

Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

January 2008

Project Director: Kelvin Campbell
Project Manager: Daniel Hill
Urban Initiatives
1 Fitzroy Square
London W1T 5HE
t: +44 (0) 20 7380 4545
f: +44 (0) 20 7380 4546

**Report prepared on behalf of
London Borough of Southwark
Aylesbury New Deal for Communities**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0	NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	5
0.1	Summary of the sustainability appraisal process	5
0.2	What were the findings of the sustainability appraisal report?	7
0.3	Statement of the difference the process has made to date	8
0.4	How do I comment on the sustainability appraisal report?	9
0.5	Where can I find out more information?	10
1	INTRODUCTION	13
1.1	Purpose of this report	13
1.2	Why do we need to carry out a sustainability appraisal?	17
1.3	Structure of this document	17
2	METHODOLOGY USED	18
2.1	Approach adopted in the sustainability appraisal	18
2.2	Previous work	18
2.3	Who was consulted?	19
2.4	What is happening at this stage of the sustainability appraisal?	22
3	BACKGROUND	22
3.1	Why do we need an area action plan and a preferred options report?	22
3.2	What are the objectives of the area action plan?	22
3.3	What are the options for the area action plan?	23
4	SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT	24
4.1	Relevant plans and programmes	24
4.2	Baseline information	30
4.3	Sustainability issues	30
4.4	Limitations of the Information	39
4.5	Development of the objectives	40
5	APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT	43
5.1	Methodology	43
5.2	Assessment of the place-making objectives	44
5.3	Assessment of the delivery objectives	47
5.4	Choosing the preferred options	50
5.5	Summary of the appraisal of the options	50
6	THE PREFERRED OPTIONS	67
6.2	Mitigation measures	77
6.3	Uncertainties and risks	79
7	IMPLEMENTATION	79
7.1	Links to other tiers of plans and programmes	79
7.2	Proposals for monitoring	79

TABLE OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1: Consultation stages in a sustainability appraisal for an AAP	16
Table 1: Compliance with the SEA Directive Requirements	14
Table 2: The different stages of SA, showing their relationship.....	20
Table 3: Key messages of relevant plans and programmes	25
Table 4: Baseline data topics covered in the scoping report	30
Table 5: Sustainability issues for the SA and summary of evidence.....	31
Table 6: Sustainable Development Objectives and Criteria.....	40
Table 7: Summary of the sustainability score of the place-making objectives.....	46
Table 8: Summary of the sustainability appraisal of the options.....	52
Table 9: Preferred and Rejected Options.....	67

ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	Area Action Plan
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
CABE	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
CRT	Cross River Tram
CLG	Communities and Local Government
DETR	Department for Environment, Transport, and the Regions
DfT	Department for Transport
DPD	Development Plan Documents
EqIA	Equalities Impact Assessment
GLA	Greater London Authority
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation
LDD	Local Development Documents
LDF	Local Development Framework
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
PTAL	Public Transport Accessibility Level
PTAZ	Public Transport Accessibility Zone
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SINC	Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SDO	Sustainable Development Objective
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SOA	Super Output Areas
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

Summary of progress of sustainability appraisal of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan

Sustainability appraisal production stage	Timetable
Consultation on Scoping Report	21 May – 25 June 2007
Consultation on Interim Sustainability Report on issues and options of the AAP	5 October – 16 November 2007
Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal Report of preferred option(s) of the AAP	17 April – 29 May 2008
Amend Sustainability Appraisal Report of the AAP if necessary following consultation on i) preferred options and ii) examination in public	Mid 2008
Publish Amended Sustainability Appraisal Reports of the AAP	Late 2008

0 NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

0.1 SUMMARY OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

- 0.1.1 This document sets out the Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options for the Aylesbury AAP. The purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal is to promote sustainable development in the AAP area through the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations.
- 0.1.2 The Aylesbury Estate and surrounding area will be transformed over the next 15 - 20 years. All of the estate will be demolished making way for new homes, streets and open spaces. The regeneration of the area will also deliver new educational and health facilities, shops, improvements to Burgess Park, and safer, more attractive pedestrian and cycle routes between the new neighbourhood on the estate and Elephant and Castle, Old Kent Road, Walworth Road and Peckham. A formal planning document is needed to help make all of these improvements possible. This is called the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (the Aylesbury AAP).
- 0.1.3 The AAP will provide a planning framework for the estate and surrounding area. The area that will undergo the most change will be the estate itself as all of the existing buildings on the estate will be demolished and new streets and buildings constructed to replace them. The AAP will provide a masterplan for this area, which will set out locations for new residential and mixed-use (retail, residential, and/or commercial) buildings, as well as community facilities and open spaces. It will provide guidance on the height of new buildings and residential densities, and make proposals to improve the pedestrian and cycling environment in the area,

as well as public transport. It will also set out how the regeneration of the estate will be implemented, including the phasing of demolition and rebuilding.

- 0.1.4 The AAP area is wider than just the estate. It includes Burgess Park, as well as parts of Walworth Road and Old Kent Road. The regeneration of the estate provides a good opportunity to improve and revitalise Burgess Park. Proposals for Burgess Park, as well as improvements to schools, shops, health facilities and other recreational facilities will effect residents in the area surrounding the estate and for this reason the AAP covers an area which is larger than the estate itself. These boundaries will be consulted on through the process of preparing the AAP.
- 0.1.5 The AAP sets out four key objectives:
- P1: Better Homes: A high quality residential neighbourhood;
 - P2: Public Life: Better and safer streets, squares and parks;
 - P3: Connections: Improved transport links and
 - P4: Community: Enhanced social and economic opportunities.
- 0.1.6 Three key delivery objectives to accompany the place-making objectives are also identified as:
- D1: Value: The need to provide adequate funds for regeneration.
 - D2: Image: The need to positively transform the image of the Aylesbury Area
 - D3: Speed: Effectively delivering a phased approach to community regeneration
- 0.1.7 The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the impact of the AAP on the environment, on jobs and the local economy and on the well-being of the community. It involves collecting baseline information on the current state of the area, and setting out sustainable development objectives for the AAP. These objectives relate to issues like energy and water use, as well as the creation of local jobs, the need to reduce crime and improve community safety, and the benefits of reducing car use and promoting walking and cycling.
- 0.1.8 The sustainable development objectives are now being used to assess the preferred options in the AAP and measure the impacts of future development. Where preferred options may have negative impacts, the council needs to examine ways of reducing the impact or look for alternative solutions to the problem. Although the preparation of a sustainability appraisal is a legal requirement, the findings are not binding.
- 0.1.9 There are four key stages in preparing an AAP and undertaking a sustainability appraisal. We are currently at stage C. At the end of the process and once the AAP has been formally agreed, the council should then monitor the AAP to ensure it continues to achieve its goals.

0.2 WHAT WERE THE FINDINGS OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT?

- 0.2.1 All the place-making objectives are very compatible with many of the sustainable development objectives (SDOs), notably SDO 1: Regeneration and Employment Opportunities and SDO 11: Quality in Design. Most of the place making objectives are very compatible with SDO 16: Sustainable Transport and SDO 6: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.
- 0.2.2 The sustainability of the place-making objectives was not especially compatible with some environmental objectives notably SDO 10: Soil and Water Quality and SDO 14: Flood Risk. This was due to the pressures of phasing new development. Phasing that will allow the maximum numbers of residents to be re-housed will result in more hard surfaces on the ground in the short and medium term that can be susceptible to more flooding without proper urban drainage systems. Likewise, soil quality degradation in the short and medium term in an area undergoing extensive redevelopment including the presence of building materials and debris is unavoidable: proper planning for the disposal of materials will be required. Negative impacts will be monitored and mitigation measures will be put into action where appropriate.
- 0.2.3 The delivery objectives are also compatible with the sustainable development objectives, particularly SDO 1: Regeneration and Employment Opportunities.
- 0.2.4 Overall, the preferred options also score well against the sustainable development objectives. While in the short term the positive impacts of some of the preferred options will not be apparent, due to the negative effects of construction and demolition in the early stages, in the medium and long term they will make a positive contribution to the SDOs on average.
- 0.2.5 None of the preferred options will have negative impacts in the medium and long term against any individual SDO. However, seven of the preferred options scored a potential negative impact on one or more of the individual SDOs, in the short term. Those preferred options are: **Distribution of Homes option 2, Housing and Open Space option 2, Street Layout option 2, Building Blocks option 1** and **Transport Options 1 to 3**. These impacts will be a result of the necessary demolition and construction in the redevelopment.
- 0.2.6 In the short term, demolition and construction work will interrupt the urban form and make it harder for individuals to find their way around, therefore discouraging walking and cycling, creating places that are temporarily not overlooked, and creating noise and dust, which will negatively impact upon health and environmental quality. Mitigation measures will be put into action in order to ensure the negative impacts are minimised in the short term and do not continue in to the medium and long term.
- 0.2.7 A preferred option has not yet been selected for the **Tram Route**. This is currently being looked at and decided upon by TfL. In terms of the SA Framework Options 2 and 3 perform better than Option 1. While Option 1 is the most direct route it proposes a route through Burgess Park which may have a negative impact on open space and the setting of the heritage assets surrounding the park.

- 0.2.8 The **Community: enhanced social and economic opportunities** and **Tenure Mix** preferred options all tended to score well against the SDOs.
- 0.2.9 The **Car Parking** preferred option (car parking option 1) improves the area's sustainability as it encourages public transport use, improves health with less road accidents and creates less air and noise pollutants.

0.3 STATEMENT OF THE DIFFERENCE THE PROCESS HAS MADE TO DATE

- 0.3.1 The sustainability appraisal process has ensured that the Aylesbury AAP Preferred Options Report reflects sustainability objectives. The establishment of our sustainable development objectives in the Scoping Report has allowed us to assess the potential social, environmental and economic impacts of the AAP options in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal. This assessment has, in turn, helped us to identify the preferred options.
- 0.3.2 The sustainability process has acted as an early warning system. Through the identification of sustainability objectives it has been possible to identify potential negative medium and long term impacts of the development options at the Issues and Options stage. This has allowed the planners at the Preferred Options stage to further develop the options in order to include mitigation measures to prevent any long term problems from occurring in the development area.
- 0.3.3 The SA process has identified the key potentially negative impacts to be associated with the intensification of development. In particular it has the potential to affect flooding, energy, water use, increased, car trips and open space in the medium and long term.
- 0.3.4 The redevelopment area is located on the floodplain and has the potential to significantly impact on flooding. In order to ensure locating more development in this area does not have a negative impact in the medium and long term on flooding, mitigation measures will include the provision of SUDs, which have been included in the sustainable design and construction option, and improvements to Burgess Park lake, which has been included in Burgess Park Option 5 (now part of the network of open spaces preferred option). Further measures may include implementing early warning systems and raising floor levels.
- 0.3.5 Due to an increase in the amount of development, there is a risk of reducing the amount of open space. The network of open spaces preferred option will mitigate any potential negative impacts through improving the provision of and access to open space and ensuring the current provision of 60 hectares is not reduced.
- 0.3.6 The redevelopment will inevitably cause disruptions to residents since they will be moved from their current homes to dwellings in other locations on the estate, or potentially off site. This has the potential of breaking up the existing community and reducing social cohesion. In order to mitigate against these potential impacts it is necessary to implement careful phasing plans to minimise the number of residents having to move off site, and through maintaining and enhancing existing social infrastructure, as outlined in the community: enhanced social and economic opportunities preferred option.

- 0.3.7 One option for mitigating these effects would be to shorten the time over which demolition and construction takes place. However, shortening this time would have a negative effect particularly on the **Housing and Open Space option 2** and **Aylesbury's Network of Open Spaces** groups of options, as more residents would have to live off-site and open space would be temporarily or, in some cases, permanently lost to ensure the speedy completion of works. This would have a negative effect on several SDOs, especially **Social and Community Cohesion, Soil and Land Quality, Open Space and Biodiversity, and Flood Risk.**
- 0.3.8 At the demolition and construction phase, SDO 8: Waste Management will particularly need to be monitored and negative impacts mitigated. This may be achieved through recycling and reusing waste as set out in the Sustainable design and construction preferred option.
- 0.3.9 An increase in road traffic is anticipated due to the necessary service vehicles for the demolition and construction and the likely increased desire for residents to use private cars to avoid the building sites. This has the potential to have a negative impact on SDO 3: Health, SDO 5: Social inclusion and community cohesion, SDO 6: Energy efficiency and renewable energy, SDO 7: Air quality and SDO 16: Sustainable transport. In the medium and long term the Transport options will mitigate the potential impacts through promoting walking and cycling, improving and increasing public transport, introducing soft transport measures such as car clubs and reducing car parking to the minimum necessary.

0.4 HOW DO I COMMENT ON THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT?

If you also wish to make representations on the preferred options report please complete the consultation questionnaire which can be downloaded from the council's website at:

www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/AylesburyAreaActionPlan.htm

Please attach your comments on the sustainability appraisal report on a separate sheet and ensure the section of the sustainability appraisal report you are referring to is clearly identified.

Please send the completed consultation questionnaire and your comments on the sustainability appraisal report by post, fax or email to:

Address: Planning Policy and Research
London Borough of Southwark
Regeneration
FREEPOST SE1919/14
London. SE17 2ES
Email: planningpolicy@southwark.gov.uk
Fax: 020 7525 5561

If you have any queries regarding this appraisal, please contact Tim Cutts at the above address or tel: 020 7525 5380.

0.5 WHERE CAN I FIND OUT MORE INFORMATION?

The full sustainability appraisal report and the preferred options report are available to view on our website - www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/AylesburyAreaActionPlan.html - or by following Planning and Building Control, Planning Policy from www.southwark.gov.uk. The appraisal is also available to view in local libraries; one stop shops; the Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5; or at the Southwark Regeneration Department Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street, SE17 2EZ.

