimated day time maximum noise levels ³ in the vicinity of the site		
Is the site on previously developed land or greenfield land?		
Is the site contaminated/ does it require remediation?		
Further technical comments:		
Summary:		

³ See noise maps at <http://www.noisemapping.org/>.

WHO guidelines on community noise in specific environments (cited in the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, 2004): School class and pre-schools, indoors, 35 dB; school playground outside, 55 dB; hospitals, max 30 dB

June 2007

Transport sites

Site(s) name:		Site no:
Description of location:		
Description of possible use of site:		
Is there an SPD or other design guidance proposed for the site? If yes, which?		
Is the site part of a cluster of sites/ in close proximity to other sites/ likely to affect other sites? If yes, which sites (name and number)?		
Grid reference:	Size of site (ha):	
Ward name:	Area Planning Team:	
Name of officer completing site proforma:		
Date(s) site proforma completed:		
Economic	Comments	
Will the site improve access to or within the most deprived wards?		
Is the site in an area that is a priority for regeneration or within a Strategic Employment Location (SEL)/ Industrial Employment Area (IEA)?		
Social		
Will the site result in the loss of open space?		
Is the site within an area of open space deficiency?		
Environmental		
Will the site affect an SSSIs or other site of nature conservation importance (e.g. metropolitan/borough importance)?		
Is the site within Zone 2 or Zone 3 of the floodplain? If yes, which?		
Does the site affect a listed building, conservation area etc?		
Is the site located within an existing MOL boundary?		
Is the site with an Air Quality Management Area?		
Estimated day time maximum noise levels ⁴ in the vicinity of the site		
Is the site on previously developed land or greenfield land?		
Is the site contaminated/ does it require remediation?		
Further technical comments:		
Summary:		

⁴ See noise maps at <http://www.noisemapping.org/> .

WHO guidelines on community noise in specific environments (cited in the Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, 2004): School class and pre-schools, indoors, 35 dB; school playground outside, 55 dB; hospitals, max 30 dB

APPENDIX 4

REVIEW OF RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

June 2007

Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
National			
1. Securing the Future. The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, March 2005	<p>The Government's 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 DPDs it remains important for it to reflect the new national strategic priorities and principles.
2. 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.	The DPD will need to not only reflect existing policy in PPS25, but also the evolving strategy.
3. Communities Plan (Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future);	<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</p>	It is important the DPDs do not conflict with this national programme of action.	The DPDs should be aware of the elements of the Communities Plan and follow the relevant principles.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
National			
2003.	<p>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. • Improvements to the local environment; particularly the public realm. 		
4. UK Climate Change Programme, 2006 (Defra)	<p>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.</p>		<p>The draft Development Policies DPD can play a significant role in reducing CO2 emissions. The DPD should be aware of, and contribute to meeting UK's commitment.</p>
5. Decent homes and decent communities, DCLG, 2006	<p>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.</p>		<p>DPDs should take these targets into account.</p>
6. DCLG, Code for Sustainable Homes: A step-change in sustainable home building practice, 2006	<p>This code aims to facilitate a step-change in design and construction of new homes for sustainability. It sets out new national standards for buildings using a rating system.</p> <p>Compliance with the Code is currently voluntary, but Government is considering making them mandatory.</p>		<p>DPDs should take the Code for Sustainable Homes into account.</p>
7. DTI Energy white paper: meeting the energy challenge, 2007	<p>This white paper sets out the Government's international and domestic energy strategy for long term energy challenges.</p> <p>It seeks to aid deliver four energy policy goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to put ourselves on a path to cutting CO2 emissions by some 60% by about 2050, with real progress by 2020; - to maintain the reliability of energy supplies; - to promote competitive markets in the UK and beyond; - to ensure that every home is adequately and affordably heated. <p>It details the implementation measures of the Energy Review Report (2006) and those announced since. Some of the measures require further consultation.</p>		<p>The draft Development Policies DPD should include measures to reduce energy consumption</p>
8. English Heritage, Countryside Agency, English Nature and Environment Agency,	<p>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</p>	<p>Included are comprehensive checklists to scope, proof and check both Regional Spatial Strategies and Sub Regional</p>	<p>Both DPDs should take this guidance document into account</p>

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
National			
Environmental quality in Spatial Planning, Incorporating the natural, built and historic environment, and rural issues in plans and strategies, 2005	the publication of PPS11 (Regional Spatial Strategies) and PPS12 (Local Development Frameworks).	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.	
9. 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 the draft Development Policies DPD
10. Draft Climate Change Bill (March, 2007)	<p>The Climate Change Bill is intended to provide a clear, credible and long-term framework for tackling climate change. It aims to reducing carbon dioxide emissions via the following four elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting targets in statute and carbon budgeting • Establishing a Committee on Climate Change • Creating enabling powers • Reporting requirements <p>The elements of this Bill create a framework to achieve a more coherent approach to managing climate change in the UK via ambitious targets, powers to achieve them, a strengthened institutional framework and clear and regular accountability to Parliament.</p>		The the draft Development Policies DPD can contribute to the UK framework for tackling climate change. Policies and supporting text should reflect the goals and objectives of the Bill through reductions in carbon dioxide emissions.
11. Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act (2006)	<p>The principal Purpose of the Act is to enhance the UK's contribution to combating climate change. Overall, it aims to increase energy efficiency and reduce green house gas emissions.</p> <p>In accordance with the Act, local authorities will have to publish an energy measures report in exercising their functions and from time to time may have to publish revised energy measures reports.</p>		The policies included in the draft Development Policies DPD can contribute to national energy and climate change related targets.
12. DCLG, Planning white paper: Planning for a Sustainable Future, Consultation 2007	<p>This white paper sets out our detailed proposals for reform of the planning system, including, improving the speed, responsiveness, efficiency in land use planning.</p> <p>It proposes reforms on decision making and further reforms to the Town and Country Planning system.</p>		Decision making in DPDs should respond to changes in the planning system made as a result of this white paper.
13. Waste Strategy for England, 2007	The waste strategy sets up the vision for sustainable waste management in England, with the following key objectives:		The draft Development Policies DPD should take this white paper into account

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
National			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • decouple waste growth (in all sectors) from economic growth and put more emphasis on waste prevention and re-use; • meet and exceed the Landfill Directive diversion targets for biodegradable municipal waste in 2010, 2013 and 2020; • increase diversion from landfill of non-municipal waste and secure better integration of treatment for municipal and non-municipal waste; • secure the investment in infrastructure needed to divert waste from landfill and for the management of hazardous waste; and • get the most environmental benefit from that investment, through increased recycling of resources and recovery of energy from residual waste using a mix of technologies. 		and include policies that help deliver the objectives of the waste strategy.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
PPGs and PPSs			
14. DCLG PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development	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 DPDs while ensuring effective environmental protection / natural resource use – the DPDs should be aware of and account for this risk.	Both DPDs should reflect these high level aims for sustainable communities
15. DCLG Consultation Draft Planning and Climate Change: Supplement to PPS1, 2006	<p>This draft PPS supplement sets out how spatial planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change (mitigation) and how it should take into account the unavoidable consequences (adaptation). This consultation is part of a package of action by DCLG to help deliver the Government's ambition of achieving zero carbon development.</p> <p>It's key planning objectives detail that regional planning bodies, and all planning authorities should prepare and deliver spatial strategies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make a full contribution to delivering the Government's Climate Change Programme and energy policies, and in doing so contribute to global sustainability; • in enabling the provision of new homes, jobs, services and infrastructure and shaping the places where people live and work, secure the highest viable standards of resource and energy efficiency and reduction in carbon emissions; 		Both DPDs should seek to fulfil these objectives of the PPS1 supplement and be aware of the overall aim of achieving zero carbon development.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
PPGs and PPSs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deliver patterns of urban growth that help secure the fullest possible use of sustainable transport for moving freight, public transport, cycling and walking; and, overall, reduce the need to travel, especially by car; • secure new development and shape places resilient to the effects of climate change in ways consistent with social cohesion and inclusion; • sustain biodiversity, and in doing so recognise that the distribution of habitats and species will be affected by climate change; • reflect the development needs and interests of communities and enable them to contribute effectively to tackling climate change; and, • respond to the concerns of business and encourage competitiveness and technological innovation. 		
16. DCLG PPS3: Housing.	This PPS provides guidance on a range of issues relating to the provision of housing.		<p>Development principles should seek to realise / complement the aims of this national PPG.</p> <p>As this represents national guidance on housing provision / planning – both DPDs should be aware of and reflect these guidelines in its scope and principles.</p>
17. DCLG PPG4: Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms.	<p>Provides guidance on a range of issues relating to industrial and commercial development and small firms.</p> <p>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.</p>		Both DPDs but particularly the draft Site Specific Allocations DPD should draw on this detailed guidance.
18. 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.	Both DPDs should reflect and be aware of these aims.
19. DCLG PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.	<p>This 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).</p> <p>The broad aim of the England strategy is that planning, construction, development and regeneration should have</p>	The DPDs should not conflict with this aims and objectives of this PPS, which may place certain constraints on development.	<p>The DPDs should seek to achieve these objectives and must adhere to the principles set out.</p> <p>These are relevant given the pressure and scarcity of habitat and greenspace within the borough.</p>

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
PPGs and PPSs	minimal impacts on biodiversity and enhance it wherever possible.		
20. DCLG PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management.	<p>Regional planning bodies and planning authorities should prepare and deliver planning strategies that:</p> <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 the draft Development Policies DPD should take this guidance into account where relevant
21. 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 draft DPDs.
22. DCLG PPG13: Transport.	<p>Key objectives are to integrate planning and transport at the national; regional; strategic and local level to:</p> <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. 	<p>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.</p> <p>Synergistic with objectives to reduce social exclusion and income disparities.</p> <p>The link between movement; transport and crime / fear of crime reduction is important for Brent.</p>	<p>Both DPDs can contribute to achieving these objectives.</p> <p>Access to public transport; priority of people over traffic and walking and cycling particularly relevant to Brent.</p>

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
PPGs and PPSs			
23. 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.
24. 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 planning policies and in development control.
25. 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 DPDs should be consistent with the protection; enhancement and inter-connection of open spaces. These aims should be incorporated into the DPDs principles.
26. 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 the draft Development Policies DPD relating to renewable energy provision.	The draft Development Policies DPD should contribute to achieving the Government energy objectives included in PPS22.
27. 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 draft Development Policies DPD should include appropriate policies and proposals for dealing with pollution, for example in dealing with the contamination and the remediation of land so that it is suitable for the proposed development/use. Conditions on sites that are contaminated should also reflect this guidance.
28. DCLG PPG24: Planning and Noise.	Outlines guidance for local authorities in England on how to use their planning powers to minimise 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.		The draft Development Policies DPD should include policies that reflect this guidance. This PPG is also relevant to the draft Site Allocations DPD as many of the sites are located in high noise areas.
29. DCLG PPS25: Development and Flood-risk.	PPS25 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. PPS25 requires local planning authorities to undertake strategic flood risk assessments (SFRA) in consultation with the EA. A SFRA allows the application of the sequential test which aims to		Both DPDs should reflect the requirements of PPS25, in particular directing vulnerable development to areas of low flood risk and undertaking both strategic and site specific flood risk assessments. See also comments above relating to

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SAs
PPGs and PPSs			
	<p>steer development from areas at risk of flooding and the exception test which should demonstrate that a development located in a flood risk zone provides benefits to the community which outweigh flood risk, that the land is suitable for development or previously developed or there is no alternative land.</p> <p>PPS25 also requires any planning applications for developments of 1 hectare or greater or in the flood plain to be accompanied by a site specific flood risk assessment demonstrating that the development will be safe and will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p>		Making Space for Water.

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
Regional / London			
30. 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.		Both DPDs should conform with the London Plan and should reflect its strategic planning objectives. .
31. Draft Further Alterations to the Mayor's London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London; 2006.	The London Plan sets out strategic planning policies for London. As such the London plan is the key planning document for the capital.		Both DPDs should be in conformity with the London Plan and should reflect its strategic planning objectives. DPD should also take into account the proposed early and further alterations to the London Plan, especially the criteria based policies.
32. Planning for Equality and Diversity in London. The London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London) Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance, 2006	<p>This SPG provides detailed guidance on how to implement the key London Plan policies relating to equality and diversity. It is principally aimed at local authority planners responsible for producing DPDs and community strategies.</p> <p>The purpose of this SPG is to give more detailed guidance on policies with equalities implications, to encourage developers and planners to consider equality issues at the earliest stages of applications and in the preparation of DPDs. Specifically in relation to Policy 3A.14 Addressing the Needs of London's Diverse Population</p> <p>It provides guidance on some of the tools available for addressing equality issues and how to take equalities issues into consideration.</p>		The Development Policies DPD should take into account equality issues at the earliest stage in the preparation of DPD.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
33. Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation. The London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London) Draft SPG, 2006	This draft SPG provides guidance to London Boroughs on providing for play and recreation needs of children and young people (under the age of 18). It also provides guidance on the use of benchmark standards in the preparation of Play and Informal Recreation Strategies (Policy 3D.11i of the Draft Further Alterations to the London Plan).		Both DPDs will have to respond to and reflect this guidance in providing for play and recreational needs of children and young people.
34. The Mayors Sustainable Design and Construction: The London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance, 2006	This SPG provides additional information to support the implementation of the Mayor's London Plan (the Spatial Development Strategy) and is applicable to all development types and associated spaces. It provides guidance on implementing London Plan Policy 4B.6 on sustainable design and construction.		The Development Policies DPD should reflect this guidance and use the criteria for sustainable design and construction as appropriate. The SA should use these as a benchmark to inform the appraisal of the Development policies in particular.
35. 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.
36. Sustainability Appraisal of the draft further alterations to the London Plan (spatial development strategy for Greater London), Forum for the Future and Ben Cave Associates, 2006, re-issued, 2007.	This Sustainability Appraisal Report sets out the results of the Sustainability Appraisal, produced in full in September 2006, and re-issued April 2007.	Contains a source of useful information on objectives, issues of importance etc	This is a key contextual document. Note as part of the SA, including the findings of the assessment of policies as well as context.
37. 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. Both DPDs and SA should reflect the vision and objectives of this high-level sustainability document.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
38. 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). LB Brent is required to produce a Business Plan and LIPs to set out how they will implement this Strategy which needs to be reflected in both DPDs.
39. 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 		Both DPDs should consider the cross cutting issues included in the strategy and incorporate them within development principles.
40. 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 		Both DPDs should reflect the objectives included in the BAP. The importance placed on green space in Brent should be explicitly addressed in DPD policy and site allocations. The DPDs should seek to promote the importance of nature / biodiversity.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
41. 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.
42. Souther 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 Development Policies DPD should be proactive in approach to managing ambient noise and reflect the issues and priorities identified in this strategy. Noise should be considered as part of siting development.
43. 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.		Both DPDs should be aware of and contribute to the aims of the strategy. LB Brent 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 emissions. Air quality should be considered as part of siting development.
44. 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 Development Policies DPD. Energy efficiency in building and construction; and the encouragement of renewables should be incorporated into the DPD principles and policies.
45. Towards Zero Carbon Development: supportive information for Boroughs, London Energy Partnership, 2006	This report provides supportive information is targeted principally at borough officers, including planners. It includes practical advice around how local authorities can use their powers to encourage zero carbon developments. It also includes discusses current planning policy issues and the introduction of Local Development Frameworks.		The Development Policies DPD should heed the recommendations made in this report.
46. 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 policies in the Development Policies DPD, for instance those on Sustainable Construction and Climate Change, and be promoted to developers as good practice.
47. Rethinking Rubbish in London. The Mayor's Municipal Waste	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		This strategy should be reflected in the Development Policies DPD, although the majority of policies on waste and spatial