At this stage of the sustainability appraisal process, the council is seeking comments on the following points:

Review the sustainability scores of the place-making and delivery objectives in Tables 7 and 8 in Section 6 of the appraisal and the written justification of these scores in Appendix B. Do you agree with these scores?

Review the sustainability scores of the preferred options in Table 9 in Section 6 of the appraisal and the written justification of these scores in Appendix A. Do you agree with these scores? The council found that not all of the sustainable development objectives were relevant to every option and therefore did not score them. Do you agree, and if not, which objectives should be added to the assessment of a particular option and what score and justification would you give?

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

- 1.1.1 The council is preparing an area action plan (AAP) for the Aylesbury Estate and its surrounding area. The broad objectives of the AAP will be to facilitate regeneration in the area and to secure social, economic, and environmental improvements.
- 1.1.2 To help prepare the AAP and any SPDs and to assess their sustainability, we will carry out a sustainability appraisal of the AAP. This will also incorporate the European Union's requirements to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and ensure the AAP has been developed with consideration of any significant social, economic and environmental effects as set out in European Directive 2001/42/EC. **Table 1** demonstrates the components of the SA Report which make up the Environmental Report for the purposes of the SEA Directive.
- 1.1.3 It is very important to ensure that the regeneration of the area is environmentally, economically and socially sustainable. Sustainable development is about ensuring that we can meet our needs now and in the future in the Aylesbury Estate and its surrounding area.
- 1.1.4 The work to prepare the AAP is being undertaken in several stages. We have gained a thorough understanding of the study area through a number of studies and ongoing consultation. The studies are included in a separate document known as the Baseline Report. We have also prepared an Issues and Options Report that has identified the critical issues that the AAP needs to address, as well as a series of different options / approaches for creating a successful neighbourhood in future. More recently we have prepared the Preferred Options Report. The Preferred Options Report presents the options from the Issues and Options Report we will be taking forward and developing further, as well as our reasons behind these choices. These include preferred options on the height of new buildings, the density of development, the mix of different types of housing such as social rented housing, private housing and intermediate housing, options to improve Burgess Park and many more.
- 1.1.5 This document is the sustainability statement of the options set out in the Aylesbury AAP Preferred Options Report and must be read together with that document.
- 1.1.6 Consultation has been a key component at each stage of preparing the sustainability appraisal. **Figure 1** presents a diagram of the consultation stages in a sustainability appraisal for an AAP. We would like your views on this report.
- 1.1.7 When we have finally adopted the AAP it will be used to make decisions on planning applications for sites in the area, will provide a road-map for the phasing of demolition and construction of buildings on the estate and the re-housing of tenants on the estate and will help guide decisions on future investment in the area. A diagram of this process which shows the current and future stages is shown in **Figure 1**.

Table 1: Compliance with the SEA Directive Requirements

SEA Directive Requirements	Where this is covered in the Sustainability Appraisal Report
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;	Section 3
b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;	Section 4
c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;	Section 4
d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;	Section 4
e) the environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	Section 4
f) the likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors*;	Section 5
g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Section 6
h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Section 6
i) a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;	Section 7
j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Section 0
The report must include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2).	All relevant information has been included

<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • authorities with environmental responsibilities, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4) • authorities with environmental responsibilities and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2) • other EU Member States where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art. 7). 	<p style="text-align: center;">Section 2</p>
<p>The environmental report and the results of the consultations must be taken into account in decision-making (Art. 8)</p>	<p>The Scoping Report, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal and feedback from stakeholders from consultations on the SA and the AAP process to date have been taken into account in the identification of the preferred options (see Section 5).</p>
<p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted should be informed and the following items are made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the plan or programme as adopted; • a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report pursuant to Art. 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Art. 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Art. 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Art. 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and • the measures decided concerning monitoring (Art. 9) 	<p>This statement will be prepared and issued when the Aylesbury AAP is adopted.</p>
<p>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan or programme's implementation (Art. 10)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Section 7</p>
<p>Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive (Art. 12)</p>	<p>This table demonstrates how the Sustainability Appraisal Report meets the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p>

*These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects

Figure 1: Consultation stages in a sustainability appraisal for an AAP



1.2 WHY DO WE NEED TO CARRY OUT A SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL?

- 1.2.1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that a sustainability appraisal (SA) is carried out as part of the preparation of new plans, including area action plans. The purpose of a SA is to assess whether or not, and to what extent, a plan meets our objectives for achieving a sustainable community.
- 1.2.2 In addition, the area action plan falls within the definition of a 'plan or programme' under European Directive 2001/42. Because the plan is likely to have significant environmental effects, we must prepare a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). The main purpose of an SEA is to predict what the likely significant effects of a draft plan will be on the environment and identify ways in which any negative effects can be overcome. Ways in which the actual effects of the plan will be measured and monitored are also identified as part of the SEA.
- 1.2.3 In this sustainability appraisal report as well as environmental impacts, we also assess the impacts of the proposed options on the economy and local community. We will use this appraisal to help us balance environmental, economic and social impacts and select the options we prefer. It will also help us consider any negative impacts which arise from the options and enable us to assess what actions we need to take to reduce or compensate for these.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THIS DOCUMENT

- 1.3.1 This document will:
- Assess whether the objectives of the AAP are compatible with the sustainable development objectives set out in the scoping report;
 - Assess the short, medium and long term sustainability effects of the preferred options; and
 - Predict the social, economic, and environmental effects of the preferred options and suggest what actions might be needed to reduce or compensate for these effects.
- 1.3.2 This report is divided into 6 sections:
- Section 1 - provides an introduction to the report.
 - Section 2 - details the process used to undertake a sustainability appraisal.
 - Section 3 - provides an overview of the objectives of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan proposed in the preferred options report.
 - Section 4 - outlines policies, plans and strategies relevant to the Aylesbury Area Action Plan and presents baseline information which is useful for understanding the current context of the area.
 - Section 5 - presents our sustainable development objectives and sets out how social, environmental and economic issues were considered in choosing the preferred options.

- Section 6 - presents the actual appraisal of the objectives of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan and the preferred options using the sustainable development objectives.
- Section 7 – presents the links to other tiers of plans and programmes and the project level and proposals for monitoring

2 METHODOLOGY USED

2.1 APPROACH ADOPTED IN THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 2.1.1 The steps involved in undertaking a sustainability appraisal are outlined in **Table 2** below.
- 2.1.2 We have prepared this appraisal following the advice set out in the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) documents *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents* (November 2005) and *A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive* (September 2005) and is compliant with European Directive 2001/42/EC. Further information on the legal background to sustainability assessments is set out in Appendix C of this report.

2.2 PREVIOUS WORK

- 2.2.1 There are four key stages in preparing an AAP and undertaking a sustainability appraisal. We are currently at the third stage.
- 2.2.2 Stage A of the SA process for the Aylesbury AAP involved deciding on the scope of the appraisal by setting out the sustainable development objectives and the issues which the appraisal should assess. This was set out in a scoping report, which was prepared in May 2007.
- 2.2.3 The scoping report involved the following:
- Identifying the key policies, plans and programmes which the appraisal should take into account (refer to Section 4).
 - Collecting information on the key environmental, social and economic characteristics of the estate and surrounding area. This can be used to measure the impact of policies and the success of the AAP (see Section 4).
 - Identifying the sustainability issues and problems that need to be addressed by the AAP. We picked out these issues by analysing the key messages of the policies, plans and programmes relevant to the AAP as well as the current characteristics of the area (refer to Section 5).
 - Setting out our sustainable development objectives in a sustainability appraisal framework. We will use this to assess the options for the AAP (refer to Section 5).
 - Consulting on the scoping report.
- 2.2.4 The second stage in the appraisal process, Stage B, corresponded with the development of options for the AAP. The options were based on the issues identified during the scoping stage. These options represented alternative

approaches that could be taken to redeveloping the estate and regenerating the area. Details of the options are given in Section 6.

- 2.2.5 The options were then assessed using the SA framework developed at the scoping stage (refer to Section 6) to identify their likely social, environmental and economic effects. The proposed place-making and delivery objectives of the AAP have also been appraised to ensure that they are consistent with the sustainability objectives. The outcomes of this appraisal have helped us to decide on the preferred approach to redeveloping the estate. This was set out in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal prepared in October 2007.
- 2.2.6 The appraisal of the options highlighted potential significant negative effects that need to be overcome, as well as options that would have a beneficial effect on the social, economic and environmental sustainability.

2.3 WHO WAS CONSULTED?

- 2.3.1 We consulted widely at both Stages A and B of the SA process with local community and voluntary groups based within and around the estate, the tenants and residents organisations, other Southwark based voluntary and interest groups and some statutory organisations. This included the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage. This consultation was consistent with government advice and also with our Statement of Community Involvement.
- 2.3.2 All the comments we received and an explanation of how we have taken these into account is set out in **Appendix E**.

Table 2: The different stages of SA, showing their relationship

Stages in the preparation of Sustainability Appraisals (SAs)	Corresponding Area Action Plan (AAP) Stage
Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope	
Task A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes and sustainable development objectives which should be taken into account in preparing the AAP and undertaking the SA	Gathering evidence to form the scope for the AAP
Task A2: Collecting relevant social, environmental and economic baseline information to understand the current context and in order to be able to measure future progress	
Task A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems which may apply to the area, using the baseline information and other relevant sources of local knowledge	
Task A4: Developing the sustainability appraisal framework, comprising sustainability objectives, indicators and targets	
Task A5: Preparing and consulting on a Scoping Report. Consultation must be undertaken with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England, as well as relevant bodies chosen in the council’s consultation plan	
Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects	
Task B1: Testing the AAP objectives against the sustainability objectives to identify potential synergies or possible inconsistencies	Assess issues and options in the AAP area and undertake consultation on these
Task B2: Developing the options	
Task B3: Predicting the social, economic and environmental effects of the preferred options	
Task B4: Evaluating the predicted effects of the AAP options	
Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects	
Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the AAP	

Stages in the preparation of Sustainability Appraisals (SAs)		Corresponding Area Action Plan (AAP) Stage
Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report		
C1: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report		Prepare Preferred Options Report
Stage D: Consulting on the development plan document and the Sustainability Appraisal Report		
Task D1: Public participation on the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the preferred options of the AAP		Consult on Preferred Options Report
Task D2: Amending the Sustainability Appraisal where necessary to appraise significant changes in either the submission draft AAP or adoption draft AAP, made as a result of consultation on the sustainability appraisal		Prepare submission draft AAP for consultation and progress through examination in public
Task D3: Make decisions on the content of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report and provide information to the public		Adopt AAP
Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the AAP		
Task E1: Finalise methods for monitoring the AAP		Monitor AAP through the Annual Monitoring Report
Task E2: Respond to any significant and adverse social, economic, or environmental effects found during monitoring		

(The SA stages and AAP stages are sourced from *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents* (Figure 5, page 39, DCLG, November 2005)).

2.4 WHAT IS HAPPENING AT THIS STAGE OF THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL?

- 2.4.1 The third stage in the appraisal process, corresponds with the identification of the preferred options for the AAP. These options represent the approach that will be taken to redeveloping the estate and regenerating the area. Details of the options are given in Section 5.
- 2.4.2 These options were then assessed using the SA framework developed at the scoping stage (refer to Section 5) to identify their likely social, environmental and economic effects. The proposed place-making and delivery objectives of the AAP have also been appraised to ensure that they are consistent with the sustainable development objectives. The outcomes of this appraisal will help us to understand the potential impacts of the preferred approach to redeveloping the estate enabling us to plan and establish any measures needed to limit negative effects.

3 BACKGROUND

3.1 WHY DO WE NEED AN AREA ACTION PLAN AND A PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT?

- 3.1.1 The Aylesbury Area Action Plan, when it is adopted, will be part of the Council's Local Development Framework. This will make it an important document which will be used for deciding what sort of development should take place within the Aylesbury area, and when, where and how it should happen. It will be a statutory plan – prepared in accordance with the new planning regulations introduced by the Government in 2004 – and will be examined in public by a Planning Inspector at a formal Examination. In the future we will produce a Core Strategy which will be the overarching planning document for Southwark. The Core Strategy and the Area Action Plan together will take over from the Southwark Plan (Unitary Development Plan) 2007. Further information on Southwark's planning policies is provided in Appendix C: Legal and policy background for sustainability appraisal and area action plans.
- 3.1.2 The Preferred Options Report outlines which of the options from the Issues and Options Report (published in October 2007) we will be taking forward and developing further.
- 3.1.3 The Aylesbury AAP is being tested through a sustainability appraisal, to make sure that its proposals meet the needs of present day residents and will provide an attractive and successful neighbourhood for future residents. This sustainability appraisal report therefore accompanies the Preferred Options Report.

3.2 WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE AREA ACTION PLAN?

- 3.2.1 The issues and options report is organised around four place-making objectives:
- P1: Better Homes: A high quality residential neighbourhood;
 - P2: Public Life: Better and safer streets, squares and parks;

- P3: Connections: Improved transport links and
- P4: Community: Enhanced social and economic opportunities.

3.2.2 The issues and options report also identifies delivery objectives to accompany the place-making objectives:

- D1: Value: The need to provide adequate funds for regeneration.
- D2: Image: The need to positively transform the image of the Aylesbury Area
- D3: Speed: Effectively delivering a phased approach to community regeneration

3.3 WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS FOR THE AREA ACTION PLAN?

3.3.1 The Preferred Options Report develops the vision, objectives and preferred options for the Aylesbury Area into an overall layout or outline Masterplan in order to deliver a new mixed tenure housing development. We will be developing this Masterplan on an ongoing basis and in the light of responses to the Preferred Options Report and this SA document.