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
Management Strategy; 2003.	waste should no longer compromise London's future as a sustainable city."		planning are proposed to be dealt with in a West London waste DPD. The need for sites for waste management should be considered in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.
48. London: Cultural Capital – Realising the potential of a world class city. The Mayor's Culture Strategy; 2004.	<p>The Mayor's Culture Strategy has four key objectives; supported by a number of detailed policies:</p> <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 London • 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>	This strategy does make reference to Wembley which is a major site for development with a nationally important cultural development.	The Development Policies DPD should reflect the importance of culture in its policies. The strategy identifies that the Mayor wishes to realise the potential of Wembley as a nationally and internationally significant sports, leisure and business location. The need for sites for the provision of the necessary facilities should be considered in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.
49. 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.
50. 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.
51. 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 Development Policies DPD should reflect this document and take on board ways in which to encourage tourism for its economic benefits, but within sustainability limits.
52. 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 		Accessibility is a key issue for Brent. Specific guidance and advice should be drawn upon in preparing the Development Policies DPD and in subsequent DPDs and SPDs which should make explicit reference to the SPG.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies national legislation and policy guidance relevant to an inclusive and accessible environment 		
53. 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 both DPDs.
54. 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 the Development Policies DPD affordable housing policy / principles, along with the London Plan and its alterations. Conditions on sites for affordable housing will also need to reflect the SPG.
55. 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 the Development Policies 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. The need for the selection and conditions to be placed on sites to reflect climate change should be considered in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.
56. 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.		Both DPDs should be in conformity with the London Plan and should reflect its strategic planning objectives.
57. Water Matters: the Mayor's consultation on the Draft Water Strategy for London, 2007	The Mayor's Draft Water Strategy has three key objectives; supported by a number of detailed policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To secure a fair share of water for Londoners and London's water-related environment through the best use of the available water To minimise the release of wastewater into the clean water environment To reduce the threat to people and their property from flooding and to mitigate its effects 		The Strategy should be reflected in the Development Policies DPD which includes a hierarchy for water supply, water use, rainwater drainage, wastewater disposal and flooding. The flooding hierarchy in particular should be reflected in the site selection process.
58. The Mayor's Draft Climate Change Adaptation Strategy for London	Currently in preparation		This strategy currently being drafted. Depending on the timing this should be reflected in the DPDs prior to the submission stage.
59. Action Today to Protect Tomorrow. The Mayor's Climate Change Action Plan, 2007	The Action Plan is to sets out an agenda to cut London's carbon dioxide emissions. It focuses on the priorities for action in London, in other words, those that deliver the most significant CO ² savings at lowest cost (and in many cases with no net cost, since many actions bring energy savings). It details what		Both DPDs can contribute to carbon dioxide emission reductions. The Action Plan should help guide CO ₂ reductions in Brent.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPDs	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How the DPDs can respond / Implications for the SA
	London can do to deliver substantial CO ² savings while boosting London's economy.		Emissions from traffic will be particularly relevant to Brent considering its relatively high traffic volumes.
60. London's Urban Heat Island: A Summary for Decision Makers, Greater London Authority 2006	This report is a summary of a technical study into London's Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect. It provides options on managing the UHI effect. It is aimed at 'decision makers' - planners, architects, urban designers, developers and public health care professionals.		This report should provide useful information on guiding the Development policies DPD to take into account and manage the UHI effect in Brent.
61. 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.
62. 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.
63. 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 both DPDs on 'Meeting housing needs'.
64. 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 Development Control DPD and the sites proposed in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.
65. 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 Development Policies DPD, as well as site selection and conditions placed upon sites, 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.
66. 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		Both DPD should take this draft SPG into account, especially when formulating policies related to employment land and industrial development.
67. 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	Both DPDs 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.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
68. LBB Core Strategy DPD Preferred Options; 2006			The Core Strategy DPD Preferred Options provides the spatial strategy and the key policies which sets the framework for both DPDs.
69. 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.
70. LBB draft Regeneration Action Plan 2007 – 2009.	The Action Plan sets a clear agenda for regeneration in Brent over the next two years to support the priorities of the Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021.		Both DPDs can play a major role contributing towards regeneration for Brent. The strategic objectives of this plan should be incorporated.
71. 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 Development Policies DPD should consider the role of spatial planning in addressing and responding to the issues and targets contained in this strategy.
72. LBB Council’s Corporate Strategy 2006 – 2010.	Brent’s Corporate Strategy 2006 - 2010 sets out Brent’s priorities and ambitions for the next four years. The overall vision and priorities of the Borough are to secure the long-term prosperity, wellbeing and quality of life for all of Brent’s residents. The vision for Brent focuses on four main themes / headings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A great place A borough of opportunity One community Civic leadership 		The values and issues within this strategy should be incorporated within the overall objectives of both DPDs.
73. LBB Community Strategy 2006-2010.	The Community Strategy 2006 – 2010 aims ensure that Brent is / will be a prosperous and lively borough full of opportunity and welcoming to all, a place that will thrive for generations to come, whose future will be determined by local people It is based around three main themes that Brent will be a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great place; A borough of opportunity An inclusive Community 		A key document. Both DPDs and SAs should consider and reflect where appropriate the priorities of local people for the future of Brent included in this plan.
74. LBB Contaminated Land	Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 placed a		Both DPDs should incorporate relevant

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
Inspection Strategy, adopted 2001, updated January and May 2007.	<p>number of new powers and duties on Brent Council with regard to contaminated land.</p> <p>The Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy encompasses the following main strategic areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective implementation of Part IIA of the Act • Procedures for dealing with contaminated land enquiries or contaminative uses • Procedures for self regulation and discharge of the Council's responsibilities as a owner and operator of contaminated sites or sites at risk <p>The Strategy was reviewed in 2005/06 and was updated in January and May 2007. The May update introduces a revised risk prioritisation and consequently a revised spread of priority sites for investigation.</p>		aspects of this Strategy in seeking the remediation and re-use of contaminated land.
75. LBB Air Quality Action Plan, 2005-2010.	<p>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.</p> <p>The plan identifies measures to improve air quality across Brent and groups them into a series of categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promoting cleaner modes of transport • Traffic reduction and tackling through traffic • Promotion of cleaner fuel technology • Measures concerning local industries • Improving Eco-efficiency of current and future developments, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • properties owned or run by the Council • Actions to be taken corporately, regionally and in liaison with the Mayor 		Both DPDs should take into account the measures included in this plan, particularly in the AQMA, including in policies relating to the siting, density, type, location and design of development.
76. 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 spaces 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 within both DPDs.
77. LBB Biodiversity Action Plan, 2001.	A partnership of local groups and organisations co-ordinated by		Both DPDs should reflect where appropriate the actions and priorities for

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
	<p>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> <p>This document is currently undergoing revision.</p>		species and habitats covered by the Biodiversity Action Plan; and be sensitive to biodiversity issues generally. The SA should reflect the priorities in the Plan.
78. 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 		Both DPDs should incorporate where appropriate the measures included in this strategy, especially those regarding the provision of sport facilities.
79. 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.	Both DPDs should reflect the need for and benefits of playing fields and account for future demand as appropriate / relevant.
80. 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 for the period to 2006:</p> <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. 		Both DPDs 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 London waste DPD.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
81. LBB Local Implementation Plan (LIP) for Brent	The production of this plan is a statutory requirement under the GLA Act. The Plan details 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 Development Plan 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. The site sections process should reflect the priorities in the LIP.
82. LBB A Regeneration Strategy for Brent 2001-2021	<p>Vision: A Brent fully integrated into the city – a single urban Borough which makes a full and positive contribution to the London economy.</p> <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 provision and affordable homes. • 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. 		This strategy sets the high-level Borough strategy for regeneration and is important context to both DPDs.
83. 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.	Both DPDs should reflect the contents of the Ecology Handbook and the updated version and seek opportunities to conserve and enhance existing habitats as well as seek opportunities to create habitat and reduce areas of deficiency.
84. 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		
85. LBB School Organisation	The SOP is the starting point for the School Organisation		It is important for both DPDs to be aware of

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough Plan 2005-2010	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.		the Plan's findings and principles when developing policies which relate to or could affect schools / education.
86. 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 SPG 05 Altering and Extending your Home SPG 07 Shop fronts and Shop Signs SPG 08 Advertisements (other than shops) SPG 10 Community Safety - building or refurbishing domestic or commercial properties SPG 12 Access for disabled people: designing for accessibility SPG 13 Layout standards for access roads SPG 14 Childcare facilities SPG 16 Special Standards for Hassop Road SPG 17 Design Guide for New Development SPG 18 Employment Development	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.

June 2007

Plan or programme title	Relevance to the DPD	Comments, opportunities, synergies and constraints	How DPD can respond / Implications for the SA
Local / Borough			
SPG 19 Sustainable Design, Construction & Pollution Control SPG 20 Buildings in Gardens within Conservation Areas SPG 21 Affordable Housing			
87. LBB Brent Sustainable Design, Construction and Pollution Control, Supplementary Design and Planning Guidance 19 (SPG 19)	The purposes of the guidance are: <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. 		The Development Policies 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.
88. 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.		Both DPDs should seek ways of contributing to achieving the objectives of this strategy.
89. LBB Brent Children and Young People's Plan (2006 – 2009), 2006	Brent's Children and Young People's Plan is intended to achieve an integrated approach to strategic planning. This single plan will replace many of these existing plans including requirements for seven statutory and ten non-statutory plans. The purpose of the plan is to avoid duplication and enhance effective and coordinated joint planning and working. The six broad priority areas for Brent over the next three years as part of the plan are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating the conditions in which children and young people thrive • Early years development • Education achievement and school improvement • Support for young people and teenagers • Focus on excluded and vulnerable groups 		The DPD should contribute to the delivery of the six strategic through planning wherever possible.

June 2007

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"> Safeguarding, health and well-being <p>They are underpinned by 32 specific objectives in order to guide delivery of the priority areas.</p> <p>It applies to all agencies, statutory and voluntary, whose work impacts on Brent's children and young people.</p>		

APPENDIX 5

BASELINE DATA

June 2007

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><i>Brent AMR 2005-06</i></p> <p>Brent is ranked 58th out of 354 on the local authority national deprivation index. Carlton, Stonebridge, St Raphaels, Roundwood and Harlesden wards are ranked in the 10% most deprived wards nationally.</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>IMD 2004:⁵</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: Rank of average score: 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 neighbouring 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>

⁵ 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.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
	<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>Average household income</p>	<p>Brent, average household income: £27,212 (AMR 2005-6)</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, 08/12/2005, cited in AMR 2005-06).</p>	<p>London, 2006</p> <p>The average household earned income is only two thirds of the London average (AMR 2005-06)</p> <p>Brent's average earned income is only 66% of the London average of £41,759, the fourth lowest in London. And the Brent average salary of £27,402 is even lower than the national average of £28,941 (Office of National Statistics, 2006, cited in AMR 2005-06).</p>	<p>Average household income of £21,552 is £6,000 less than London average (Brent Housing Needs Survey 2004)</p>		<p>These data emphasise the intra-borough disparities which exist.</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</p> <p>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>

June 2007

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>Brent, 2004-05</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>London</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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Percentage of households suffering from fuel poverty	<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
Self assessment of health over last 12 months	<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>			Brent levels are comparable with National.
Perception of factors impacting on health	<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>				High incidence and fear of crime is a key sustainability issue.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Participation in sport (excludes walking)</p>	<p>Only site specific data within Brent was located.</p> <p>The Brent Playing Pitch Strategy identifies that Brent has a below average level of participation in football and a below minimum standard of outdoor playing space as determined by the National Playing Field Association Standards.</p> <p>The Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity in Brent reports the profile of users as follows:</p> <p>Gender:</p> <p>Male - 59% Female - 41%</p> <p>Age:</p> <p>Under 16 yrs - 23% 16 – 34 yrs - 51% 35 – 59 yrs - 22% Over 60 yrs - 4%</p> <p>Ethnic background:</p> <p>African-Caribbean - 36% White - 28% Asian - 30% Other - 6%</p> <p>However, the ethnic profile of users varies significantly across each of the centres to reflect the ethnic make-up of the wards in which they are based and their catchment areas.</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% of England's population to be reasonably active (30 minutes of moderate exercise five times a week) by 2020</p> <p>(http://www.shu.ac.uk/cgi-bin/news_full.pl?id_num=PR561&db=04)</p> <p>The London Plan aims to increase overall participation rates by an average of 1% per year, increase participation by under represented groups and provide structures to enable individuals to reach their sporting potential.</p>	<p>-</p>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Number of sports facilities by type</p>	<p>Brent Indoor sports: Vale Farm Sports Centre – 25m pool and teaching pool, 5 badminton courts/sports hall, squash courts, dojo and meeting rooms.</p> <p>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 – six lane 25m main pool plus teaching pool, four badminton court sports hall, fitness / weights area, dojo and multi purpose room, athletic s and five-a-side indoor football pitches.</p> <p>Source: A Strategy for Sport and Physical Activity in Brent</p>				
<p>Access to public open spaces</p>	<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>Source: AMR 2004-05</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 2005-06).</p> <p>See Figure 6 in Section 3 (Part A) for areas of open space deficiency.</p>		<p>The net loss of 4.6ha⁶ of open space during 2000-2006, compares positively to the 28.6ha net loss in the previous six year period. Since the Revised Unitary Development Plan 2001 came into effect, public open space has generally been successfully protected from alternative or inappropriate uses (AMR 2005-06).</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>

⁶ The substantial difference between this figure and the 2005 AMR figure is due to an allotment site (Ref.:00/0751) not being included in the original calculation.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Main mode of travel to work</p>	<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>
<p>Health inequalities</p>	<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 2005-06)</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>			

June 2007

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>Brent 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>Brent LEA average, 2006: Level 2, 5 or more GCSE grades A*-C (including english and maths): 48.9%</p> <p>DfES: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables</p>	<p>England average, 2006 Level 2, 5 or more GCSE grades A*-C (including english and maths): 45.8%</p> <p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables</p>	<p>Brent Level 2: 2000: 48.4% 2001: 45.6% 2002: 49.7% 2003: 50.7% 2004: 54.5% 2005: 57.1% http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/LEAS/304.shtml</p> <p>England Level 2: 2001: 53.7% 2004: 53.7% 2005: 57.1%</p>		<p>Educational attainment at Level 2 / GCSE level are comparable with national averages.</p>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Primary: Key Stage 2 performance (% achieving level 4+)</p>	<p>Brent LEA average, 2005: English: 79% Maths: 73% Science: 82%</p> <p>DfES: http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables</p>	<p>England average, 2005 English: 79% Maths: 76% Science: 87%</p> <p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables</p>	<p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/performancetables</p> <p>Brent: English2001 2000 - 74% 2001 - 74% 2002 - 74% 2003 - 77% 2004 - 78% 2005 - 78%</p> <p>Brent: Maths 2000 - 72% 2001 - 72% 2002 - 75% 2003 - 72% 2004 - 74% 2005 - 73%</p> <p>Brent: Science 2000 - 83% 2001 - 86% 2002 - 84% 2003 - 84% 2004 - 83% 2005 - 79%</p> <p>http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/LEAS/304.shtml</p> <p>England, 2002 English: 75% Maths: 73% Science: 86%</p> <p>England, 2004 English: 78% Maths: 74% Science: 86%</p> <p>England, 2005 English: 79% Maths: 75% 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>