3.3.2 To deliver the four place-making and three delivery objectives, the preferred options report develops options on:

- Mix of tenures, such as social rented housing, intermediate housing and private housing
- Size of Homes
- Distribution of residential density showing which areas could have the highest housing densities and which areas the lowest
- Demolition
- Housing and Open Space
- Sustainable Design and Construction
- Street Layout
- Building Blocks
- Building Heights
- Network of Open Spaces
- Transport
- Tram
- Car Parking
- Community: enhanced social and economic opportunities
- Phasing

4 SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT

4.1 RELEVANT PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

- 4.1.1 The review of plans and programmes which are relevant to the AAP and the collection of baseline information helped identify the issues which the AAP needs to address.
- 4.1.2 A detailed list of relevant documents and the key messages of these documents is given in **Table 3**. We presented a previous version of this table in the scoping report.

Table 3: Key messages of relevant plans and programmes

Plan or programme	Key messages
International	
Kyoto Protocol to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992	Promotes a reduction in the release of green house gases, particularly carbon dioxide.
National	
Securing the Future – UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy, 2005	Sets out the national UK framework for promoting sustainable development.
Department for Transport 10 Year Transport Plan, 2000	To reduce congestion and pollution from all types of transport.
The UK Climate Change Programme, 2000	To cut UK carbon dioxide emissions by 60% by 2050.
Urban White Paper, 2001	Promotes the need to better link the management of urban initiatives by taking a holistic approach.
Communities Plan (Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future, 2003	To tackle housing supply issues and promote improvements to the local environment; particularly the public realm.
Code for Sustainable Homes: A step change in sustainable home building practice, 2006	To make a single national standard for sustainable homes.
Guidance on Tall Buildings CABE and English Heritage, 2007	To ensure that tall buildings are properly planned as part of an exercise in place-making informed by a clear long-term vision. The existing context, including the historic environment, should be understood in order to identify the most appropriate locations for tall buildings.
Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, 2005	Sustainable Development should be the core principle underpinning planning.
Draft PPS 1 Supplement: Planning and Climate Change	Spatial planning should attempt to mitigate and adapt to climate change.
By Design – Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice. DETR / CABE, 2000 (PPS 1 Companion Guide)	To promote high standards in urban design through development.
Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3: Housing, 2006	Ensure that housing needs are met. Increase densities but emphasise the importance of good design and ensure that all people have a decent home in which to live.

Plan or programme	Key messages
Better Places to Live By Design, 2001 (PPS 3 Companion Guide)	To set attributes that underlie successful residential environments.
Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 4: Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms, 1992	To meet the needs of businesses and wider environmental objectives.
PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, 2005	To promote sustainable development by ensuring that biological and geological development are conserved and enhanced.
PPS 10: Planning for Waste Management, 2005 management facilities in England.	To create a policy context and criteria for siting waste.
PPG 13: Transport, 2001	Promotes the need to integrate transport and planning so as to minimise the need to travel, especially by car.
PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment, 1994	Creates policies for the identification and protection of historic buildings, conservation areas, and other elements of the historic environment.
PPG 16: Archaeology and Planning	Sets out advice on handling unknown archaeological discoveries.
PPG 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, 2002	Describes the role of the planning system in assessing opportunities and needs for sport and recreation provision and safeguarding open space which has recreational value.
Regional / London	
The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, 2004	Sets out the spatial vision for London.
The Mayor's Transport Strategy, GLA, 2004	Promotes sustainable transport choices.
A Sustainable Development Framework for London. London Sustainable Development Commission, June 2003	Sets out the sustainable development strategy for London.
Sustainable Communities Plan for London: Building for the Future, 2003	Sets out how the government intends to achieve sustainable communities in London.
Sustaining Success: The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy, GLA, 2004	Promotes cross-cutting sustainable development themes including health and equality of opportunities and builds these into economic analyses and proposals.
Connecting with London's Nature. The Mayor's Biodiversity Action Plan, GLA, 2002	Protect and conserve London's open spaces.
Design for Biodiversity, 2003 London Development Agency with English Nature, GLA and the London Biodiversity Partnership	A hierarchy of design principles: Protect nature; mitigate against negative impacts to nature; compensate for local conservation

Plan or programme	Key messages
	value.
Sounder City: The Mayor's Ambient Noise Strategy, GLA, 2004	Minimise the adverse impacts of noise.
Cleaning London's Air, The Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, 2002, GLA with London Best Practice Guidance: The control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition, 2006	Minimise the adverse impacts of air quality on human health.
Draft London Plan SPG: Planning for Equality and Diversity in London, GLA, 2006	Promote social inclusion and to help eliminate discrimination by ensuring that the spatial needs of all London's communities are addressed.
London Plan SPG: Accessible London: achieving an inclusive environment, GLA, 2004	Provides guidance on the policies contained in the London Plan regarding the promotion of an inclusive and accessible environment.
London Plan SPG: Land for Transport Functions, GLA, 2007	To ensure that efficient and effective use of land for transport purposes is delivered in London.
Transport 2025 (2007)	To accommodate further dispersed housing growth in London.
Green Light to Clean Power. The Mayor's Energy Strategy, GLA, 2004	Reduce London's contribution to climate change by minimising emissions of carbon dioxide.
Rethinking Rubbish in London. The Mayor's Waste Management Strategy, GLA, 2003	Minimise waste production in London.
Local / Borough	
Southwark 2016: Sustainable Community Strategy	Sets out a vision and priorities for the borough: Improving individual life chances, making the borough a better place for people and delivering quality public services.
Southwark Unitary Development Plan (Adopted: July 1995)	Sets out the land use and development framework for the borough.
The Southwark Plan (Unitary Development Plan), Southwark Council, July 2007	Document has replaced the 1995 UDP. Sets out the development and land use framework for Southwark.
Southwark Local Implementation Plan: 2005-10	Delivering improved transport services and promoting sustainable transport.
Southwark Waste Management Strategy: 2003-2021	Increase household recycling and composting. Increase recovery of municipal waste.
London Borough of Southwark: Enterprise Strategy: 2005 – 2016	Promote inward investment and enterprise opportunities in the borough.

Plan or programme	Key messages
London Borough of Southwark: Employment Strategy: 2005 – 2016	Improve access to employment for disadvantaged communities in Southwark.
London Borough of Southwark Contaminated Land Strategy 2001.	Identify contaminated land and facilitate its remediation.
London Borough of Southwark Biodiversity Action Plan 2006	Protect, manage and promote key wildlife habitats and species in the Borough.
London Borough of Southwark Air Quality Management and Improvement Plan 2002 to 2005	Improve ambient air quality in the borough.
Southwark Housing Strategy 2005 to 2010	Increase the supply and quality of homes in the borough.
Southwark Housing Strategy Consultation Document: Looking to 2010, LBS 2004	Increase the supply and quality of homes in the borough. Reduce crime and anti-social behaviour.
Southwark Crime and Drugs Strategy 2005 to 2008	
Southwark Climate Change and Sustainability Strategy (Emerging) 2006	Promote sustainable practices.
Draft Insulation & Combined Heat & Power Strategy 2006	Promotes improvement to energy efficiency.
Southwark Schools for the Future (Executive Committee Report, July 2006)	Ensure high quality education for all.
Children and Young People's Plans 2006/7 to 2008/9	Build a better future for children and young people.
The Aylesbury New Deal for Communities – Delivery Plan 2005-06 (and any subsequent plan of the successor to the NDC)	To improve the neighbourhood and achieve urban renewal.
The Aylesbury Estate: Revised Strategy, 2005 (Executive Report)	To bring about a social and physical regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate.
Aylesbury SW Corner – Early Housing and Aylesbury Resource Centre / Phase 1a, January 2007	To provide outline planning and design proposals for the proposed first phase of redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate.
The Walworth Project: Project Objectives Paper, 2007	To improve the street scene and improve safety for all users of Walworth Road.
Southwark Open Space Strategy, 2002	To enhance the open space policies in the Southwark Plan for developers, the community, planning applicants and council officers.
Parks and Public Places Strategy, 2006	To effectively plan and manage parks and open spaces in the borough.
Strategic Service Development Plan For Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham Primary Care Trusts, March 2006	To set out the plans for the development and improvement of primary care and community based health and social care services across Lambeth, Southwark and

Plan or programme	Key messages
	Lewisham.
Glengall Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Design Guidance Statement, 1998	Preserve and enhance the character of Glengall Road Conservation Area.
Addington Square Draft Conservation Area Appraisal	Preserve and enhance the character of Addington Square.
Coburg Road Conservation Area Appraisal, Dermot Jones, 1985	Preserve and enhance the character of Coburg Road.
Grosvenor Park Draft Conservation Area Appraisal	Preserve and enhance the character of Grosvenor Park.

4.2 BASELINE INFORMATION

4.2.1 We obtained the baseline information used in this appraisal from a range of sources. These included, amongst many others, national statistics data, health data from the National Health Service, environmental monitoring, energy ratings, flood risk assessments, transport surveys, and detailed site visits. These topics are outlined in **Table 4**. We presented a previous version of this table in the scoping report.

Table 4: Baseline data topics covered in the scoping report

Regeneration and employment opportunities
Education
Physical and mental health
Crime and community safety
Social inclusion and community cohesion
Energy efficiency and renewable energy
Air quality
Waste management
Water resources
Soil and land quality
Noise
Quality in design
Conservation of historic environment
Open space and biodiversity
Flood risk
Housing
Sustainable transport

4.3 SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

4.3.1 The relevant plans and programmes and the baseline data identified a number of sustainability issues for the AAP, supported by the evidence base. A summary of these issues is included in **Table 5**. We presented a previous version of this table in the scoping report.

Table 5: Sustainability issues for the SA and summary of evidence

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
Relatively high levels of deprivation overall according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)	The Aylesbury Estate is designated as part of a larger area for regeneration in the London Plan due to Faraday and East Walworth Wards' standing as part of the 20% most deprived wards in London as defined by the London Index of Deprivation. Despite the successes of the 1998-2003 Single Regeneration Budget programme, levels of deprivation, as measured by the aggregated overall Index of Multiple Deprivation for England and Wales (IMD), remain high.
Employment inequalities and employment opportunities	Southwark's working age employment rate is significantly below the London average, and the figures for the Aylesbury area are even lower. The number of people in Aylesbury claiming job seekers allowance has changed little between 2001 and 2006, while the Southwark total has fallen. The number of incapacity benefit claimants rose overall in the Aylesbury area, indicating that disability is a significant barrier to employment. However, the rises since 2004 are in parts of the action area that are not included in the New Deal for Communities project, whereas the NDC area's number of claimants fell in that same period. The percentage of lone parents has risen since 2001 (see Appendix 6) and may constitute a further barrier to employment without adequate social provision. There are a number of community buildings located within the study area, some of which provide facilities for informal or formal training, as well as health care and childcare. There were around 1,500 residents in the study area in August 2006 claiming either incapacity benefit (IB) or severe disablement allowance (SDA) which represents around 10% of the total number of claimants throughout the London Borough of Southwark. In 2005 there were a total of 567 workplaces in the study area. The majority of these (87%) were small businesses employing between one and ten employees. Skills levels (see next section) may comprise an additional barrier to employment. Employment in Southwark is projected to increase by around 76,000 jobs over the period 2004 to 2026 which equates to an increase of 43%. Businesses in Southwark generally have a start-up rate lower than Greater London and less than a quarter of jobs were held by residents of the borough. During the AAP preparation process, consideration should be given to how the plan can further reduce the social, economic, and environmental barriers to employment, including provision of workspace and positive procurement strategies.
Education, skills and training deprivation	There are significant levels of education, skills and training deprivation within the action area according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>The indices are a relative measure of deprivation between areas of England in several categories such as crime, housing, and transport. Primary schools in the Aylesbury area are performing well, particularly Michael Faraday where students are above the Southwark average. The overall quality of the school is reported as excellent in the last Ofsted report, published in 2001, and received a high achievement award from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in 2000. Standards are average in English, above average in mathematics, and in the top five per cent of results in science, compared to all schools nationally. The proportion of pupils in secondary schools in the Aylesbury area gaining 5 or more GCSEs at grades A* to C is significantly below the Southwark average. Approximately 37 per cent of students at Walworth Secondary School nearby have special educational needs, and many students have emotional and behavioural disorders. These statistics are well above the national average. The Walworth School is classed as a satisfactory school with improving standards. Although standards are still below average, the overall achievement of students as assessed by the Department for Education and Skills is satisfactory, and at the end of year 11, the overall achievement standard is good. It is important to be aware of the limitations of looking at those schools which fall purely within the AAP boundary. Many pupils who reside within this area may attend alternative schools. In contrast to other regions, pupils in London are able to apply to attend primary and secondary schools in any London borough and therefore catchment areas do not apply in a meaningful way.</p>
Improving health and reducing health inequalities	<p>Deprivation in terms of health and disability varies across Southwark. Parts of the AAP, however, fall within the 10% most deprived super output areas in the country. The number of claimants for incapacity benefits has been growing consistently in Southwark and in the wards that make up the AAP area since 2001. Poor amenities, shared facilities, overcrowding, inadequate heating and energy inefficiency all contribute to ill health. The NHS Borough & Walworth Area has a high percentage of purpose built flats, and substantially more than nationally. There are very few detached or semi-detached houses in the Borough & Walworth area. Faraday Ward has the highest percentage of purpose built flats - over 80% of households. In Faraday, 78.6% of homes are rented from the council or other social landlord and only 11.8% of homes are owned (the lowest home ownership in the whole of Southwark). The Borough of Southwark, especially the Walworth area, has the highest number of social and council housing (over 50,000) in London. The impact of tenure on health was examined in the South East London Report on health and the 2001 census. It found that people living in council or other social</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>rented housing in South East London are two to three times more likely to report poor health than people living in owner occupied housing. In the Borough & Walworth area, 1.1% of the GP registered population are recorded as having a severe mental illness. This is the highest prevalence of all the localities in Southwark. Faraday Ward has a higher life expectancy - 77.1 (male) and 85.9 (female) - than the England and Southwark average, and East Walworth Ward has a lower life expectancy – 73.5 (male) and 77.8 (female) - than average.</p>
<p>Need to promote equality, diversity and social cohesion</p>	<p>An Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is being prepared early in the plan making process to inform the sustainability appraisal reports of the AAP and SPD. The findings of the EqIA will form the baseline against which the effects of the AAP will be measured, particularly in relation to the following equality target groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Disability • Faith/belief • Gender • Race and ethnicity • Sexual orientation
<p>High levels of crime and fear of crime</p>	<p>The measure of crime between the super output areas (SOAs) in the AAP area compared with all of England vary widely according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Crime Domain, which amalgamates different sources such as the British Crime Survey, police statistics, and Census questionnaires. The areas near Walworth Road are within the 10% most affected in terms of crime in England – one SOA next to Walworth Road is in the 1% most deprived. Conversely, SOAs inside the Aylesbury Estate are some of the least deprived – the area around the corner of Thurlow Street and Albany Road is in the 30% least deprived in terms of crime. See Scoping Report Appendix 10 for a map of the deprivation scores from the IMD. Issues surrounding safety and security should be taken into account in the preparation of the AAP and any SPDs. Secured by Design (Home Office/DCLG) is a nationally recognised standard for ensuring that safety and security are considered during the preparation of planning applications and is a requirement of the Southwark Plan.</p>
<p>Accessibility</p>	<p>Accessibility for any potential user of the Aylesbury Estate, regardless of their age, ability, or situation, means that all should be able to find their way around the estate and its buildings safely and easily. However, a recent review of local authority housing in Southwark found that of the samples surveyed, including the Aylesbury Estate, none were fully compliant with the Disability and Discrimination Act. In addition, access to</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>public transport and access to public spaces are to be improved as a result of the SA of the AAP. The AAP should improve access to green space and leisure activities in order to improve health by promoting physical activity. The submission of 'Design and Access Statements' with new planning applications is required by the submitted revised Southwark Plan. A Design and Access Statement has been prepared as part of a planning application for the South West Corner provides for full access to 10% of all houses and apartments and for full access to all retail units and public spaces. Any additional Design and Access Statements should take account of the sustainability appraisal's goal of an accessible urban environment. Full access standards can be found in the National Wheelchair Housing Design Guidelines. The sustainability appraisal of the AAP should take into account the BVPI 165 standard for pedestrian crossings. The standard has been applied to all major crossings on Walworth Road, Old Kent Road and Albany Road.</p>
<p>Energy efficiency and use of renewables</p>	<p>The Rodney-Taplow Community Energy Study (2003) covered approximately 10,000 homes between Burgess Park and Elephant and Castle, including most of the Aylesbury AAP study area. The average energy use in the Aylesbury Estate is greater than neighbouring houses and flats in surrounding estates. The SAP (Standard Assessment Procedure) rating of the typical Aylesbury Estate flat is 34-45, compared to Victorian/Georgian terraces with a typical SAP rating of 57 and the GLC-era flats at the Alvey Estate with a typical SAP rating of 81. The average flat in the Aylesbury Estate produced 4.6 tonnes of carbon dioxide per flat annually from domestic natural gas heat and hot water use compared to 3.1 tonnes in other Southwark-owned estates in the study area. It is a Southwark Plan requirement that all new development minimises energy consumption and generates at least 10% of predicted energy use from renewable sources. This may rise to 20% with further alterations to the London Plan. A number of different renewable energy schemes were explored and costed in the study. For the Rodney-Taplow study area the most promising sources were bio-fuels: specifically biogas and bio-diesel powered combined heat and power (CHP) systems that were costed at around £16 million for the Aylesbury Estate. The SAP rating is expected to be increased by 20 points to 54-65 and a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions for the Aylesbury Estate is estimated to be 13,800 tonnes, or 5.7 tonnes per unit, for both gas and electricity. The technical potential for solar was vast but the capital cost was determined to be extremely high for solar thermal. Intriguingly, data from a Southwark weather station, positioned on an Aylesbury building, showed that the average wind speed was typical of speeds found on Welsh mountain</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>ranges. Further monitoring is planned to assess at what points on the building these effects occur and therefore the potential of building-mounted wind systems.</p>
<p>Poor air quality and high levels of ambient noise, particularly along Walworth Road and Old Kent Road</p>	<p>The entire AAP (and SPD) area is located within a designated Air Quality Management Area. This is a designation assigned by the London Borough of Southwark that means that UK air quality objectives for key pollutant gases, such as PM10 and NO2, which are the result of the combustion of fossil fuels, are unlikely to be met. Parts of the Aylesbury Estate area suffer from noise, notably near arterial routes. Noise can be split into two main types of noise: ambient noise and neighbourhood noise. There are some noise sources that fit into both types but in general the two groups are defined as follows: 'Ambient noise' covers noise and vibration from transport (including road traffic, rail traffic, aircraft and water transport) and fixed industrial sources. Ambient noise can be dealt with by strategic plans and programmes such as an AAP. 'Neighbourhood noise' is defined by Southwark as 'noise from household appliances, TV, music systems, noisy pets, DIY activities, construction sites, intruder alarms, parties or similar gatherings'. Planning policies typically do not regulate neighbourhood noise, but requirements for high quality insulation are appropriate in policies. As might be expected on a major arterial route, levels of ambient noise generated by traffic on Walworth Road and Old Kent Road is high (see scoping report Appendix 11). The UK standard for ambient noise has been set at 55 decibels (A) Lden. Lden is an abbreviation for day-evening-night level. It is a measure of noise over a whole day with a penalty of 10 decibels for night time noise (22.00-7.00) and an additional penalty of 5 decibels for evening noise (i.e. 19.00-23.00). The inside of all the blocks in the Aylesbury Estate and the interior of Burgess Park are below this threshold (normally in the 45-50 range) as are many of the lightly trafficked streets, including Westmoreland Road, Merrow Street, Liverpool Grove, Kinglake Street, and East Street (west of Portland Street). Buildings that abut Albany Road, Portland Street, East Street (east of Portland Street), Thurlow Street/ Rodney Road/ Flint Street, Trafalgar Avenue, Old Kent Road and Walworth Road are likely to suffer from ambient noise above the 55 decibel (A) Lden threshold.</p>
<p>Need to minimise waste arisings and increase recycling rates</p>	<p>Though the borough's recycling rate has improved from 7% in 2003/4 to just under 15% in 2005/6, the borough's target for recycling and composting of its waste is ambitious – 50% by 2020. In the Aylesbury area, Southwark estimates that the participation rate for door-to-door collection is around 30-40%, double the borough-wide recycling rate. There are eight recycling collection points in the Aylesbury AAP study</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>area, collecting 2,130 kilograms per week, an average of 266 kg per collection point. The average amount collected per 'bring bank' in 2003 was 799 kilograms, according to the Southwark Waste Management Strategy 2003.</p>
<p>Need for sustainable use of water resources</p>	<p>There is a need to consider what implications this may have in terms of sustainable urban drainage. PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk advises that all sites require flood risk assessments. Selection of the most appropriate sustainable urban drainage approach should be based on meeting the same principles of hydrology and hydraulics as traditional drainage systems, but also taking into account the interests of the landscape and the environment. As a general principle, techniques based on the control of run-off near its source are to be preferred to off-site solutions.</p>
<p>Need to maintain and enhance open space</p>	<p>Most of Southwark's designated open spaces are located in the southern part of the borough. There is a district park, Burgess Park, inside the action plan area, catering for a number of leisure, sport, and cultural needs of the area. Scoping Report Appendix 12 shows open space designations in the borough in relation to the action plan area. A major study into the quality (what activities are catered for in the space) and the quantity (amount of space and ability to go to the space) of open space was carried out in 2003. This included a 'quality percentage' assigned to each park that was a qualitative assessment of facilities, conditions, and security. The largest part of Burgess Park, a major district park, had a quality percentage of 81%, had unrestricted access, and comprised 32 hectares of land. The most significant local parks, Surrey Square and Faraday Gardens, had a quality percentage of 82%, had unrestricted access, and together comprised 1.2 hectares of land. However, Burgess Park, Faraday Gardens, and open space in the Aylesbury Estate (in housing management) were considered to be three of the twelve most vandalised green spaces in Southwark. The open spaces in the Aylesbury Estate (in housing management) also scored in the lowest eight spaces in Southwark in terms of quality and security. Appendices 16 and 17 of the scoping report show the local and district level parks deficiencies in the borough and the action plan area. The entire area, due to the quantity and quality of Burgess Park, has good provision of district-level parks. The Aylesbury Estate generally has a good provision of local parks, with one of the best provision of local parks in Southwark at the northern end of the study area near the junction of Thurlow Street and East Street. The edges of the study area have considerably worse provision near to Walworth Road, Albany Road and Old Kent Road.</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>There are two sites of importance for nature conservation (SNICs) within the Aylesbury action plan area: Surrey Square (ref OS77) and Burgess Park (ref OS91). The AAP should consider how it can: improve the provision of open spaces; ensure that it meets the need; improve access to open space; improve the safety and security of open spaces and improve biodiversity and access to nature.</p>
<p>Need to preserve, enhance, and protect the built heritage and the archaeological environment</p>	<p>The action plan area contains the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area and borders an archaeological priority zone, Sutherland Square, Grosvenor Park, Addington Square, Coburg Road, Trafalgar Avenue, and Glengall Road Conservation Areas. The AAP should ensure that the heritage value of the area is preserved. Only Glengall Road has a character appraisal and design guidance statement and Liverpool Grove has a designation report. The other conservation areas have character appraisals of varying quality from varying dates, one from 1971. The AAP area also contains a number of listed buildings, including an Ecclesiastical Grade A, St. Peter's Church. The Conservation Areas include a number of Grade II and unlisted buildings that contribute to the character and appearance of the areas, these buildings have been listed in the Baseline Report.</p>
<p>Housing sizes</p>	<p>A recent Housing Needs Survey (2003) for Southwark identified 35,851 households stating a need to move in the next 5 years. Of those households, 48% stated the main reason for needing to move was that their home was too small and 54.3% needed a home with 3 or more bedrooms. A survey of the number of bedrooms (housing size) of each property of the Aylesbury Estate has been performed and the results will be reflected in the sustainability report.</p>
<p>Housing affordability</p>	<p>Over the last 5 years, inflation in housing prices has continued to significantly outstrip rises in income. The Southwark and London Plan target is to ensure that 50% of all new housing is affordable. Southwark's Annual Monitoring Report shows that Southwark has not delivered this target over the last two years, although this may be due to the fact that the emerging UDP and London Plan were only published in 2004. An analysis of housing approvals last year and dwellings under construction also indicate that affordable housing provision is improving. Last year, 38% of dwellings in schemes approved, and 52% of dwellings under construction, were affordable. The Aylesbury Estate contains 2758 units. 2253 (82%) are socially rented, and 505 (18%) are under leasehold. At the time of the 2001 Census 53.5% of households were living in social rented housing in Southwark compared to 19.3% in England. Only 31.4% of households in Southwark were owner occupied compared with 68.7%</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	<p>in England. The London Plan sets a target of 29,530 additional residential units in Southwark. To meet this target significant housing targets have been designated in opportunity areas and action areas of which Aylesbury is one.</p>
<p>Need to improve accessibility by public transport and minimise the need to travel by car</p>	<p>The action plan area is generally very accessible by public transport, particularly along Walworth Road and Old Kent Road. The level of access to public transport is considerably less in some areas in the centre of the proposed action plan area. The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) is a measure used in London to assess the availability of public transport. The London Plan and the Southwark Plan have strategies that tie PTAL to allowable residential densities. Walworth Road and Old Kent Road, and the part of the AAP west of Portland Street have a medium (3-4) level of accessibility, with a small area along Walworth Road (north of East Street) having a high (5 and above) PTAL. The interior of the Aylesbury Estate and the area on either side of Thurlow Street have a low (2 and below) level of accessibility. The proposed Cross River Tram offers an opportunity to improve access by public transport to Aylesbury and Central London to and from the central areas of the action plan area. Census data shows that people in the Aylesbury area travel less, and less to work, than Southwark as a whole and there is a different split in the modes of transport (in terms of travel to work) used in the Aylesbury area in 2001 in comparison with Southwark as a whole. Almost half of the resident population in the action plan area aged 16-74 were not working - 8371 out of 17,469, or 48% (compare to all of Southwark: 41%). Only 1,938 out of 17,469 residents, or 11% travelled to work by tube or rail (Southwark: 18%). 3,093, or 18%, travelled by bus (Southwark: 13%), 1,737, or 10%, drove a car (Southwark: 2%), 1,004, or 6% travelled on foot (Southwark: 7%), and 285, or 2%, travelled by bicycle (Southwark: 2%). In contrast, 17% of the daytime population (1,740 out of 10,031 daytime users) drove a car, 9% or 944, took a bus into the area, and just 8%, or 858, took the tube or rail. There is still a problem with congestion and pollution in the area, particularly along Walworth Road along the western edge of the action area.</p>
<p>Need to improve safety in streets and the public realm</p>	<p>In the three years between 2003 – 2006, 366 accidents involving vehicles took place in the AAP study area. There were 2 fatal accidents: at the corner of Walworth Road and MacLeod Street, and the corner of Westmoreland Road and Queen’s Row. Multiple serious accidents could be found at five junctions along Walworth Road from Albany Road to Browning Street, at the corner of Albany Street and Thurlow Street, and four junctions along Old Kent Road from East Street to Albany Road. A</p>