June 2007

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

June 2007

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, 2005</p> <p>All people: 270,100 Males: 135,600 Females: 134,500</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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
			<p>Brent, 2004 All people: 267,700 Males: 134,300 Females: 133,400</p> <p>(Nomis Labour Market Profile for Brent. www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>		
Population density: people per hectare	<p>Brent = 61 persons per hectare. (AMR- 2005-06)</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. (AMR- 2005-06)</p>	<p>Brent = 55 people per hectare in 1991 (AMR- 2005-06)</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.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
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>		<p>Brents' diversity represents a cultural / community asset.</p>
Average house prices by type	<p>Brent, October - December 2006 Detached: £602,125 Semi: £365,335 Terraced: £336,764 Flat: £226,823</p> <p>All properties: £292,596</p> <p>(Land Registry – http://www.landreg.gov.uk/propertyprice/interactive)</p>	<p>Greater London, October - December 2006 Detached: £628,239 Semi: £361,619 Terraced: £331,450 Flat: £275,267</p> <p>All properties: £323,511</p> <p>England and Wales, March 2007 All properties: £178,423</p> <p>(Land Registry – http://www.landreg.gov.uk/propertyprice/interactive)</p>	<p>Brent, October – December 1996 Detached: £161,315 Semi: £108,190 Terraced: £89,209 Flat: £58,731</p> <p>All properties: £82,829</p> <p>Greater London, October – December 1996 Detached: £208,427 Semi: £114,392 Terraced: £103,973 Flat: £90,023</p> <p>All properties: £105,159</p> <p>England and Wales, April- June 2006 All properties: 199,184</p> <p>(Land Registry – http://www.landreg.gov.uk/propertyprice/interactive)</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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<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.irf.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. (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. (London Key Facts, LGA 2004)</p>			<p>As above</p>
<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%. (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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<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>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>(Census 2001, accessed online at www.statistics.gov.uk)</p> <p>Brent has the third highest household size in England and Wales and second highest level of overcrowding in London, with over 23% of its households living in overcrowded accommodation.</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</p>			Household sizes and overcrowding levels are higher than London averages, and both important issues.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<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>
<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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Additional home provision, new home completions (UDP Indicator)	<p>Brent 1997-2005</p> <p>Completed housing and additional housing: 4,817 new self-contained homes 1,565 new non self-contained homes 810 formerly vacant dwellings Total: 7,192</p> <p>(AMR 2005-2006)</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>	As above
Affordable housing provision	<p>Brent 1997-2005</p> <p>2480 self-contained dwellings 710 non- self contained homes 3190 total additional homes</p> <p>Total additional affordable homes 2005-06 = 551</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</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>		<p>Brent 1997-2004</p> <p>2091 self-contained dwellings 710 non- self contained homes 2876 total additional homes</p> <p>(AMR 2004-05)</p> <p>Total additional affordable homes 2004-05 = 249</p> <p>(AMR 2004-05)</p>	<p>UDP Target: 4800 affordable home completions 1997-2016</p>	As above
Vacant homes	<p>Brent, 2006</p> <p>At the end of 2005-06, Brent had a total of c106,000 houses and flats (including c4,000 homes) vacant. There were a variety of reasons for the vacancies, particularly legal problems and refurbishment schemes.</p>		<p>Brent, 2004</p> <p>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</p> <p>2005-2006 fiscal year return: 97%</p>		<p>2003-2004 fiscal year return: 99.56% 2004-2005 fiscal year return: 100%</p>	<p>UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010</p>	

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Homelessness Acceptances	Brent 2003/04 Decisions: 2666 Acceptances: 933 (Brent Affordable Housing Development Team, RSL Key Facts, April 2004)		Brent 2002/03 Decisions: 2524 Acceptances: 1085 Brent 2000/02 Decisions: 2539 Acceptances: 1263		

June 2007

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 2005 Wembley: 18.4% Kilburn: 1.4% Cicklewood: 12.2% Burnt Oak: 0.0% Willesden: 4.7% Kingsbury: 2.6% Harlesden: 7.3% Sudbury: 6.5% Wembley Park: 8.7% Preston Road: 3.60% Queens Park: 2.0% Neasden: 6.0% Colindale: 3.2% Ealing Road: 7.9% Kenton: 27.2% Kensal Rise: 7.6%</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</p>		<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>(AMR 2004-05)</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>	UDP Target: National Average by 2010	<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>

June 2007

<p>Public parks / Open Spaces</p>	<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>UDP Target: No net decrease 2000-2010</p>	
<p>Noise nuisance</p>	<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)

<p>Data Theme / Indicator</p>	<p>Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference</p>	<p>Comparators</p>	<p>Trend</p>	<p>Targets</p>	<p>Issues and Comments</p>
<p>Fear of crime</p>	<p>Brent, 2004 66% of residents feel threatened a 'great deal' by crime in their area (Brent's Crime Audit questionnaire, 2004, cited in AMR 2005-06).</p>			<p>Brent's Crime Strategy aims to reduce the figure (of residents that feel threatened 'a great deal') to 50% by 2007 (AMR 2005-06)</p>	<p>Fear of crime is a key sustainability issue</p>

June 2007

<p>Levels of crime</p>	<p>Brent, Apr 2005- Mar 2006 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 30.9 Sexual offences: 1.2 Robbery: 8.8 Burglary: 14.5 Vehicle and other theft (includes theft from and of a vehicle): 42.5</p> <p>(Crime Statistics for England and Wales www.crimestatistics.org.uk)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>England and Wales, Apr 2004- Mar 2005 Rates per 1000 population Violence against person: 19.8 Sexual offences: 1.2 Robbery: 1.8 Burglary: 12.1 Vehicle and other theft (includes theft from and of a vehicle): 37.3</p> <p>(Crime Statistics for England and Wales www.crimestatistics.org.uk)</p>	<p>Brent, 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</p> <p>(The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.)</p> <p>England and Wales, 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</p> <p>(The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent)</p>		<p>Other than sexual offences, all crime rates are above the national average within Brent. Violent crimes, robbery and burglary are particularly high.</p> <p>The high incidence of crime is a key sustainability issue.</p>
-------------------------------	--	---	---	--	---

June 2007

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	Brent, 2002 Satisfied: 74% Dissatisfied: 17% (Living in Brent 2002 a Representative View. A MORI study for Brent Borough Council.)	London 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 (GLA Mori Poll: Annual London Survey, 2003). http://www.mori.com/polls/2003/gla-dec.shtml)	Brent, 2000 Satisfied: 72% Dissatisfied: 16%		Comparable with London averages.
Net change in floorspace in D2 community use	Brent, 2005-06 6190m ² of new community floor space was created in 2005-06. (AMR 2005-06)		Brent 1994-1999 Overall net decrease of 920m ² 2000-2004 Overall net increase of 24,710m ² (UDP Annual Monitoring Report 2004) 4120m ² of new community floor space was created in 2004-05 (AMR 2004-5)	UDP Target: No net loss 2000-2010	
Percentage involved in volunteering over last 3 years	No data identified.	London 2001 39% Londoner's participated in formal volunteering (at least once in the last 12 months) identical to the England average. (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)			

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
<p>Access to non-car transport</p>	<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>				
<p>Access to Services (% having difficulty with access) Access to: Post office Food shop GP Primary school</p>	<p>No data identified.</p>				<p>Provision of and access to essential services and amenities is a key sustainability issue.</p>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<p>Number of childcare places available per 1,000 population of children under 5 not in early education</p>	<p>Brent</p> <p>450 childcare providers distributed (evenly) throughout the borough</p> <p>Net increase in childcare/nursery floorspace 2005-06: 1330 m².</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</p>		<p>Net increase in childcare facility floorspace 1994-2004; 3,890m²</p> <p>(Brent LEA)</p> <p>Increase in childcare/nursery floorspace 2004-2005: 2100 m²</p> <p>(AMR 2004-5)</p>		<p>Provision of and access to essential services and amenities is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>% Population living within 200m of open space</p>	<p>Identical to Open Space indicator and access map under Sustainability Objective 2.</p>				
<p>Area of outdoor sports land for community use (hectares per 1000 population)</p>	<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>				

June 2007

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 2002 – 2005</p> <p>Estimated traffic flows for all motor vehicles by Local Authority, 2002-2005 (million Km)</p> <p>2002: 1005 million Km 2003: 1013 million Km =0.8% change</p> <p>2004: 1013 million Km 2005: 1017 million Km =0.0% change</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</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>Brent's level of increase in traffic was below that of Camden, Barnet and Westminster.</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</p>	<p>Brent 1997-2004 Between 1997 and 2004 Brent has recorded an 80 million Km, or 8.6%, increase in traffic flow.</p> <p>(Annual Monitoring Report 2004-05)</p>	<p>Brent UDP Target: 10% reduction 1997-2008</p> <p>"noticeable reduction in growth" target up to 2011 (AMR, 2004-5)</p>	<p>Traffic flows barely increased in Brent in 2005-06. The percentage increase of traffic flows between 2002-2003 to 2004-2005 has decreased within Brent</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</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>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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Transport modal split	See Sustainability Objective 22.			<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>				Noise nuisance and vibration from major road routes in the Borough is a key sustainability issue.

June 2007

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 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 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><i>Brent, 2004</i></p> <p>CO: 1 Station Target achieved: NA</p> <p>NO₂: 4 Station Annual mean achieved: YES (1 station) / NA (2 stations) NO (1 station)</p> <p>Ozone: Days moderate or above: 7 (1 station) Target achieved: YES</p> <p>SO₂: Days moderate or above: 0 (3 stations) Target achieved: NA (3 stations)</p> <p>PM₁₀: Days moderate or above: 5-165 (4stations) Targets achieved: YES (2 stations), NO (2 stations)</p> <p>(Air Quality in London 2004, Kings College London, Environmental Research Group, 2004)</p> <p>PM₁₀: 2005-2006 Annual mean Objective (of 40 µgm⁻³) exceeded at Brent 4 (roadside station) and Brent 5 (residential station)</p> <p>Incident-based Objective of 50 µgm⁻³, measured as a daily mean (not to be exceeded on more than 35 days per year) was exceeded on 180 days in 2005. Brent 4 also exceeded the objective.</p> <p>During the first 6 months of 2006, Brent 5 exceeded the daily mean objective on 85 days as did Brent 4 (51 days).</p> <p>(Air Quality In London 2005 and mid 2006 – Briefing, July 2006)</p>		<p><i>Brent, 2003</i></p> <p>CO: Days moderate or above: 0 (1 station) Target achieved: YES</p> <p>NO₂: Days moderate or above: 1 (3 stations) Targets achieved: YES (1 station) / NA (2 stations)</p> <p>Ozone: Days moderate or above: 54 (1 station) Target achieved: NO</p> <p>PM₁₀: Days moderate or above: 12-25 (3 stations) Targets achieved: YES (1 station), NO (2 stations)</p> <p>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>

June 2007

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>See also Figure 21 in Section 3 of Part A.</p> <p>Brent, 2003: 60</p> <p>Regional Quality of Life 2003, Defra, 2004</p>	<p>Other London, 2003:</p> <p>N. Kensington: 59 Camden: 23 Marylebone Rd: 104 Haringey: 19 London A3: 33 Bexley: 77 Eltham: 65 Hillingdon: 45</p> <p>England urban: 51</p> <p>Regional Quality of Life 2003, Defra, 2004</p>	<p>2002:</p> <p>Brent: 24</p> <p>N. Kensington: 16 Camden: 3 Marylebone Rd: 57 Haringey: 10 London A3: 1 Bexley: 34 Eltham: 24 Hillingdon: 11</p> <p>England urban: 19</p>		<p>Number of days slightly above national urban average.</p> <p>Trend 2002 –2003 shows large increase, though this may be influenced by atmospheric and meteorological factors.</p> <p>Poor air quality, particularly along roads is a key sustainability issue.</p>
<p>Air Quality Management Area/s</p>	<p>Brent, 2001</p> <p>The Council has approved that AQMAs be declared in the following areas:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>(Indicators for a sustainable Brent, 2001)</p> <p>See Figure 20 in Section 3 of Part A for Brent's Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) and Major Roads.</p>				<p>Poor air quality, particularly along roads is a key sustainability issue.</p>

June 2007

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 importance in Brent. Figure 23 shows areas of nature conservation importance and access deficiency.</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>
Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs)	<p><i>Brent</i>, 2000:</p> <p>Sites of Metropolitan Importance: 3 sites, 169 hectares</p> <p>Sites of borough importance: Grade I: 6 sites, 124 hectares Grade II: 15 sites, 99 hectares</p> <p>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:</p> <p>A: Maintain, and improving the wildlife status of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance in the Borough.</p> <p>B: Reduce Areas of Wildlife Deficiency in the Borough.</p> <p>Targets to be achieved through management of the Council's own land; encouraging good practice by other land managers; and through planning policy</p>	As above

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
				<p>London, No net loss over the London Plan period</p> <p>(London Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006)</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>				As above

June 2007

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, 2006 Tree protection orders: 300 trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). Between April 2005 to March 2006, 7 new tree preservation orders were made which included some 100 trees.</p>		<p>307 Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). 9 new TPOs were made in the period April 2004 to March 2005 which includes some 307 individual trees and many trees in groups and areas (AMR, 2004-5).</p>		<p>As above</p>

June 2007

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 24).			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	<i>Brent</i> , 2005-06 97% of housing developments built on previously developed urban land (AMR, 2005-06).		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				

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
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	Brent Brent has 1 Grade I listed building and 6 Grade II* listed buildings. (LB Brent Planning Services. <i>Pers. Comm.</i>)				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 22 in Section 3 of Part A shows areas of nature conservation importance in Brent. Figure 23 shows areas of nature conservation importance and access deficiency.				

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Listed buildings at risk	<p>Brent, 2006</p> <p>The English Heritage register of listed buildings that are at risk:</p> <p>Old Oxgate Farm, Cricklewood (Grade II*) Dollis Hill House, Gladstone Park (Grade II) Cambridge Hall, Kilburn (Grade II) St Andrews Church Yard (not listed, contains 6 listed monuments) St Andrews Old Church, Kingsbury (Grade I) 148 Slough Lane, Kingsbury (Grade II)</p> <p>(http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1424)</p>		<p>Brent, 1999</p> <p>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 [accessed September 2006]</p>	<p>Other London Boroughs:</p> <p>Lewisham: 54 Greenwich: 68 Haringey: 13 Newham: 32 Southwark: 454 Lambeth: 274 Tower Hamlets: 228 Hackney: 73 Islington: 146 Ealing: 35</p>			As above

June 2007

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, 2004-05)			UDP Target Net Increase	
Domestic energy efficiency – SAP ratings and National Homes Energy Ratings	No data identified.				
Domestic CO2 emissions	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. (Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)	UK, 2003 Estimated domestic CO2emissions: 2.8 tonnes per capita Greater London, 2003 Estimated domestic CO2emissions: 2.6 tonnes per capita (Defra (2005) Local and Regional CO2 Emission Estimates for 2003)	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. (Indicators for a		Domestic CO2 emissions in Brent are similar to those of Greater London and the UK averages. There was a small decrease in emissions since 2000.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
<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>sustainable Brent, January 2001)</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>
<p>% Energy from renewable resources</p>	<p>Brent, 2005-2006</p> <p>There were three planning applications which included renewable energy generation. Two included solar panels installation and the other was for 10 wind turbines in the South Kilburn Regeneration area.</p> <p>(AMR, 2005-06)</p>		<p>Brent, 2004-2005</p> <p>There are currently a few small scale renewable energy schemes in the Borough.</p> <p>(See Table 3, p. 18 AMR 2004-05)</p>	<p>Brent</p> <p>10% by 2016 AMR 2004-05</p>	

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Flood risk areas	<p>Specific localised flooding is an issue in the Borough particular at times of increased run-off.</p> <p>The Brent Council website identifies five problem areas / issues: Welsh Harp, River Brent, Wealdstone Brook, surface water and water mains/melting snow/smaller water courses.</p> <p>(http://www.brent.gov.uk/services.nsf/0/3bbed5d8f558ab1080256e6a005627c7?OpenDocument)</p>			<p>London</p> <p>No net loss of functional floodplain</p> <p>(London Plan, Annual Monitoring Report, 2006)</p>	<p>Flooding and flood risks particularly in relation to the Welsh Harp Reservoir and River Brent is a key sustainability issue.</p>
Flood risk zones	<p>Environment Agency produces flood risk maps.</p> <p>http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/maps/960669/?version=1&lang=e</p> <p>See Figure 19 for a map of flood risk zones in Brent.</p>				<p>Flooding and flood risks particularly in relation to the Welsh Harp Reservoir and River Brent is a key sustainability issue.</p>
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.				

June 2007

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
Household waste collection and composition % waste: - recycled - composted - land-filled	Brent Apr-Dec 2005 Recycled (tonnes): Kerbside collection: 5336 Organic waste: 8716 Bring bank sites: 1786 Civic amenity site: 1274 Recycling: 21% Brent's recycling rate http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste		Brent 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% 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% Brent Recycling Performance Data Chart: http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste	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	Local pressures and national / regional policy is driving the need to manage waste more effectively. The critical need to minimise waste arisings and deal with waste locally and in a sustainable manner is a key sustainability issue.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Population with access to recycling facilities	Brent , 2005-06 Households with kerbside recycling collections: 76,000 = 74% have kerbside collection. http://www.capitalwastefacts.com	Greater London 2003/2004 Number of households: 3.1 million Over 90 per cent of London households have a recycling collection from home or have suitable access to near entry facilities (source: BVPI 91a 2005/06). http://www.capitalwastefacts.com	Brent , 2000-2001 Total properties collected from: 102,737 Households with kerbside recycling collections: 72,781 = 71% have kerbside collection. Brent Recycling Performance Data Chart: http://www.brent.gov.uk/waste	Statutory recycling target 2007/08: 20%	As above
Waste generation	Brent , 2004-5 Summary of waste arisings: Municipal waste: 131,000 tonnes of which household waste accounted for 117,000 tonnes. Waste generated per household: 1121 kg (West London Waste Authority and Constituent Boroughs (2005) Draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy)	West London Waste Authority , 2004-5 Waste generated per household: 1195 kg	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. (West London Waste Authority and Constituent Boroughs (2005) Draft Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy)		
Consumption of aggregates per capita	No data identified				

June 2007

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 Potentially a quarter of the land in Brent could be contaminated due to historic industrial landuses.</p> <p>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 2005-06)</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 26 shows areas of potentially contaminated land in Brent (Section 3, Part A).</p>			Net decrease (AMR 2004-5)	
Loss of greenfield land	<p>Brent 2005-2006</p> <p>Net loss of 0.7ha of public open space to development.</p> <p>(Total open space in Brent: 412 ha)</p> <p>There was an increase in the number of open space applications determined. However, net loss of public open space was marginal in comparison to previous rates of loss and new provision for sport and facilities was permitted.</p> <p>(AMR, 2005-06)</p>		<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>Brent 1993-1999</p> <p>Net loss of 38.5 ha</p> <p>(AMR 2004-05)</p> <p>Brent has seen a substantial improvement in the protection of public</p>	No net loss of open space (AMR 2004-5)	

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
			<p>open space, playing fields and allotments, since the mid 1990s (net loss of open space during 2000-2006 was 4.6ha, compared to the 28.6ha net loss in the previous six years.</p> <p>(AMR 2005-06)</p>		
<p>Stock / Area of Vacant and Brownfield Land</p>	<p>No data identified.</p>				
<p>% of housing built on previously developed land (UDP Indicator)</p>	<p>Refer to indicator under Objective 4.</p>			<p>UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010</p>	

June 2007

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	

June 2007

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, October, 2006 Unemployment rate: 4.3% Male unemployment: 5.7% Female unemployment: 2.7%</p> <p>Brent South: 14.6% (the second highest unemployment rate at London parliamentary constituency level) Brent North: 6.9% Brent East: 5.2%</p> <p>Figure 27 illustrates unemployment levels by ward (Section 3, Part A).</p>	<p>London, October 2006 Unemployment rate: 3.3% Male unemployment: 4.4% Female unemployment: 2.1%</p> <p>(AMR, 2005-06)</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 May 2006 Brent East: 4.5% Brent North: 2.5% Brent South: 5.9%</p> <p>(www.nomisweb.com)</p> <p>Unemployment rates range from 9.1% in Harlesden to 2.7% in Queensbury (AMR 2004-5)</p> <p>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>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>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
			<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>Long-term unemployment (percentage of unemployed who have been out of work for over one year)</p>	<p>Brent, April 2007</p> <p>25.1% of long-term unemployment</p> <p>Source: claimant count (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>London</p> <p>20.3% long-term unemployment (April, 2007) 19.5 long-term unemployment (June 2006)</p> <p>Great Britain 16.7% (April, 2007)</p> <p>UK 15.7% (June, 2006)</p> <p>Source: claimant count (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>Brent, June 2006</p> <p>21.7% of long-term unemployment</p> <p>Source: claimant count (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p> <p>Brent is ranked as the 39th most employment deprived district in the country</p> <p>(IMD 2004)</p> <p>2001 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>Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.</p>

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
			(Brent Regeneration Strategy 2001-2021)		
Occupation of those currently in employment	<p>Brent, 2005 Full time: 74% Part time: 26%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 11% Construction: 4.9% Services: 84.1% Tourism related: 5.3%</p> <p>Nomis Brent Labour Market Profile (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>London, 2005 Full time: 74% Part time: 26%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 5% Construction: 3% Services: 91.7% Tourism related: 8.4%</p> <p>London, 2004 Full time: 73.7% Part time: 26.3%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 5.5% Construction: 3% Services: 91.2% Tourism related: 8.5%</p>	<p>Brent, 2004 Full time: 74% Part time: 26%</p> <p>Manufacturing: 10.7% Construction: 5% Services: 84.2% Tourism related: 5.5%</p> <p>Nomis Brent Labour Market Profile (www.nomisweb.co.uk)</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>
Barriers to finding work	<p>Brent, 2002 Not enough jobs: 15% Need child care: 15% Not enough well paid jobs: 13% Lack of skills / quals: 12% Few jobs suitable: 9% Don't know: 40%</p> <p>(Living in Brent 2002 a Representative View. A MORI study for Brent Borough Council.)</p>				Unemployment and job opportunities for local people is a key sustainability issue.
% People in Work-less Households	No data identified.	<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>			

June 2007

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 and Figure 3 (Part A, section 3).				
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.

June 2007

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, 2005 VAT registrations: 1,085 (12.4%) VAT de-registrations: 955 (10.9%)</p> <p>Percentage change in VAT registered business over year: 0.14%</p> <p>(www.nomisweb.co.uk)</p>	<p>London, 2005: VAT registrations: 11.8% VAT de-registrations: 10.5%</p> <p>Great Britain, 2005: VAT registrations: 9.7% VAT de-registrations: 8.3%</p> <p>(www.nomisweb.co.uk)</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>http://www.sbs.gov.uk/default.php?page=/analytical/statistics/vatstats.php [accessed September, 2006]</p>	<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>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/vatsats.php [accessed September, 2006]</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.				

June 2007

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 , 2005-06 % approved applications at PTAL levels: Moderate: 51% Good: 47% Very good: 2% 100% in moderate to very good PTAL locations PTAL – Public Transport Accessibility Level (AMR, 2005-06 (Planning Applications Database))		Brent , 2004-05 % approved applications at PTAL levels: Low: 16% Moderate: 59% Good: 17% Very good: 8% 84% in moderate to very good PTAL locations (AMR 2004-05 (Planning Applications Database)) 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	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.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
			locations UDP Annual Monitoring Report, 2004		
% new retail / leisure floorspace planning permissions in/adjoining town centres	Brent , 2005-06 In town centre: 33.3% Adjoining town centre: 33.3% Out of town: 33.3% (AMR, 2005-06 (Brent Planning Applications Database))		1994-2004 In town centre: 46% Adjoining town centre: 21% Out of town: 33% (AMR, 2004-05 (Planning Applications Database))		As above
Commuting by mode (mode of travel to work and school)	Brent 2001 Means of travelling to work (question in Census) Underground: 26% Train: 7% Bus: 13% Walk: 7% Car: 34% Other: 6% Note: these data do not sum to 100% as does not include those who work mainly from home. The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.	London 2001 Underground: 18.8% Train: 12.2% Bus: 11.1% Walk: 8.4% Car: 36% Other: 4.9% National Statistics, Neighbourhood Statistics (based on Census 2001). http://neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/Reports/eng/TableViewer/wdsview/download.asp 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%) National Travel Survey, Department for Transport. http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_transstats/documents/page/dft_transstats_028347_hcsp	Brent 1991 Underground: 25% Train: 4.5% Bus: 12.5% Walk: 9% Car: 36% Other: 6% Note: these data do not sum to 100% as does not include those who work mainly from home. The 2001 Census, A Profile of Brent.		Relatively high use and dependence on public transport, and particularly underground. 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.

June 2007

Data Theme / Indicator	Quantified Data, Scale, Map Reference	Comparators	Trend	Targets	Issues and Comments
Peak / Off peak traffic speeds / flows		<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/ Surveys of Access	Targets from Brent PCT
		1. Practices with an appointment to see a primary care professional within 1 working day 2. Practices with an appointment to see a GP within 2 working days: 73.8% 3. Practices with an appointment system in place to see a primary care professional: 90.5% 4. Practices participating in Primary Care Access Survey: 53%	1. 100% 2. 90% 3. 90% 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	50 dwellings per hectare (50 dph) 50 dph (minimum) (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD).
		House prices	

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it reduce homelessness? 	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	
		Additional home provision, new home completions (UDP Indicator)	Current UDP target 1997-2016: Provision of at least 13,510 additional homes, including 9,650 self contained dwellings
		Affordable housing provision / completions	UDP Target: 4800 affordable home completions 1997-2016 Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD target: 4,575 affordable homes 2007/8 - 2016/17
		Vacant homes	
		% of housing built on previously developed land	UDP Target: 95% 2000-2010 Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD: 95%
		Homelessness Acceptances	
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	UDP Target: National Average by 2010
		% residents who are satisfied with their neighbourhoods as a place to live	
		Surveys of perceptions	
		Public parks / Open Spaces	UDP Target: No net decrease 2000-2010 No net loss of open space to alternative uses. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		% population living within 200m of open space	Enhance and increase public open space provision. Reduce area of open space deficiency. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Area of outdoor sports land for community use	
		Provision of new or improved children's play areas	Net increase in number and quality of children's play areas. Reduce areas of deficiency. (Section 7 on Monitoring

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
			and Implementation of the draft Development Policies DPD)
		Improvement of existing and provision for new or extended Public Open Space	Enhance and increase public open space provision. Reduce area of open space deficiency (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Noise complaints	To achieve no net increase in the number noise complaints (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Road / ambient noise mapping	
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	Brent's Crime Strategy aims to reduce the figure (of residents that feel threatened 'a great deal') to 50% by 2007 (AMR 2004-5)
		Level of crime	Net reduction in criminal offences (AMR)
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 Net increase of leisure facilities (AMR)
		Provision of new or extended community facilities / Protection of existing community facilities	Facilities to be accessible to those who need them (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Developer contributions towards new or improved community facilities	Contributions towards community facilities where a development results in additional pressure on, or shortage of, existing facilities (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
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	To ensure sustainable communities, all new residential developments should be within 30 minutes of public transport time of: a GP; hospital, primary school, areas of employment; and a major retail centre(s). (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Surveys of access / ease of access	

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
		Area of outdoor sports land for community use (hectares per 1000 population)	
		% Population living within 200m of open space	
		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	
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	
		Number of planning permissions granted which are contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality or flood risk	To achieve no permissions granted contrary to EA advice on water quality or flood risk (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Domestic water consumption	
	Sustainable water use in new development	Net increase in number of applications implementing measures to reduce water demand (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)	
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)	National Air Quality Target achievement throughout the borough. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it conserve and enhance habitats of 	Tree coverage and Tree Protection Orders	Net increase in tree cover (Section 7 on

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
EN4. To conserve and enhance biodiversity	<p>borough or local importance habitats and create habitats in areas of deficiency?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 		Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies (DPD)
		Area (Hectares) of Nature Conservation Importance in Brent	<p>No net loss of areas of wildlife and nature conservation importance. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)</p> <p>Enhance biodiversity and wildlife habitats of wildlife corridors. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)</p>
		Townscape considered to be of low townscape quality (UDP indicator)	UDP Target: 10% decrease 2000-2010
		Percentage new homes built on previously developed land	
		Loss of greenfield land	
		Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) / Meeting Brent BAP targets	<p>Brent Biodiversity Action Plan Targets:</p> <p>A: Maintain, and improving the wildlife status of Sites of Nature Conservation Importance in the Borough.</p> <p>B: Reduce Areas of Wildlife Deficiency in the Borough.</p> <p>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,</p> <p>No net loss over the London Plan period (London Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2006)</p>
<p>Landscape & Townscape</p> <p>EN5. To maintain and enhance the character and quality of landscapes and townscapes</p>	<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? 	Meeting Brent BAP targets	
		% vacant properties	
		Number and condition of listed buildings and monuments	
		Conservation areas	Net improvements (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		Area of townscape considered to be of low quality	
		Listed buildings at risk	
Historic Environment &	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it protect and enhance Conservation Areas and other sites; 	Listed buildings at risk	

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
EN9. To conserve and enhance land quality and soil resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? 	% 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	
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	<p>Net increase in the amount of floorspace developed by type.</p> <p>Net increase in the amount of floorspace developed by type in employment or regeneration areas.</p> <p>Maintain integrity of Strategic and Borough employment area designations, subject to SSAs.</p> <p>5% or less losses of employment land in employment/regeneration areas and local authority areas. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)</p>
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 economic performance and promote sustainable regeneration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it promote regeneration; reducing disparity with surrounding areas? 	Vacant land and properties and derelict land	UDP Target: 25% reduction in derelict land by 2008
		Ratio of most to least deprived wards	
		Area of land redeveloped in important regeneration areas: Park Royal Wembley	UDP Target: 20Ha by 2010
Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will it encourage 	% Business Investment from Outside Borough	

June 2007

Sustainability Objectives	Criteria	Potential Indicators	Targets
EC4. To encourage and accommodate both indigenous and inward investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> indigenous business? Will it encourage inward investment? Will it make land and property available for business development? 	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	Majority of new retail development to be located in Wembley and in locations with 'Good' PTAL rating. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the draft Development Policies DPD)
		% new retail / leisure floorspace planning permissions in/adjoining town centres	No more than 35% of non- retail uses in District and Local centres' Primary Frontage. No more than 50% in centres with 10% or high vacancy level. No more than 30% in Major Centres' Primary Frontage. (Section 7 on Monitoring and Implementation of the Development Policies DPD)
		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

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 completed SA of the Core Strategy Preferred Options to make them applicable to the Brent context, and can be provided on request.

The significance criteria developed for the SA of the Core Strategy DPD Preferred Options were also applicable to the SAs of the Development Policies and the Site Specific Allocation Preferred Options.

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

June 2007

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.
- Sites: a major positive if all or most of the sites in or within easy access of most deprived wards; if providing a significant number of affordable homes;

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 ⁷
Major Positive (++)	<p>An option, policy or group of sites?? 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>

⁷ These comments should be reflected across the application of the criteria for each objective.

Score	Description	General Comments ⁷
	<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>	
Major Negative (-)	<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>
Mixed (e.g. +/-, +/- - etc.)	<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>
Uncertain (?)	<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>