Sustainability issue	Summary and source of evidence
	map displaying the accidents in Aylesbury 2003-2006 is included in Scoping Report Appendix 18. Data on injuries to car passengers, cyclists, and pedestrians in the Aylesbury area has yet to be compiled by Transport for London.
Improve walking and cycling infrastructure within the action area	Scoping Report Appendix 15 shows the existing cycle paths in Aylesbury in relation to the rest of the Borough. There are four designated paths of the London Cycle Network through or adjacent to the Aylesbury AAP study area, including dedicated cycle lanes on Portland Street. An extract from the London Cycle Network is included in Scoping Report Appendix 21. The SA of the AAP should encourage more and better walking and cycling routes, and assess and monitor the walking and cycling flows in the Aylesbury area. Two major pedestrian/cycle counts have been done in the Aylesbury Estate area recently. The first was along Portland Street, a designated path in the London Cycle Network. These counts by Sustrans clearly show greater amounts of walking and cycling by children relative to their share of the local population. 24% of pedestrians and cyclists were young, compared to 3% who were elderly, 42% who were adult males and 31% who were adult females. 879 pedestrians and cyclists per day used Portland Street on a term-time weekday, compared to 474 on a holiday-time weekday. A second pedestrian survey was done as part of improvements to accessing Burgess Park across Albany Road. A Southwark programme to allow better pedestrian access through the estate along Albany Road and Thurlow Street/ Rodney Road/ Flint Street to Burgess Park was implemented during 2005. Pedestrian flows before the improvements at the junction of Albany Road and Chumleigh Street were highest, especially for children, in the morning (8:30am: 25 children, 32 adults, 1 pensioner, compared to 12:00pm: 2 children, 14 adults, 2 pensioners, 7:00pm: 1 child, 18 adults, 0 pensioners). The average vehicle speed was 33.1 miles per hour, which makes Albany Road faster than 85% of all other roads in Southwark. Follow-up monitoring on the effectiveness of the improvements has not yet been done.

4.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE INFORMATION

- 4.4.1 The baseline data has been drawn from a number of sources. While the data is considered comprehensive, it is not necessarily exhaustive. Appropriate additional datasets that were identified during consultation on the Sustainability

Appraisal Scoping Report and Interim Sustainability Appraisal have been welcomed and incorporated into this document. Where data is not currently available, it will be added when available. Where data gaps do exist they have been clearly identified.

4.5 DEVELOPMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES

- 4.5.1 We have developed an SA framework which contains 16 sustainable development objectives. We have used similar objectives in preparing the Southwark Plan and other documents in the Local Development Framework, such as the Peckham AAP.
- 4.5.2 To help apply the sustainable development objectives and focus on the important issues we have also set out criteria questions. The sustainable development objectives and criteria are listed in **Table 6**. We presented a previous version of the objectives in the scoping report.

Table 6: Sustainable Development Objectives and Criteria

Sustainable Development Objective	Criteria question
Regeneration and employment opportunities SDO 1. To tackle poverty and encourage wealth creation	Will it create job opportunities?
	Will it help remove barriers to employment?
	Will it encourage the retention and /or growth of local employment?
	Will it promote inward investment?
	Will it enhance enterprise opportunities in nearby business districts and town centres?
	Will it reduce the disparity with surrounding areas in London?
	Will it improve the range of employment opportunities?
Education SDO 2. To improve the education and skill of the population	Will it provide high quality educational facilities? Particularly in areas of demonstrated educational deficiency?
	Will it provide opportunities to improve the skills of the population, particularly for young people and adults?
	Will it help fill key skill gaps?
Health SDO 3. To improve the health of the population	Will it promote healthy living in a number of key areas – increasing physical activity, opportunities to improve diet, reduce problematic alcohol consumption, smoking and drug misuse?
	Will it reduce stress, anxiety and mental disorders?
	Will it promote social capital, social interaction and a sense of belonging?
	Will it encourage the prompt recognition and early intervention of important health conditions?

Sustainable Development Objective	Criteria question
	Will it help residents manage their chronic disease?
	Will it reduce accidents and injuries?
Crime and community safety	Will it improve safety and security?
SDO 4. To reduce the incidence of crime and the fear of crime	Will it incorporate measures to reduce the fear of crime?
Social inclusion and community cohesion	Will it secure improved facilities and infrastructure within the public realm for people with disabilities?
SDO 5. To promote social inclusion, equality, diversity and community cohesion	Will it encourage the retention of key services and amenities such as schools and green spaces?
	Will it provide high quality accessible community facilities within the vicinity of people's homes and as an essential component of regeneration schemes?
	Will it improve the quality / extend the range of leisure and cultural facilities?
	Will it promote equality and diversity in the action area?
	Will it encourage people to meaningfully participate in local decisions?
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	Will it achieve high standards of energy efficiency?
SDO 6. To reduce contributions to climate change	Will it encourage the generation and use of renewable energy?
	Will it encourage a reduction in the journeys made by car through the area?
	Does the urban, landscape, and building design take account of changes to the local climate and its impacts throughout the expected lifetime of the development on the local built and natural environment?
Air Quality	Will it help achieve the objectives of the Air Quality Management Plan?
SDO 7 To improve air quality and reduce pollutants	Will it encourage a reduction in the emission of key pollutants?
Waste management	Will it provide appropriate waste management infrastructure? e.g. integrated recycling facilities
SDO 8. To reduce waste and maximise use of waste arising as a resource	Will it promote the reduction of waste during construction / operation?
Water resources	Will it reduce water consumption?
SDO 9. To encourage sustainable use of water resources	Will it adopt technologies / infrastructure that will encourage the reuse of water / maximise water efficiency?
Water, Land, and Soil Quality	Will it lead to a reduction in the quality of soils?
SDO 10. To maintain and enhance the quality of	Will it lead to a reduction in the quality of surface water /

Sustainable Development Objective	Criteria question
water, land and soils	waterways? Will it encourage the remediation of land identified as potentially contaminated?
Quality in design SDO 11. To protect and enhance the quality of landscape and townscape	Will it enhance and maintain the quality and attractiveness of the built environment? Will it improve the relationship between different buildings, streets, squares, parks and waterways, and other spaces that make up the public domain? Will it have a negative impact on important strategic / local views?
Conservation of historic environment SDO 12. To conserve and enhance the historic environment and cultural assets	Will it conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the historic environment and cultural assets (such as conservation areas listed buildings and archaeology) and their setting? Will it involve the loss of existing traditional features of interest that positively contribute to the character of the area?
Open space and biodiversity SDO 13. To protect and enhance open spaces, green corridors and biodiversity	Will it encourage development on previously developed land? Will it encourage the appropriate management or enhancement of existing open spaces or the creation of open spaces? Will it enhance public access to open space? Will it help achieve the goals of the Southwark Local Biodiversity Action Plan? Will it promote the provision of high quality open space that caters for a variety of needs? Particularly in areas of regeneration? Will it help achieve the goals of the Biodiversity Action Plan?
Flood risk SDO 14. To reduce vulnerability to flooding	Will it minimise the risk of flooding to the development area? Will it adopt the principles of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?
Housing SDO 15. To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home	Will it contribute towards meeting the need for affordable housing? Will it provide a range of housing tenures? Will it increase access to homes with three or more bedrooms?

Sustainable Development Objective	Criteria question
	Will the neighbourhood collectively be able to support the lifestyle requirements of all regardless of race, income, age, religion, or sex?
	Will it replace the number of homes lost in the redevelopment of the Inner Aylesbury area?
Sustainable transport SDO. 16 To promote sustainable transport and minimise the need to travel by car	Will it encourage development near key transport / public transport locations?
	Will it improve accessibility in and around the borough by public transport, walking and cycling?
	Will it support a car free or restraint based approach to the provision of residential car parking?
	Will it improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists?
	Will it encourage the use of alternatively fuelled vehicles?
	Will it safeguard land for future transport schemes?
	Will it encourage a high level and high standard of cycle storage provision throughout the development?
	Will it support access to, and for, local businesses?

5 APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS REPORT

5.1 METHODOLOGY

5.1.1 We carried out the actual appraisal of the Preferred Options Report in two main steps. You can find comments on the sustainability scores in Appendix A and B. The Preferred Options Report sets out place making and delivery objectives for the regeneration of this area. We have used the sustainability appraisal framework to assess these objectives.

5.1.2 First, we assessed whether the place-making objectives of the AAP were compatible with the sustainable development objectives and their criteria set out in Section 3.2. We have made recommendations on how to improve or counter the effects found. Each of the place-making objectives were scored as follows:

- ** Not at all compatible
- * Not compatible
- 0 Neutral
- ✓ Quite compatible
- ✓✓ Very compatible

5.1.3 Second, we assessed the options on whether they are consistent with the sustainable development objectives and their criteria set out in Section 3.2. Not all of the sustainable development objectives were applicable to every option and in these cases, no score was given. In the table below, and Appendices A and B,

these cells are coloured yellow. A summary table has been provided in this main document.

5.2 ASSESSMENT OF THE PLACE-MAKING OBJECTIVES

5.2.1 Four inter-related themes recur throughout the Preferred Options document and are the objectives that will be assessed in terms of their compatibility with the sustainable development objectives developed in the scoping report.

The place-making objectives are:

P1: Better Homes: A high quality residential neighbourhood:

1. To create a range of affordable and high quality homes;
2. To offer a mix of housing types and tenure;
3. To offer existing Aylesbury tenants homes of a similar size to those that they occupy now;
4. To concentrate higher densities on good transport sites and higher value land;
5. To create a neighbourhood with a distinct character and identity;
6. To promote sustainable buildings and construction; and
7. To maintain existing housing to a high standard.

P2: Public Life: Better and safer Streets, Squares and Parks

1. To improve Burgess Park;
2. To promote well designed and safe streets and parks; and
3. To provide better management and maintenance of public spaces.

P3: Connections: Improved Transport Links

1. To improve public transport links;
2. To make the wider Aylesbury area accessible for all; and
3. To provide high quality pedestrian and cycle routes.

P4: Community: Enhanced Social and Economic Opportunities

1. To provide better educational, health and social opportunities;
2. To provide more and better local shopping; and
3. To offer more accessible local employment opportunities.

5.2.2 The assessment of the place-making objectives is included below in **Table 7** and a full version with commentary is available in Appendix B.

5.2.3 All the place-making objectives are very compatible with many of the sustainable development objectives, notably SDO 1: Regeneration and Employment Opportunities and SDO 11: Quality in Design. Most of the places making objectives are very compatible with SDO 16: Sustainable Transport and SDO 6: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

- 5.2.4 The sustainability of the place-making objectives was not especially compatible with some environmental objectives notably SDO 10: Soil and Water Quality and SDO 14: Flood Risk. This was due to the pressures of phasing new development. Phasing that will allow the maximum numbers of residents to be re-housed will result in more hard surfaces on the ground in the short and medium term that can be susceptible to more flooding without proper urban drainage systems. Likewise, soil quality degradation in the short and medium term in an area undergoing extensive redevelopment including the presence of building materials and debris is unavoidable: proper planning for disposal of materials will be required.

Table 7: Summary of the sustainability score of the place-making objectives

Table		Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	
		SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	Average
Place-making Objective	Description																	
Priority 1	Better homes: A high quality residential neighbourhood	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	*	*	*	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
Priority 2	Public life: better and safer streets, squares and parks	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓
Priority 3	Connections: Improved transport links	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	✓✓	0	0	0	✓	✓✓	✓
Priority 4	Community: Enhanced social and economic opportunities	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	0	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓

5.3 ASSESSMENT OF THE DELIVERY OBJECTIVES

5.3.1 As well as ensuring that all the place-making objectives set out above are met, it is essential to develop a plan that is socially, physically and economically deliverable as well as being flexible enough to incorporate future changes that are inevitable over the 15 to 20 year life of the AAP. This means that the project will need to create value to make the project financially viable, which should be supported by positively transforming the image of the area. However the needs of the existing residents need to be prioritised in the phasing of the regeneration programme. The programme needs to get underway as soon as possible and avoid the pitfalls that have prevented previous attempts at regeneration. These points are summarised below:

D1: Value: The need to provide adequate funds for regeneration

1. To generate value: the value is related to the quality of the neighbourhood and therefore to the four place-making objectives described previously.
2. To build new private homes and take other steps that will help to generate value which can in turn be used to generate funds for the wider redevelopment.
3. To convince public sector bodies like Southwark Council, Communities England and other government agencies to help fund the regeneration.

D2: Image: The need to positively transform the image of the Aylesbury Area

1. To help transform the image of the area to a place that people and especially families, will aspire to live, work and visit.
2. To challenge the stereotypes of the area and boost the confidence of investors and the local community.
3. To encourage and foster the highest quality of design, management and maintenance, in the buildings, parks streets and other elements of placemaking to help challenge existing perceptions.

D3: Speed: Effectively delivering a phased approach to community regeneration

1. To deliver wholesale change as quickly as possible and the plan should identify early wins; this is a strong desire of all stakeholders especially the residents.
2. To phase the project so as to deliver a new neighbourhood in as short a time as possible whilst ensuring that the re-housing needs of residents are met and the disruption to the wider community is minimised.
3. To identify early housing sites to allow for phased delivery to take place.

5.3.2 The assessment of the delivery objectives is included in **Table 8** .

5.3.3 Overall the delivery objectives are compatible with the sustainable development objectives, in particular SDO 1, Regeneration and Employment Opportunities.

Table 8: Summary of the sustainability score of the delivery objectives

Place-making Objective	Description		Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average		
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16			
Delivery 1	Value: The need to provide adequate funds for regeneration	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	.	.	0	0	0	0		
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	0	.	.	0	✓	✓	✓	
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Delivery 2	Image: The need to positively transform the image of the Aylesbury Area	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	*	0	.	✓	0	0	0	0	0	
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Delivery 3	Speed: Effectively delivering a phased approach to community regeneration	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	*	*	*	*	**	0	*	*	.	*	*	0	*	*	0	
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	.	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

5.4 CHOOSING THE PREFERRED OPTIONS

- 5.4.1 The preferred options have been identified taking into account a number of factors including feedback from formal and informal consultation both on the Issues and Options Report and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal and the effects of each of the options identified in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal.
- 5.4.2 In the Issues and Options Report we set out options for the redevelopment of the estate and regeneration of the area. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal assessed each of these options against the SDOs and compared the social, economic and environmental effects of each. This assessment has, in turn, informed the identification of the preferred options, which will form the basis for the final Aylesbury AAP.
- 5.4.3 We prepared the options taking into account many factors such as the place making objectives, information on the current characteristics of the area, previous masterplanning work, current planning policies, and the need to ensure that redevelopment is deliverable.
- 5.4.4 You will find a summary table of the findings of the sustainability appraisal of all the options considered in the Issues and Options Report in **Table 9** below. A full assessment of the options with commentary is set out in Appendix B . Not all of the sustainable development objectives were applicable to every option and so sometimes no score was given. In the table below, and Appendix A, these cells are coloured yellow. The effects of the options were scored as follows:
- xx Very negative
 - x Somewhat negative
 - 0 No benefit
 - ✓ Somewhat positive
 - ✓✓ Very positive
- 5.4.5 In **Table 9** the preferred options are highlighted in blue. The majority of the preferred options are based on an option set out in the Issues and Options Report. Where this is the case, the preferred option uses the same heading as previously set out in the Issues and Options Report for simplicity. Some of the original options, however, have been combined to make one single preferred options, or significantly altered in light of further work. These options therefore have new headings.

5.5 SUMMARY OF THE APPRAISAL OF THE OPTIONS

- 5.5.1 Overall, the options score very well against the sustainable development objectives. Some general comments are outlined below.
- 5.5.2 The preferred options represent the most sustainable development approaches for the Aylesbury Area. All the preferred options score better against the sustainable development objectives than those that have been rejected. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal in terms of influencing the choice of preferred options.

- 5.5.3 None of the preferred options will have a negative impact in the medium and long term against any SDO. However, seven of the preferred options scored a potential negative impact on one or more of the SDOs in the short-term. Those options are: **Distribution of Homes Option 2, Housing and Open Space Option 2, Street Layout Option 2, Building Blocks Option 1** and **Transport Options 1, 2 and 3**. These impacts will be a result of the necessary demolition and construction in the redevelopment.
- 5.5.4 In the short term, demolition and construction work will interrupt the urban form and make it harder for individuals to find their way around, therefore discouraging walking and cycling, creating places that are temporarily not overlooked, and creating noise and dust, which will negatively impact upon health and environmental quality. Mitigation measures should be put in place in order to ensure the negative impacts are minimised in the short term and that they do not continue in to the medium and long term.
- 5.5.5 In the Preferred Options Report Burgess Park Options 2-5, Surrey Square Option 1, Biodiversity Option 1 and Sports and Leisure Option 2 from the Issues and Options Report have been combined to create a new option, **Aylesbury's Network of Open Spaces**. This option scores well against the SDOs and will have a particularly positive impact on health, community cohesion, soil and land quality and biodiversity.
- 5.5.6 A preferred option has not yet been selected for the **Tram Route**. This currently being looked at and decided upon by TfL. In terms of the SA Framework Options 2 and 3 perform better than Option 1. While Option 1 is the most direct route it proposes a route through Burgess Park which may have a negative impact on open space and the setting of the heritage assets surrounding the park.
- 5.5.7 The **Car Parking Option 1** improves the area's sustainability as it encourages public transport use, improves health with less road accidents and creates less air and noise pollutants.

Table 9: Summary of the sustainability appraisal of the preferred options

- 5.5.8 **PLEASE NOTE:** In **Table 9** the preferred options are highlighted in blue. The majority of the preferred options are based on an option set out in the Issues and Options Report. Where this is the case, the preferred option uses the same heading as previously set out in the Issues and Options Report for simplicity. Some of the original options, however, have been combined to make one single preferred options, or significantly altered in light of further work. These options therefore have new headings.

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport			
SDO 1																					
SDO 2																					
SDO 3																					
SDO 4																					
SDO 5																					
SDO 6																					
SDO 7																					
SDO 8																					
SDO 9																					
SDO 10																					
SDO 11																					
SDO 12																					
SDO 13																					
SDO 14																					
SDO 15																					
SDO 16																					
			Average																		



Options that impact on SDOs



Options do not or make little impact on SDOs



Preferred option

Tenure Mix Option 1	Minimum Private	Short	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓
		Medium	0	.	✓	✓	*	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓
		Long	0	.	✓	✓	*	✓✓	.	.	.	✓	.	✓
Tenure Mix	Balanced provision of social rented, intermediate and private housing (Tenure Mix Options 2 and 3 combined).	Short	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓
		Medium	✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Long	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
Size of Homes	Mix of Different Home Sizes (New Option)	Short	.	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Medium	.	✓	✓✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Long	.	✓	✓✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
Types of Homes	Mix of Different Types of Home (New Option)	Short	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Medium	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Long	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓
Distribution of Homes Option 1	Determined by PTAL	Short	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	*	.	.	.	0	*	0	.	✓	✓	0
		Medium	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	.	.	✓	*	0	.	✓✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	.	.	✓	*	0	.	✓✓	✓	✓
Distribution of Homes Option 2	Determined by PTAL, Value and Centres	Short	✓	.	✓	.	✓	.	*	.	.	.	0	0	0	.	0	✓	0
		Medium	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average	
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16		
		Long	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Standards for New Housing	New Housing Will Meet Lifetime Homes Standards (New Option)	Short	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓
		Medium	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓
New Homes Option 1	Demolish all	Short	.	.	✓✓	.	0	**	0	.	.	.	✓✓	.	.	0
		Medium	.	.	✓✓	.	0	0	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	.	✓✓
		Long	.	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	.	✓✓
New Homes Option 2	Refurbish Selected	Short	.	.	✓✓	.	0	*	*	.	.	.	✓	.	.	0
		Medium	.	.	✓✓	.	✓	0	✓	.	.	.	✓	.	.	✓
		Long	.	.	✓✓	.	✓	✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓	.	.	✓✓
Housing and Open Space Option 1	Maximise private	Short	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	.	.	0	.	*	✓	✓	*	.	✓	.	.	✓
		Medium	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	✓	.	.	✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
		Long	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	✓✓	.	✓
Housing and Open Space Option 2	Balance private and public	Short	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	.	.	0	.	**	✓	0	*	.	✓	.	0
		Medium	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	0	.	✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	.	✓	.	✓
		Long	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	0	.	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓✓	.	✓	.	✓
Sustainable Design and Construction Option 1	Greener Aylesbury Area	Short	.	✓	✓	.	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	.	0	0	✓✓	.	✓
		Medium	.	✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓
		Long	.	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓
Street Layout Option 1	Traditional Connections	Short	✓	.	✓	0	0	✓	*	.	.	.	0	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓	0
		Medium	✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓
		Long	✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓
Street layout Option 2	Connections and Green	Short	✓	.	✓	*	0	✓	**	.	.	.	0	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average		
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16			
	Fingers	Medium	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
		Long	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Building Blocks Option 1	Smaller blocks	Short	✓	.	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	.	.	0	✓✓	✓	.	✓	0	0	0	
		Medium	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Building Heights Option 1	Medium rise	Short	0	.	✓	.	0	✗	✗	.	.	.	0	✗	0	.	✓✓	✓	0	0	
		Medium	0	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	✗	0	.	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
		Long	0	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	✗	0	.	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
Building Heights Option 2	Range of heights	Short	0	.	✓	.	0	✗	✗	.	.	.	0	0	0	.	✓✓	✓	0	0	
		Medium	✓	.	✓✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Building Heights	Taller buildings in important places (based on Building	Short	✓	.	✓	.	✓	✗	✗	.	.	.	0	0	0	.	✓✓	✓	0	0	
		Medium	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average	
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16		
	Height Option 3 with variation)	Long	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	
Building Heights Option 4	Taller buildings with landmark buildings	Short	✓	.	✓	.	✓	*	*	.	.	.	0	0	0	.	✓✓	✓	0	
		Medium	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	✓✓	.	✓✓	.	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Aylesbury's Network of open Spaces	Based on Burgess Park Options 2-5, Surrey Square Option 1, Biodiversity Option 1 and Sports and Leisure Option 2: Facilities in the park and estate	Short	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	.	.	✓✓	
		Medium	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	.	.	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	✓	✓✓	✓✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	.	.	✓✓	✓✓
Burgess Park Option 1	Minimum intervention	Short	0	0	0	.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
		Medium	0	0	0	.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.	0
		Long	0	0	0	.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.	.	0
Surrey Square Option 2	Transformation	Short	0	<	.	*	.	<<	.	<
		Medium	<	<	.	*	.	<<	.	<
		Long	<	<	.	*	.	<<	.
Biodiversity Option 2	Maximising biodiversity	Short	.	.	<	<<	.	.	<	.	.	.	<
		Medium	.	.	<	<<	.	.	<	.	.	.	<
		Long	.	.	<	<<	.	.	<	.	.	.	<
Sports and Leisure Option 1	Facilities in estate	Short	.	.	<	<<	<	0	<	.	*	*	.	.	0
		Medium	.	.	<	<<	<	0	<	.	*	*	.	.	0
		Long	.	.	<	<<	<	0	<	.	*	*	.	.	0
Transport Option 1:	Develop a well-connected	Short	.	.	*	0	<	*	*	.	.	.	*	.	0	0	.	0	0

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
Promoting walking and cycling	network of high quality streets	Medium	.	.	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	.	✓	0	.	✓	✓
		Long	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	.	✓	0	.	✓✓	✓
Transport Option 2: Designing Streets as Attractive Public Spaces	Design streets as public spaces	Short	.	.	x	0	✓	x	x	.	.	.	x	✓	0	0	.	0	0
		Medium	.	.	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓	✓	0	.	✓	✓
		Long	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓	✓	0	.	✓✓	✓✓
Transport Option 3: Public Transport	Enhance public transport connections	Short	.	.	x	.	.	x	0	.	.	.	0	.	.	0	.	✓	0
		Medium	.	.	0	.	.	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	.	.	0	.	✓✓	✓
		Long	.	.	✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	.	.	.	✓	.	.	0	.	✓✓	✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
Tram Option 1	Thurlow – Chandler (Final decision to be made by TfL)	Short	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Medium	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Long	✓✓	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	.	.	✓	.	*	.	.	✓✓
Tram Option 2	Thurlow - Albany – Wells (Final decision to be made by TfL)	Short	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Medium	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Long	✓✓	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	✓	.	0	.	.	.	✓✓
Tram Option 3	Thurlow - Beaconsfield – Wells (Final decision to be made by TfL)	Short	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Medium	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	0	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Long	✓✓	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	.	.	✓✓	.	0	.	.	✓✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
Car Parking Option 1	Lower than existing car ownership with car free areas	Short	.	.	0	0	0	0	0	.	.	.	0	.	0	.	.	0	0
		Medium	.	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	.	✓	.	.	✓	✓
		Long	.	.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓
Community: Enhanced Social and Economic Opportunities	Centralising facilities. Based on Local Services Option 2 linked with a range of other options which are based on Business and Employment Support Option 2, New	Short	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	0	0	.	.	.	✓	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓
		Medium	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	.	✓	.	✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓	.	✓	✓	✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
	Employment Accommodation Option 2, Health Provision Option 1, Health Standards Option 1, Education Options 1 to 4, Arts and Culture Option 2, Shopping Option 1 and elements of Shopping Option 2.																		
Local Services Option 1	Dispersed	Short	0	.	0	.	0	0	0	.	.	.	0	0	0
		Medium	✓	.	0	.	✓	0	0	.	.	.	x	x	0
		Long	x	.	x	.	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	.	.	.	x	x

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average	
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16		
Business and Employment Option 2	Virtual facilities	Short	0	0	.	.	0	✓	0	✓	0	
		Medium	✓	✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
		Long	✓	✓✓	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
New Employment Accommodation Option 1	Central incubator	Short	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓
		Medium	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓
New Employment Accommodation Option 3	Incubator and grow-on	Short	✓	.	.	.	✓	✓✓	✓	✓
		Medium	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
		Long	✓✓	.	.	.	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
Arts and Culture Option 1	Maximise access to outside	Short	✓	✓	.	.	✓	✓	

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
	opportunities	Medium	✓✓	✓	·	·	✓	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓	·	·	✓	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	·	✓
Phasing 1	18 Year Programme	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	*	0	*	*	**	0	*	*	·	0	0	0	*	0
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓	*	✓	✓✓	✓	0	0	0	0	·	0	0	✓	0	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	·	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Phasing 2	15 Year Programme with Thurlow focus	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	*	*	*	*	**	0	*	*	·	*	*	0	*	0
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	·	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	·	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
Phasing 3	15 Year Programme	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	*	*	*	*	**	0	*	*	·	*	*	0	*	0
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	·	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	·	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

Option	Description	Timescale	Regeneration and Employment Opportunities	Education	Health	Crime and Community Safety	Social inclusion and Community Cohesion	Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Air Quality	Waste Management	Water Resources	Soil and Land Quality	Quality in Design	Conservation of Historic Environment	Open Space and Biodiversity	Flood Risk	Housing	Sustainable Transport	Average
			SDO 1	SDO 2	SDO 3	SDO 4	SDO 5	SDO 6	SDO 7	SDO 8	SDO 9	SDO 10	SDO 11	SDO 12	SDO 13	SDO 14	SDO 15	SDO 16	
Phasing	Combination of Phasing Options 1-3 (New Option)	Short	✓✓	✓✓	0	*	*	*	*	**	0	*	*	·	*	*	0	*	0
		Medium	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	0	✓	✓✓	✓	0	✓	✓	✓	·	✓	0	✓✓	✓	✓
		Long	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	·	✓✓	0	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓

6 THE PREFERRED OPTIONS

- 6.1.1 While the short term effects will be neutral for some of the options, due to the negative effects of construction and demolition in the early stages, in the medium and long terms the preferred options will make a positive contribution to the SDOs on average.
- 6.1.2 The following table (**Table 10**) sets out the preferred and rejected options and offers an explanation as to why they were selected or rejected. A more detailed commentary on each of the options is set out in **Appendices A** and **B**.

Table 10: Preferred and Rejected Options

Option	Preferred or Rejected?	Reasons for Choice
Better Homes: A High Quality Residential Neighbourhood		
<i>Tenure Mix Option 1: Minimum Private</i>	Rejected	This option proposes to match the current figure of social rented units. Additional housing would consist of a mix of private for sale and intermediate housing. In the medium and long term this would have a neutral impact on SDO 1, Regeneration and Employment Opportunities. Fewer private homes may also mean the redevelopment period takes longer.
<i>Tenure Mix: Balanced provision of social rented, intermediate and private housing (Tenure Mix Options 2 and 3 combined).</i>	Preferred	This option proposes to deliver 5000 homes comprising of about 34% social rented, 11% intermediate and 55% private homes. This option scores well against the SDOs, in particular SDO 11, high Quality Design and SDO 15, Housing, since the residential design standards of each flat or house, whether an RSL, private, or shared ownership property, will be of a high standard for every tenant. However, in the long term the provision of more private homes could possibly result in the creation of two distinct communities, therefore reducing social inclusion and community cohesion. The greater number of private homes in the short term would ensure the redevelopment takes place in as short a time as possible, reducing the amount of disruption from construction and demolition.
<i>Size of Homes Option 1: Mix of different home sizes</i>	Preferred	Only one <i>Size of Homes Option</i> was provided in the Issues and Options Report. It maximises the provision of family homes

		and will contribute towards creating variety and richness in the townscape and creating a more mixed community. The option has an average score of 'very compatible' with the SDOs in the short, medium and long term and is particularly compatible with SDO 11, Quality in Design, and SDO 15, Housing.
<i>Types of Homes: Mix of Different Types of Home (New Option)</i>	Preferred	This option proposes a good mix of different types of homes. We estimate that the mix will be in the order of 70% flats, 15% maisonettes/houses over houses and 15% houses. This option scores very well against the SDOs and in particular SDO 5: Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion and SDO 15: Housing. In addition the problems associated with higher density living will be avoided by minimising the number of households sharing common parts of buildings such as corridors, stairwells and lifts which will have a positive impact on SDO 4: Crime and Community Safety.
<i>Distribution of Homes Option 1: More Uniform Density with Higher Concentration at Existing Public Transport</i>	Rejected	This option would provide a fairly uniform distribution of development, with the highest densities at existing public transport sites. This does not recognise the potential for increasing densities in certain areas in order to support improved public transport and local services, which would have a more positive impact on SDO 16, Sustainable Transport, in the medium and long term. On average it scores lower against the SDOs than <i>Distribution of Homes Option 2</i> . In addition this option has the potential to have a negative impact on the short, medium and long term on SDO 12, Conservation of Historic Environment.
<i>Distribution, Number and Density of Homes: Higher concentrations at future public transport routes, local facilities and where value is highest</i>	Preferred	This option concentrates development on both existing and emerging transport routes. This option will increase support of public transport initiatives in the area and promote the use of more sustainable modes of transport. In the medium and long term it is very compatible with the SDOs. The objective may have a negative impact on air quality in the short term since it will encourage ore demolition and construction, but in the medium and long term it will

		encourage people to walk and cycle and further promote the use of public transport.
<i>Standards for New Housing: New Housing Will Meet Lifetime Homes Standards (New Option)</i>	Preferred	New housing in the area will be expected to meet 'Lifetime Homes Standards'. Furthermore the option proposes at least 10% of new housing should be designed to meet the needs of vulnerable groups, most will be designed so that it is tenure blind, and will be 'Secured by Design'. The standards will ensure all new housing is of the highest quality, is inclusive and accessible to all groups and due to this it will have a very positive impact on the SDOs, in particular SDO 5: Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion, SDO 11: Quality in Design and SDO 15: Housing.
<i>New Homes Option 1: Demolish all</i>	Preferred	This option proposes to demolish and redevelop the entire Aylesbury Estate. This includes all of the grey slab concrete blocks, as well as all of the red brick buildings within the boundary of the estate. The approach has been chosen since the current layout, form and scale of the estate do not contribute to the creation of an attractive, pedestrian-friendly and sustainable neighbourhood. Furthermore the existing buildings perform poorly in terms of energy, water and waste efficiency. Since completely rebuilding the estate would allow for the development of homes that meet decent home standards and new blocks that will be much more energy efficient and sustainable in addition to the creation of a more well connected and a significantly improved public realm the option will have a significantly positive impact on SDO 3: Health, SDO 5: Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion, SDO 6: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, SDO 11: Quality in Design and SDO 15: Housing.
<i>New Homes Option 2: Refurbish selected</i>	Rejected	This option proposed the refurbishment of selected buildings, largely the red brick buildings. In order to bring the buildings up to the decent homes standards a significant amount of investment would be required. While the option scored fairly well against the SDOs, it does not have the potential to have as positive an impact on the area than

		the <i>Demolition of Existing Buildings</i> , in particular in terms of SDO 6: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and SDO 15: Housing. . This option has been rejected since it could compromise the placemaking objectives, in particular <i>Objective 1: Better Homes</i> and <i>Objective 2: Better and Safer Streets, Squares and Parks</i> .
<i>Housing and Open Space Option 1: Maximise access to private open space</i>	Rejected	This option would require either a reduction in the density of the project or a loss of public and communal open space. This could have an impact on the likely viability of the overall project. While this option scores higher on average than option 2 in the short term, long term option 2 scores higher. The option is also incompatible on the short term with SDO 10, Soil and Land Quality, and SDO 13, Open Space and Biodiversity, due to contamination of land and disturbances from the necessary demolition and construction.
<i>Housing and Open Space Option 2: Balance and access to private, communal and public space</i>	Preferred	This option will enable the construction of more homes and higher density development, therefore improving the overall financial viability of the project. This option will also enable the provision of more formal and informal sports and recreation facilities. In addition, this option scores highly against the place making (P1 and P2), delivery (D1, D2 and D3) and sustainability objectives (SDO11 and SDO13).
<i>Sustainable Design and Construction Option 1: Greener Aylesbury</i>	Preferred	This option aims to ensure that development results in zero carbon growth all new dwellings will achieve at least Level 4 rating of the Code for Sustainable Homes and that the Development meets the GLA target of 20% CO2 emissions reduction through the use of renewable energy supplies. It scores very well against the SDOs, in particular SDO 6: Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, SDO 7: Air Quality, SD) 8: Waste Management, SDO 9: Water Resources, SDO 10: Soil and Land Quality, SDO 11, Quality in Design, SDO 13: Open Space and Biodiversity and SDO 14: Flood Risk.

Public Life: Better and Safer Streets, Squares and Parks		
<i>Street Layout Option 1: Putting back the traditional connections</i>	Rejected	This option will produce a more traditional grid-like layout with smaller blocks than at present. It will allow people to move around the redeveloped area more easily and directly. However the option scores lower on average against the SDOs than option 2. It has a potentially negative effect on SDO 7, Air Quality, in the short term. The option also has a neutral effect on SDO 14, Flood Risk, on the short, medium and long term.
<i>Street Layout Option 2: Putting back the traditional connections and creating green fingers</i>	Preferred	This option does everything in Street Layout Option 1 but in addition it will create three 'green fingers'. This option scores better on average on the short, medium and long term against the SDOs than Option 1. However on the short term it has a potentially very negative effect on SDO 7, Air Quality, and a negative effect on SDO 4, Crime and Community Safety. In the short term, construction works will have both negative and positive effects as additional dead ends and confusion may be caused having an effect on community safety and air quality could suffer with the amount of demolition and construction traffic.
<i>Building Blocks Option 1: Smaller Street Blocks and Finer Grain</i>	Preferred	This was the only option offered for Building Blocks in the Issues and options Report and was developed as a response to the problems associated with the existing large block sizes. On average it has a very positive effect on the SDOs in the medium and long term. The option will potentially have a negative effect on SDOs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on the short term. Creating new smaller blocks may create confusion in the short term, and therefore may slightly increase crime and reduce community cohesion. However in the long term the new developments will have a very positive effect on the SDOs by creating a more legible neighbourhood that encourages more sustainable modes of transport.
<i>Building Heights Option 1: Medium-rise</i>	Rejected	Under this option new buildings will generally be medium rise with not much difference between areas. Benchmark heights will vary between 4 and 7 storeys. The lower end of this range will be next to

		<p>conservation areas and existing areas of low-rise housing, while the upper end of this range will be facing Burgess Park and along Thurlow Street. Landmarks will only stand out a little above the benchmark height and there will be no tall buildings. Overall this option does not score well against the SDOs. This option lacks variety with a greater number of flats and a more limited mix of dwellings. The likely socioeconomic mix for encouraging wealth creation in the community is therefore also limited. However, local employment may not increase given that there will be a priority on house building before adding retail and workshop units. It will therefore have a neutral impact in the short, medium and long term against SDO1, Regeneration and Employment Opportunities. In addition it will have a negative effect on SDO 12, Conservation and Heritage, as due to the largely uniform height.</p>
<p><i>Building Heights Option 2: Range of heights</i></p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>This option will allow for a greater variation in benchmark heights, ranging from 2 to 3 storeys next to conservation areas and existing areas of low-rise housing, and up to 10 storeys in other parts of the estate, such as facing Burgess Park and along Thurlow Street. Benchmark heights will be different from one part of the Aylesbury area to another. Landmarks will only stand out a little above the benchmark height and there will be no tall buildings. This option scores fairly well against the SDOs, however on the short term it is likely to have a negative impact on SDOs 6 and 7 due to the construction and demotion.</p>
<p><i>Building Heights Option 3: Taller buildings in important places (with variation)</i></p>	<p>Preferred</p>	<p>This option will have a similar range of benchmark heights across the Aylesbury area to Building Height Option 2 (2 to 10 storeys), but the development will also contain two taller buildings. These taller buildings will mark both ends of Thurlow Street, which will become the main route through the area. A building of up to 20 storeys will mark the southern end of Thurlow Street, while a building of up to 15 storeys will mark the northern end of Thurlow Street. It scores well against the SDOs. In particular, taller buildings could</p>

		better support a combined heat and power system and harness local wind energy opportunities, which will have a positive impact on SDO 6. In addition by providing taller buildings in important locations, there is more scope to provide lower rise family housing with private gardens. Greater contributions may also be available for the funding of open spaces and parks which is compatible with SDO 13.
<i>Building Heights Option 4: Tall buildings and landmark buildings at valuable locations</i>	Rejected	This option will have a similar range of benchmark heights across the Aylesbury area to Building Height Option 2 (2 to 10 storeys), but the development will also contain a number of taller buildings in the locations with the highest land value. It scores well against the SDOs, however an increase in the number of tall buildings will mean that a lower proportion of residents will have access to private open spaces in the tall buildings, which will not have as positive an impact on SDO 13 as Building Heights Option 3.
<i>Aylesbury's Network of Open Spaces (A combination of Burgess Park Options 2-5, Surrey Square Option 1, Biodiversity Option 1 and Sports and Leisure Option 2)</i>	Preferred	This option is a combination of seven of the options offered in the Issues and options Report. It promotes investment into the green spaces in Aylesbury to form a network – from Burgess Park at a regional level to Surrey Square at a borough level and smaller pocket parks and children's play areas integrated into the residential areas at the heart of the redeveloped area. The new option has a positive effect on the SDOs, in particular SDO 3, Health, SDO 5, Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion, SDO 10, Soil and Land Quality, and SDO 13, Open Space and Biodiversity.
<i>Burgess Park Option 1: Minimum intervention</i>	Rejected	This option proposed to leave Burgess Park in it's current condition. It offered no positive effects on any of the SDOs.
<i>Surrey Square option 2: Transformation</i>	Rejected	This option proposed the development of housing on the south side of the Square and a green finger to Burgess Park. The option would have a positive effect on the SDOs on average in the short, medium and long term. However the reduction in open space would have a negative effect on SDO 13, Open Space and Biodiversity. This option was also strongly objected to

		through consultation exercises.
<i>Biodiversity Option 2: Maximising biodiversity</i>	Rejected	This option proposed not only to protect and maintain existing levels of biodiversity, but also improve upon current levels. This option may limit the opportunity to use of open space for formal and informal recreation. In addition, this option will not make the best use of existing spaces across the AAP area and will not maximise the potential use of these spaces by all interest groups.
<i>Sports and Leisure Option 1: Facilities in the estate</i>	Rejected	This option proposes developing a network of informal sports / multi-use games areas distributed across the redeveloped Aylesbury area. However this option will involve more hard surfaces for play areas and therefore will have a somewhat negative effect on SDOs 13, Open Space and Biodiversity, and 14, Flood Risk.
Connections: Improved Transport Links		
<i>Transport Option 1: Promoting walking and cycling</i>	Preferred	This option will develop a well-connected network of high quality streets that provide a safe, accessible, comfortable and attractive environment for walking and cycling. While on the short term construction may discourage walking and cycling in the area, having a negative impact on SDOs 3, 6, 7 and 11, in the long term improvements in the area will facilitate and promote pedestrian and cycle movement. This will have a positive effect on health, community cohesion, energy efficiency and renewable energy and sustainable transport.
<i>Transport Option 2: Designing streets as attractive public spaces</i>	Preferred	This option will design streets as public spaces using high quality materials creating a pleasant and safe environment. In the short term demolition and construction may have a negative impact on the local environment effecting SDOs 3, 6, 7 and 11. However on the long term it is anticipated the significant improvements to streets will promote and encourage walking through the area. This will have a positive effect on health, community cohesion, energy efficiency and renewable energy and

		sustainable transport.
<i>Transport Option 3:</i> Public transport	Preferred	This option will enhance public transport connections to key attractions in the area and beyond, by supporting public transport improvements, including the Cross River Tram and new bus services. Some of the public transport initiatives will not be completed until later stages in the redevelopment, and therefore the positive effects will not be seen straight away. However in the medium and long term the sustainability appraisal shows that it will have a very positive effect on the SDOs, particularly SDOs 6, 7 and 16.
<i>Cross River Tram Option 1:</i> Thurlow Street – Chandler Way	Being considered by TfL	No preferred option has currently been chosen for the Cross River Tram. This route will have a negative effect on SDO 8, Waste Management, since it may require the movement of Wells Way next to the tram tracks which is likely to increase the amount of construction waste. It may also have a negative effect on SDO 13, Open Space and Biodiversity, since the route runs through the green space currently used for pitches.
<i>Cross River Tram Option 2:</i> Thurlow – Albany - Wells	Being considered by TfL	No preferred option has currently been chosen for the Cross River Tram. This route will not have any significant negative or positive impacts on the SDOs.
<i>Cross River Tram Option 3:</i> Thurlow – Beaconsfield - Wells	Being considered by TfL as a sub-option of option 2	No preferred option has currently been chosen for the Cross River Tram. This route will not have any significant negative or positive impacts on the SDOs.
<i>Car Parking Option 1:</i> Provide for appropriate levels of car parking	Preferred	This option will provide for the appropriate level of car parking within the development itself supported by controlled parking zones along the main streets. On the short term this option will not have an impact on the SDOs however in the medium and long term maintaining a low level of parking space will reduce the use of cars will have a positive impact on the SDOs, specifically SDO 11, 12 and 16.
Community: Enhanced Social and Economic		

Opportunities		
<p><i>Community:</i> Enhanced Social and Economic Opportunities</p>	<p>Preferred</p>	<p>This option proposes to locate local facilities together so that the services required by the community, including schools, health centres, community halls and shops in accessible locations in a way in which different facilities can complement and support each other. By centralising facilities it will have a positive impact on the SDOs, in particular SDO 16: Sustainable Transport, since most facilities will continue to be within easy walking and cycling distance and will encourage these modes of transport and conveniently locating services in on location reduces the need for travel. A more concentrated development of shops will be able to support a greater range of facilities in the long term. Including business and employment support and promoting new employment opportunities in the area will have a positive impact on SDO 1, Regeneration and Employment. This will be supported by improvements to education at all levels, which will also have a positive impact on SDO 2: Education. Further social infrastructure improvements in the area will include improvements to the provision of healthcare and health standards, which will have a particularly positive impact on SDO 3: Health. Further proposals in the option include the provision of local arts and cultural facilities, this has the potential to have a positive influence on SDO 5, Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion.</p>
<p><i>Local Services Option 1:</i> Dispersing local facilities</p>	<p>Rejected</p>	<p>In this option, shops, meeting places and public facilities would be dotted around the area, allowing most people to be within a three minute walk of local facilities. However on average this option would have no effect on the SDOs in general. In the medium and long term it may even have a negative effect on SDO 1, Regeneration, SDO 3, Health, SDO 11, Air Quality and SDO 16 Sustainable Transport. While will provide opportunity for local shops/small scale enterprise to be set up in the medium term but these may not be sustained in the long term as shops and services on their own would struggle and the range of facilities will be limited. In addition dotting</p>

		facilities around will mean that it will be more difficult to walk from one to the other facility easily and may encourage movement by car.
<i>Supporting Existing and New Employment</i> <i>Option 2: Virtual facilities</i>	Rejected	Internet based or 'virtual' business and employment support facilities could be installed within the Aylesbury area. Distributing virtual support services maximises the accessibility of these facilities to local residents. The option scores very well against the SDOs, however it is unlikely to have the same level of impact as the permanent re-location of a formal support agency.
<i>Creating Opportunities for New Business</i> <i>Option 1: Central incubator</i>	Rejected	This option proposes the inclusion of a single business incubation centre located at the heart of the area potentially as part of a larger cluster of community buildings, easily accessible to local residents that contains multiple small and flexible units for community-based entrepreneurs and start-up businesses. This option scores well against the SDOs, in particular SDO 11.
<i>Creating Opportunities for New Business</i> <i>Option 3: Incubator and grow-on</i>	Rejected	This option proposes the inclusion of small flexible business spaces in addition to complementary, larger move-on accommodation provided close by. This option scores well against the SDOs, in particular SDO 1, 5 and 11.
<i>Arts and Culture</i> <i>Option 1: Maximise accessibility to outside opportunities</i>	Rejected	This option proposed improving access to the proposed facilities at Elephant and Castle from the study area in order to improve local residents' access to the arts. This accessibility would be enhanced by good walking, cycling and public transport routes. Overall this would have a positive effect on the SDOs, in particular SDO 1, Regeneration and Employment Opportunities. However people would need to leave the area to use the facilities which may not increase residents' desire to access these facilities.

6.2 MITIGATION MEASURES

- 6.2.1 The intensification of development in the area and the significant increase in population has the potential to have a negative impact on flooding, open space, energy use, water use, waste management, community cohesion and number of

car trips. Table 9 shows the negative impacts are anticipated to be short term since mitigation measures have been incorporated in some of the options.

- 6.2.2 Seven of the preferred options scored a potential negative impact on one or more of the SDOs, in the short term. Those options are: Distribution of Homes Option 2, Housing and Open Space Option 2, Street Layout Option 2, Building Blocks Option 1 and Transport Options 1, 2 and 3. Largely these impacts will be a result of the necessary demolition and construction as part of the redevelopment.
- 6.2.3 The redevelopment area is located on the floodplain and has the potential to significantly impact on flooding. In order to ensure locating more development in this area does not have a negative impact in the medium and long term on flooding mitigation measures will include the provision of SUDs, which have been included in the sustainable design and construction option, and improvements to Burgess Park Lake, which has been included in Burgess Park Option 5 (now part of the combined preferred option Aylesbury's new network of open spaces). Further measures may include implementing early warning systems and raising floor levels.
- 6.2.4 Due to an increase in the amount of development, there is a risk of reducing the amount of open space. The Aylesbury's Network of open spaces preferred option will mitigate any potential negative impacts through improving the provision of and access to open space and ensuring the current provision of 60 hectares is not reduced.
- 6.2.5 The redevelopment will inevitably cause disruptions to residents since they will be moved from their current homes to dwellings in other locations on the estate, or potentially off site. This has the potential of breaking up the existing community and reducing social cohesion. In order to mitigate against these potential impacts it is necessary to implement careful phasing plans to minimise the number of residents having to move off site, and through maintaining and enhancing existing social infrastructure, as outlined in the preferred option Community: enhanced social and economic opportunities.
- 6.2.6 Table 9 shows that the demolition and construction phases have the potential to have the most significant negative impact on the SDOs. One option for mitigating these effects would be to shorten the time over which demolition and construction takes place. However, shortening this time would have a negative effect on the **Housing and open space option 2** and **Aylesbury's network of open spaces** groups of options, as more residents would have to live off-site and open space would be temporarily or, in some cases, permanently lost to ensure the speedy completion of works. This would have a negative effect on several SDOs, especially **Social and Community Cohesion, Soil and Land Quality, Open Space and Biodiversity, and Flood Risk**.
- 6.2.7 At the demotlition and construction phase, SDO 8: Waste Management will particularly need to be monitored and negative impacts mitigated. This may be achieved through recycling and reusing waste as set out in the Sustainable Design and Construction Option.
- 6.2.8 An increase in road traffic is anticipated due to the necessary service vehicles for the demolition and construction and the likely increased desire for residents to use private cars to avoid the building sites. This has the potential to have a negative impact on SDO 3: Health, SDO 5: Social inclusion and community

cohesion, SDO 6: Energy efficiency and renewable energy, SDO 7: Air quality and SDO 16: Sustainable transport. In the medium and long term the Connections Objectives will mitigate the potential impacts through promoting walking and cycling, improving and increasing public transport, introducing soft transport measures such as car clubs and reducing car parking to the minimum necessary.

6.3 UNCERTAINTIES AND RISKS

- 6.3.1 The results of the sustainability appraisal have largely been based on professional judgement and therefore the predicted effects are not definite. Therefore, continued monitoring by the council will need to be carried out in order to ensure the redevelopment of Aylesbury does not have any significant negative medium and long term effects.

7 IMPLEMENTATION

7.1 LINKS TO OTHER TIERS OF PLANS AND PROGRAMMES

- 7.1.1 The preparation of the AAP has been compliant with national, regional and local guidance. A list of the relevant strategies, plans and programmes may be found in section 4 of this document.
- 7.1.2 The following documents have been produced in the AAP process:
- Sustainability Scoping Report
 - Aylesbury AAP Baseline Report
 - The Neighbourhood Charter
 - Equalities Impact Assessment
 - Aylesbury AAP Issues and Options Report
 - Interim Sustainability Appraisal
- 7.1.3 The full Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Preferred Options Report are available to view on our website - www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/AylesburyAreaActionPlan.html - or by following Planning and Building Control, Planning Policy from www.southwark.gov.uk. The appraisal is also available to view in local libraries; one stop shops; the Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5; or at the Southwark Regeneration Department Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street, SE17 2EZ.

7.2 PROPOSALS FOR MONITORING

- 7.2.1 The approaches to the redevelopment will continue to be monitored using the 16 sustainability objectives established in the scoping report. These will assess whether or not the predictions made in the sustainability framework are accurate and will allow the council to see if any mitigation measures will be needed to reduce any unexpected negative impacts. In addition the monitoring process will look at the positive effects of the redevelopment approaches.

- 7.2.2 The impacts of the AAP will be monitored against the baseline information in the scoping report and the predicted effects documented in this Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- 7.2.3 The outcomes of the sustainability framework show that monitoring must be focussed on the short term impacts of the following development approaches:
- Distribution of Homes Option 2 on SDO 7, Air Quality.
 - Housing and Open Space Option 2 on SDOs 10, Soil and Land Quality, and 13, open Space and Biodiversity.
 - Street Layout Option 2 on SDOs 4, Crime and Community Safety, and 7, Air Quality.
 - Building Blocks Option 1 on SDOs 4, Crime and Community Safety, 5, Social Inclusion and Community Cohesion, 6, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, 7, Air Quality, and 8, Waste Management.
 - Transport Option 1 on SDOs 3, Health, 6, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, 7, Air Quality, and 11 Quality in Design.
 - Transport Option 2 on SDO SDOs 3, Health, 6, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, 7, Air Quality, and 11 Quality in Design.
 - Transport Option 3 on SDOs SDOs 3, Health, and 6, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.
- 7.2.4 The short term impacts of the above approaches on the SDOs will largely be due to the necessary construction and demolition. However it will be important to monitor progress in order to ensure the negative effects do not continue into the medium and long term.
- 7.2.5 If adverse effects are found the council will take action to mitigate against the negative impacts. This may require reviewing aspects of the development approach.
- 7.2.6 This section will be added to once we have developed our monitoring approach for the Preferred Options Report further.

How to comment on this report

- 7.2.7 To comment on this report please use the contact details below. Please can you also fill in an ethnic monitoring form. The forms are available on the council's website at the address below and from the council offices.
- 7.2.8 Consultation on this sustainability report begins on 17 April 2008. All comments must be received by 29 May 2008.
- 7.2.9 This Sustainability Appraisal Report is also available to view on our website – www.southwark.gov.uk/YourServices/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/AylesburyAreaActionPlan.html - or by following Planning and Building Control, Planning Policy from www.southwark.gov.uk.
- 7.2.10 This report is also available to view in local libraries; one stop shops; the Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5; or at the Southwark Regeneration Department Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street, SE17 2EZ.
- 7.2.11 If you have any queries regarding this report please contact Tim Cutts at the address below or telephone: 020 7525 5380
- 7.2.12 Comments can be sent by post, fax or email to:

Address: Planning Policy and Research
London Borough of Southwark
Regeneration
FREEPOST SE1919/14
London, SE17 2ES

Email: planningpolicy@southwark.gov.uk

Fax: 020 7525 5611

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: APPRAISAL OF THE OPTIONS

APPENDIX B: APPRAISAL OF THE PLACE-MAKING OBJECTIVES

APPENDIX C: LEGAL AND POLICY BACKGROUND FOR SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND AREA ACTION PLANS

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY

APPENDIX E: RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL COMMENTS OF THE SCOPING REPORT AND INTERIM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT