



London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Local Plan

Addendum Report

**Pre-Publication
Site Allocations
Development Plan Document**

**Sustainability Appraisal
of new additional sites**

June 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY	3
1 Introduction and Purpose of this Addendum Report	6
2 Sustainability Appraisal Framework	6
3 Testing the new proposal sites for inclusion in the SA Plan.....	8
3.1 Introduction and methodology	8
3.2 List of new proposed additional sites	9
3.3 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal assessment of the new proposed additional sites	9
4 Next stages.....	11
APPENDIX 1 – Sustainability Appraisal matrices of new additional proposal sites.....	12

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1 Introduction and purpose of this Addendum Report

The Council is currently preparing the Site Allocations Plan, which will set out the Council's proposals for land and buildings on significant sites within the borough, which are likely to be subject of development proposals during the next 15 years.

The Council has already undertaken public consultation on a previous version of the Site Allocations Plan, i.e. the Pre-Publication version¹, whereby public consultation took place from 1 October 2013 until 12 November 2013. The responses received to this previous consultation have identified a number of new sites, which are now subject of this Addendum Report.

This SA Addendum Report should be read in conjunction with the previous Sustainability Appraisal (September 2013) and it investigates the likely significant impacts of the new proposed additional sites on the borough and the wider area in terms of the contribution towards sustainability that might arise if the new proposals are implemented.

1.1 The Purpose of the SA/SEA

The overall purpose of the SA (incorporating SEA) is to ensure that environmental, social and economic considerations have been integrated into the preparation of the SA Plan. The SA will:

- Ensure compliance with the SEA Directive, SEA Regulations and guidance on SEA/SA;
- Review the Local Plan's relationship with other sectoral plan's, and plans operating at a national, regional and more local level with regard to their policies and programmes;
- Establish the baseline environmental, social and economic characteristics of the area;
- Identify any current environmental constraints, issues and problems;
- Help develop viable options and alternatives; and
- Review the sustainability impacts of the options, and of the preferred SPD option.

1.2 The Site Allocations Plan

The Site Allocations Plan (SA Plan) will include site-specific proposals for the whole borough, other than Twickenham, where the [Twickenham Area Action Plan](#) applies. The proposals in the SA Plan will reflect the needs of the borough, existing national, regional and local policies, site specific constraints and opportunities and will be subject to public consultation as part of the statutory planning process. The Plan looks ahead for 15 years after it is adopted in 2015.

This Addendum Report only deals with the new proposed additional sites to be included in the Site Allocations Plan and therefore this report should be read in conjunction with the Pre-Publication Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Progress Report (September 2013).

To ensure transparency and consistency in the SA/SEA process, all new sites have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report, and they will be subject to public consultation from 9 June until 21 July 2014.

¹ All documents from the Pre-publication consultation, including the September 2013 Sustainability Appraisal, are available to view at: www.richmond.gov.uk/prepublication_of__site_allocations_dpd.htm

1.3 Methodology

The SA/SEA process consists of the following stages and is being undertaken in accordance with government guidance contained within the [CLG Plan making manual](#) on Sustainability Appraisals, launched in September 2009, which replaces the 2005 government guidance on ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents’. Note that whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has superseded the majority of Planning Policy Statements and government guidance, including PPS12, which contained advice on Sustainability Appraisals, the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) is reviewing all their planning guidance, including the Plan making manual, but until it is officially withdrawn or revised, it remains extant. The methodology is as follows:

- Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope
- **Stage B: Developing and refining options**
- **Stage C: Appraising the effects of the plan**
- Stage D: Consulting on the plan and the SEA/SA report
- Stage E: Monitoring Implementation of the Plan

1.4 Scope of the SA/SEA

Baseline data and the development of the SA/SEA framework has been organised in accordance with the topics required by the SEA Directive and as outlined in the CLG Plan Making Manual. The scope of the baseline review has been refined to cover a broader spectrum of sustainability issues which are a reflection of the combined SEA/SA assessment.

2 Stage B and C: Developing and refining options and appraising the effects of the draft plan

Note that the Council has consulted on the draft Scoping Report in from 15 March until 19 April 2013 (Stage A), and the revised SA Scoping Report was published in July 2013 and is available on the Council’s website: http://www.richmond.gov.uk/sustainability_appraisal_ldf.htm

Stage B and C of the SA/SEA consist of developing and refining options and appraising the effects of the draft plan. This is an Addendum Report to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Pre-Publication version of the Site Allocations Plan, and therefore only options and alternatives for the new proposed additional sites have been appraised.

3 Sustainability Appraisal of the options and draft proposals of the new additional sites

The development and appraisal of the new additional proposals to be contained within the SA Plan is an iterative process. This process started with appraising the options as set out later in this report. The options were then refined to take account of the SA appraisal. The proposals will be subsequently incorporated into the Publication version of the Site Allocations Plan, which will be fully informed and accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal Report (i.e. Environmental Report).

4 Results and conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal of the new proposed additional sites

There are 9 additional proposed sites, of which 5 sites are owned by either Royal Mail or the Metropolitan Police; these sites may become surplus to requirements within the SA Plan period. Two further proposal sites reflect the need to upgrade and refurbish local railway stations and one proposal site focuses on the retention and upgrade of university facilities.

All of the new proposed additional sites that have been assessed in this report are likely to have some positive impacts, particularly as redevelopment proposals would provide opportunities for incorporating low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies, implementing sustainable design and construction practices and rebuilding/upgrading facilities with climate change adaptation measures (including the potential for green roofs).

The majority of the new sites are within sensitive locations, and whilst the appraisals were carried out without having detailed designs and layouts, there would be on some sites the potential to conserve and enhance Listed Buildings, Buildings of Townscape Merits and Conservation Areas, including their settings. However, in relation to St Mary's University, the assessment shows that this is a very constrained and sensitive site with very limited opportunities for new development or intensified uses. Any renovations or refurbishments need to be very sensitively designed, take account of the historic environment and ensure that there will not lead to any harm.

With the exception of Teddington Station and St Margarets Station, which only have positive impacts, the other sites have positive as well as negative impacts. Generally speaking, the positive as well as negative impacts increase the more action and intervention is taken on sites. For example, an intensification of uses on a site would most likely be considered as making more efficient and better use of previously developed land, thus contributing to the protection of the borough's parks and open spaces; however, an intensification of uses may also have potential negative impacts on waste and traffic.

The sites owned by Royal Mail and the Metropolitan Police are still in existing use and the proposals would all lead to the loss of a social infrastructure or a local service with likely significant cumulative impacts. The Sustainability Appraisal recommends that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of these sites for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on these sites as part of a mix of uses if feasible. The loss of a social infrastructure may however provide some positive impacts in relation to creating more housing opportunities (this applies to all sites), and the appraisal also identified for 2 sites opportunities for creating new commercial development and they would add to the vitality and viability of existing local/town centres. In addition, the proposal for Cassel Hospital would also lead to a loss of existing social infrastructure; however, the option includes the re-provision of some community as well as residential uses on this site, which would be considered as having a positive impact.

Wherever the SA identified potential negative impacts or dis-benefits, the SA makes recommendations on how mitigation measures could be incorporated into the final proposals for the SA Plan to reduce or mitigate some of these impacts. The full Sustainability Appraisal assessments for all the new additional sites are included in Appendix 1 of this report.

1 Introduction and Purpose of this Addendum Report

- 1.1.1 The Council is currently preparing the Site Allocations Plan, which will set out the Council's proposals for land and buildings on significant sites within the borough, which are likely to be subject of development proposals during the next 15 years.
- 1.1.2 The Council has already undertaken public consultation on a previous version of the Site Allocations Plan, i.e. the Pre-Publication version, whereby public consultation took place from 1 October 2013 until 12 November 2013. The responses received to this previous consultation have identified a number of new sites, which are now subject of this Addendum Report.
- 1.1.3 As part of the process for preparing the Council's Local Plan, the Council is statutorily obliged to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), incorporating the requirements for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Site Allocations Plan.
- 1.1.4 This SA Addendum Report to the Pre-Publication version of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Allocations Plan, dated September 2013, investigates the likely significant impacts of the new proposed additional sites on the borough and the wider area in terms of the contribution towards sustainability that might arise if the new proposals are implemented.
- 1.1.5 This Addendum Report only deals with the new additional sites proposed to be included in the Site Allocations Plan and therefore this report should be read in conjunction with the Pre-Publication Site Allocations Sustainability Appraisal Progress Report (September 2013).
- 1.1.6 To ensure transparency and consistency in the SA/SEA process, all new sites have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal, as set out in Appendix 1 of this report. Note that options for MOL changes at Harrodian School, which is also proposed in conjunction with the nine new additional sites, have been included in the September 2013 Sustainability Appraisal assessment.
- 1.1.7 For further information about the Sustainability Appraisal process, the relevant plans, policies and programmes, the baseline characterisation and sustainability issues of the borough and monitoring proposals please see the main Sustainability Appraisal Progress Report (September 2013).

2 Sustainability Appraisal Framework

- 2.1.1 In order to help assess the sustainability of the policies in the Local Plan, and to monitor its achievement in sustainability terms, sustainability objectives and indicators have already been developed in order to measure the operation of the Local Plan.
- 2.1.2 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives are based on the issues, which are affecting the borough, as identified in the previous SA Progress Report (September 2013) and in the SA Scoping Report (July 2013). The table below sets out the existing SA Objectives that have also been used for appraising the new proposed additional sites.

SA objectives for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan			
	Env	Econ	Soc
1) To prevent and reduce the amount of waste that is produced and increase the proportion that is reused, recycled and composted, recovered (including energy recovery) before lastly disposal.	✓		
2) To reduce pollution (such as air, noise, light, water and soil) from any source and ensure air and water quality improves and safeguard soil quality and quantity.	✓		
3) To reduce the need for travel, encourage alternatives to the car, make best use of existing transport infrastructure and improve public transport integration.	✓		✓
4) To mitigate climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting sustainable energy use through maximising energy efficiency, use of zero- and low carbon technologies and renewable energy, and provide satisfactory water and sewerage infrastructure.	✓		✓
5) To ensure resilience to the effects of climate change through effective adaptation, in particular avoiding or reducing flood risk from all sources and conserving water.	✓	✓	✓
6) To conserve and enhance biodiversity, avoid damage and irreversible losses to designated sites and protected species, adding to the abundance of non-designated biodiversity features and habitats (such as trees, gardens, green roofs and other features).	✓		
7) To promote high quality places, spaces and buildings and conserve and enhance the borough's landscape and townscape character and its heritage assets and their settings..	✓	✓	✓
8) To protect and enhance the quality and range of parks and open spaces and plan positively for the creation, protection and enhancement of the green infrastructure network.	✓		✓
9) To make best and efficient use of previously developed land and existing buildings, implement sustainable design and construction practices and remediate and reuse contaminated land.	✓	✓	✓
10) To provide new housing opportunities and sufficient affordable housing that meets local needs.		✓	✓
11) To facilitate and improve the health and well-being of the population, reduce health inequalities and deliver safer and more secure communities.			✓
12) To promote the independence of people and communities by improving the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities, such as health, transport, education, training, employment, environment, leisure, sport and recreation opportunities.		✓	✓
13) To increase the vitality and viability of existing town centres, local centres and parades.		✓	✓
14) To promote and strengthen a buoyant, diverse and resilient local economy and facilitate inward investment that will secure sustainable economic growth.		✓	✓
15) To increase the amount and quality of commercial development opportunities to meet the needs of the local and sub-regional economy.		✓	✓

Table 1: SA objectives for the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan

3 Testing the new proposal sites for inclusion in the SA Plan

3.1 Introduction and methodology

3.1.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) procedure was to appraise each of the new proposed additional sites against the SA objectives and identify the effects over the short, medium and long term using the key shown in the table below. The full findings of this SA are set out in Appendix 1 of this document.

++	Very sustainable
+	Sustainable
?	Uncertain
-	Unsustainable
--	Very unsustainable
Neutral	Neutral

+/-/? In some instances, the option could have both positive and negative effects against a sustainability objective. The reasons for including both pluses and minuses in the appraisal are explained in the commentary. In other instances, where there is some uncertainty as to whether the effect will occur, a question mark may be added.

Table 2: Key to the SA matrices

- 3.1.2 The assessment looks at key discernible effects, but there may be other impacts on the environment such as an increase in the need to travel, which will in all likelihood have a wide range of effects on the environment including on water quality because of contaminants and on biodiversity through land take. The system does not attempt to score or weight options, but to flag up likely significant impacts. The impact of proposals and policies identified as having significant adverse effects on a sustainability objective may, with appropriate mitigation, be modified to reduce its negative effects.
- 3.1.3 For this exercise short term is considered to be a 5 year period, from 2014 up to 2019; medium term is 2019 to 2024; long term is 2024 to 2029 and beyond.
- 3.1.4 The SA of the new additional site-specific proposals of the Site Allocations Plan was conducted by a team of Council planning officers.
- 3.1.5 In some cases, knowledge of the potential impacts of a proposal/policy may be limited, particularly where cumulative effects are concerned and the appraisal therefore involves making a certain amount of subjective judgements of the likely sustainability impacts of proceeding with any proposal/policy over the short, medium and long term. The judgement is made by reference to what the sustainability objective is trying to achieve and the possible impact a proposed action may have.
- 3.1.6 In this stage of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) the purpose is to identify what the sustainability issues may be of delivering the site-specific proposals, looking for positive and

potentially negative impacts. Where the potential for negative impacts are identified, the SA makes recommendations on how these could be avoided or mitigated against.

- 3.1.7 The appraisal is based on the information available at this time. It is evident that detailed aspects of proposals and/or policies, including their delivery, will be subject to further detailed plans contained within for example site briefs and/or planning applications.
- 3.1.8 The full detailed analysis and matrices of the SA for each proposal and policy can be found within Appendix 1.

3.2 List of new proposed additional sites

3.2.1 The following new proposed additional sites were subject to full Sustainability Appraisal:

- Hampton Traffic Unit
- Hampton Delivery Office
- Teddington Delivery Office
- Teddington Station
- St Margarets Station
- Barnes Green Police Station
- Mortlake and Barnes Delivery Office
- St Mary's University College
- Cassel Hospital

In addition, there is one proposed change to the boundary of an existing MOL designation at Harroddian School – see the options assessed on this site within the September 2013 Sustainability Appraisal report.

3.3 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal assessment of the new proposed additional sites

- 3.3.1 There are 9 additional proposed sites, of which 3 sites are Royal Mail owned Delivery Offices (i.e. Hampton, Teddington, and Mortlake and Barnes) which may become surplus to requirements in the future. In addition, 2 sites are owned by the Metropolitan Police (i.e. Hampton Traffic Unit and Barnes Green Police Station), which may also become surplus to requirements within the Plan period. Two further proposal sites reflect the need to upgrade and refurbish local railway stations (i.e. Teddington and St Margarets). In addition, the proposal for St Mary's University College, which largely relates to the retention and upgrading of their facilities, has also been assessed as part of this Sustainability Appraisal.
- 3.3.2 All of the new proposed additional sites that have been assessed in this document are likely to have some positive impacts. Overall, positive impacts have been identified for the majority of the sites in relation to mitigating climate change as redevelopment proposals would provide opportunities for incorporating low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies. In addition, most proposed sites would allow for the implementation of sustainable design and construction practices and for the potential to rebuild/upgrade facilities with climate change adaptation measures (including the potential for green roofs).

- 3.3.3 The majority of the new sites are within sensitive locations, and whilst the appraisal was carried out without having detailed designs and layouts, there would be on some sites the potential to conserve and enhance historic buildings (including Listed Buildings and Buildings of Townscape Merits) and Conservation Areas, including their settings, and the proposals could lead to enhancement of the borough's landscape and townscape character – this would apply to the Hampton Traffic Unit, Hampton Delivery Office, Teddington Delivery Office, Teddington Station, Barnes Green Police Station and Mortlake and Barnes Delivery Office.
- 3.3.4 Some sites may potentially have positive as well as negative impacts, with the exception of Teddington Station and St Margarets Station, for which no likely negative or uncertain impacts have been identified. Generally speaking, the positive as well as negative impacts increase the more action and intervention is taken on sites. For example, an intensification of uses on a site would most likely be considered as making more efficient and better use of previously developed land, thus contributing to the protection of the borough's parks and open spaces; however, an intensification of uses may also have potential negative impacts on waste and traffic.
- 3.3.5 5 out of the 9 sites (i.e. the sites owned by Royal Mail and the Metropolitan Police) are still in existing use; however, the owners have identified them as likely to become surplus to requirements in the future, i.e. during the SA Plan period (next 15 years). These sites would all involve the loss of a social infrastructure or a local service, for which the Sustainability Appraisal has identified some likely negative impacts. Cumulatively this amounts to a significant loss of social infrastructure for local residents. The Sustainability Appraisal recommends that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of these sites for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on these sites as part of a mix of uses if feasible. The loss of a social infrastructure may however provide some positive impacts in relation to creating more housing opportunities (this applies to all sites), and the appraisal also identified for 2 sites opportunities for creating new commercial development and they would add to the vitality and viability of existing local/town centres. In addition, the proposal for Cassel Hospital would also lead to a loss of existing social infrastructure; however, the option includes the re-provision of some community as well as residential uses on this site, which would be considered as having a positive impact.
- 3.3.6 The Sustainability Appraisal identified various uncertainties in relation to St Mary's University. The assessment shows that this is a very constrained and sensitive sites (the majority of the site is covered by either Metropolitan Open Land and/or Historic Park & Garden designation). As such, there are very limited opportunities for new development or intensified uses. Any renovations or refurbishments need to be very sensitively designed, take account of the historic environment and ensure that they will not lead to any harm.
- 3.3.7 In addition, 2 of the new proposed sites are within a high probability flood zone; in both instances there would be an increase in flood risk vulnerability and it would involve putting more users/residents at risk of flooding. The Sustainability Appraisal assessment has identified that this could be mitigated. In addition, the SA Plan is also informed by a flood risk sequential test, which addresses this issue.
- 3.3.8 Wherever the Sustainability Appraisal identified potential negative impacts or dis-benefits, the Sustainability Appraisal makes recommendations on how mitigation measures could be incorporated into the final proposals for the SA Plan to reduce or mitigate some of these

impacts. Any potential negative impacts or consequences of proposals need to be understood and mitigated prior to the development of the detailed design.

- 3.3.9 This SA Addendum Report, which has assessed objectively the various options and alternatives for the sites, will fully inform the refinement of the SA Plan proposals. The full Sustainability Appraisal assessment for all the sites that will be included in the draft Site Allocations Plan can be found in Appendix 1 of this report.

4 Next stages

- 4.1.1 The next stages in the SA process are completed alongside the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan. The new additional sites will be subject to public consultation from Monday 9 June until 21 July 2014. The SA Addendum Report will form part of this consultation.
- 4.1.2 Following the consultation on the new additional proposed sites, the Council will consider any responses received to the consultation and this SA Addendum Report. The results of the consultation on the new proposed sites and the SA Addendum Report will determine whether any further changes are required to the final version of the SA Plan.
- 4.1.3 Following consideration of comments received, the Council will prepare and finalise the Publication Site Allocations Plan, including the final Sustainability Appraisal report (i.e. Environmental Report). This will again be consulted on and accompanied by Sustainability Appraisal (Stage C and D of the SA process).

APPENDIX 1 – Sustainability Appraisal matrices of new additional proposal sites

Proposal Site: Hampton Traffic Unit							
Option A: Retain status quo (Office and car park for police vehicles)							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral; adjacent to OSNI
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; within Conservation Area, BTM
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral; adjacent to OOLTI and POS
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Site may be declared surplus to requirements by Metropolitan Police, thus retaining the status quo would not be considered the most efficient use of land
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Retaining the status quo would not make the most efficient use of land if this site is declared surplus to requirements by the Metropolitan Police.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> Not applicable.							

Proposal Site: Hampton Traffic Unit							
Option B: Residential, including affordable housing and pedestrian link through the site							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	?/+		?/+			?/+	As the existing use involves a traffic unit, overall, it is likely that traffic would decrease as a result of this option
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+	+	+	Opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water	+		+	+			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change adaptation measures; potential for green roofs
6. Biodiversity	?		?	?	?	?	Adjacent to OSNI; redevelopment proposals should take account of adjoining land with high biodiversity value
7. Landscape & townscape	?/+		?/+			?/+	Preservation of the BTM and creating a more attractive frontage could positively enhance the Conservation Area, but this will depend on the detailed design scheme
8. Parks & open spaces	?/+		?/+				Adjacent to Public Open Space; could improve access and connectivity between sites
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	?		?	?		?	Uncertain because of loss of community infrastructure, but if surplus to requirements, redevelopment would allow sustainable design and construction techniques
10. Housing	+		+	+	+		Provision of housing including affordable homes
11. Health, well-being, secure communities	-/?		-/?			-/?	Loss of social infrastructure, which may also lead to a perception of a less secure area
12. Accessible local services	-/?		-/?			-/?	This proposal would lead to the loss of a social/police service and there are no plans to re-provide other local services
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities	-		-	-		-	Loss of opportunity for commercial development
Summary of assessment: (likely sustainability impact of the option)							
Overall considered to have some positive sustainability impacts, with some negative impacts on waste, commercial development opportunities and loss of local service. It would provide some housing, which should also improve the townscape, enhance the Conservation							

Area and improve the BTM. There are some potential uncertainties in relation to biodiversity, OOLTI and OSNI, which can be mitigated by careful design.

Possible Mitigation: *(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)*

It is recommended that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of these sites for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on this site if feasible. Waste – more activity and development on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste. Biodiversity – ensure that the proposal will not lead to any harm by providing the appropriate biodiversity assessment and ensuring the design and layout takes full account of the adjacent designations.

Conclusions: compare the different options

Option B may be more sustainable, subject to the existing police traffic unit being declared surplus to requirements.

Proposal Site: Hampton Delivery Office

Option A: Retain status quo (Postal delivery office)

SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; within Conservation Area
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Site may be declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail, thus retaining the status quo would not be considered the most efficient use of land
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local							Neutral

services								
13. Town centres								Neutral
14. Local economy								Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities								Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i>								
Retaining the status quo would not make the most efficient use of land if this site is declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail.								
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i>								
Not applicable.								
Proposal Site: Hampton Delivery Office								
Option B: Residential, including affordable housing								
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation	
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term			
1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site	
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral	
3. Travel	?		?			?	As the existing use involves some vehicle movements, it is uncertain whether there would be a net increase or decrease as a result of this option	
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+	+	+	Opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies	
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water	+		+	+			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change adaptation measures; potential for green roofs	
6. Biodiversity							Neutral	
7. Landscape & townscape	?/+		?/+			?/+	Potential to enhance the Conservation Area, but this will depend on the detailed design scheme	
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral	
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	?		?	?		?	Uncertain because of loss of community infrastructure, but if surplus to requirements, redevelopment would allow sustainable design and construction techniques	
10. Housing	+		+	+	+		Provision of housing including affordable homes	
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral	
12. Accessible local services	-/?		-/?			-/?	This proposal would lead to the loss of a social infrastructure and there are no plans to re-provide other	

							local postal services
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities	-		-	-		-	Loss of opportunity for commercial development
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Overall considered to have some positive sustainability impacts, with some negative impacts on waste, commercial development opportunities and loss of local service. It would provide some housing, which should also improve the townscape and enhance the Conservation Area.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> It is recommended that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of this site for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on this site if feasible. Waste – more activity and development on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste.							
Conclusions: compare the different options Option B may be more sustainable, subject to the existing delivery office being declared surplus to requirements.							

Proposal Site: Teddington Delivery Office							
Option A: Retain status quo (sorting office)							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; within Conservation Area, part BTM
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Site may be declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail, thus retaining the status quo would not be

construction							considered the most efficient use of land
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral; town centre location, key shopping frontage
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Retaining the status quo would not make the most efficient use of land if this site is declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> Not applicable.							
Proposal Site: Teddington Delivery Office Option B: Mixed use scheme, with active frontage on ground floor to High Street, and residential including affordable homes or office above or to the rear							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	?		?			?	As the existing use involves some vehicle movements, it is uncertain whether there would be a net increase or decrease as a result of this option
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+	+	+	Opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water	+		+	+			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change adaptation measures; potential for green roofs
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape	?/+		?/+			?/+	Potential to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and BTM, but this will depend on the detailed design scheme
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land	?		?	?		?	Uncertain because of loss of community infrastructure, but

& sustainable construction							if surplus to requirements, redevelopment would allow sustainable design and construction techniques
10. Housing	+		+	+	+		Some provision of housing including affordable homes
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services	-/?		-/?			-/?	This proposal would lead to the loss of a social infrastructure and there are no plans to re-provide other local postal services
13. Town centres	+		+	+	+		Improvements to the frontage and provision of some retail/commercial uses on the ground floor could add to the vitality of Teddington town centre
14. Local economy	+		+	+			Potential contribution to more diverse economy due to retail/commercial offer and provision of jobs
15. Commercial development opportunities	+		+	+			Opportunity for commercial development

Summary of assessment: *(likely sustainability impact of the option)*

Overall considered to have some positive sustainability impacts, with some negative impacts on waste and loss of local service.

Redevelopment may contribute to the vitality and viability of the town centre and provide some opportunity for commercial development, thus resulting in a more diverse economy. It would also provide more housing, which should also improve the townscape, enhance the Conservation Area and improve the BTM.

Possible Mitigation: *(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)*

It is recommended that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of this site for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on this site as part of a mixed use scheme (if feasible). Waste – more activity and development on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste.

Conclusions: compare the different options

Option B is the most sustainable, subject to the existing delivery office being declared surplus to requirements.

Proposal Site: Teddington Station

Option A: Retain status quo (railway station)

SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral

2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation							Neutral
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; partly within a Conservation Area, partly BTM and partly a Listed Building
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction							Neutral
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral; within Teddington Town Centre
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Neutral							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> Not applicable.							
Proposal Site: Teddington Station Option B: Interchange improvements							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	++	+	+	+	+	+	Improvements to public transport and accessibility for the public is likely to encourage use of public transport and

							makes better use of existing transport infrastructure
4. Climate change mitigation	++	+	+	+	+	+	Reduction in greenhouse gas and carbon dioxide emissions through improving public transport interchanges and network
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape	+		+	+	+		Improvements to the Conservation Area, BTM and Listed Building including their setting
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	+		+	+	+		Optimises the existing infrastructure and incorporate sustainable construction practices if possible
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services	+		+				Improved accessibility will be beneficial to all residents, including disabled access
13. Town centres	+		+			+	Improved and refurbished facilities should enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i>							
Overall very positive impacts, particularly as the interchange improvements and enhancements to the station will contribute to enhancing the historic environment, encouraging public transport use, which should contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions; improved accessibility will benefit all residents, particularly those in wheelchairs, and is also expected to contribute to the vitality of Teddington.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i>							
None.							
Conclusions: compare the different options							
Option B is considered to be the most sustainable.							

Proposal Site: St Margarets Station
Option A: Retain status quo (railway station)

SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation							Neutral
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction							Neutral
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral; within St Margarets Area of Mixed Use
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Neutral							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> Not applicable.							
Proposal Site: St Margarets Station							
Option B: Interchange improvements							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-	Short-	Medium-	Long-		

		boundary	term	term	term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	++	+	+	+	+	+	Improvements to public transport and accessibility for the public is likely to encourage use of public transport and makes better use of existing transport infrastructure
4. Climate change mitigation	++	+	+	+	+	+	Reduction in greenhouse gas and carbon dioxide emissions through improving public transport interchanges and network
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction							Neutral
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services	+		+				Improved accessibility will be beneficial to all residents, including disabled access
13. Town centres	+		+			+	Improved and refurbished facilities should enhance the vitality and viability of St Margarets Area of Mixed Use
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Overall very positive impacts, particularly as the interchange improvements to the station will encourage public transport use, which should contribute to a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions; improved accessibility will benefit all residents, particularly those in wheelchairs, and is also expected to contribute to the vitality of St Margarets.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> None.							
Conclusions: compare the different options Option B is considered to be the most sustainable.							

Proposal Site: Barnes Green Police Station							
Option A: Retain status quo (police station and car park)							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; surrounded by Conservation Area, Listed Building opposite, nearby BTMs
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Site may be declared surplus to requirements by Metropolitan Police, thus retaining the status quo would not be considered the most efficient use of land
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i>							
Retaining the status quo would not make the most efficient use of land if this site is declared surplus to requirements by the Metropolitan Police.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i>							
Not applicable.							

Proposal Site: Barnes Green Police Station							
Option B: Residential, including affordable housing							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	?		?			?	It is uncertain whether this option would lead to an increase or decrease in traffic as the existing site has a car park and vehicle movements
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+	+	+	Opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water	+/-		+/-	+/-			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change adaptation measures; potential for green roofs. In a high risk flood zone - would increase the flood risk vulnerability and number of people in a flood risk area, which needs to be mitigated.
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape	?/+		?/+			?/+	Potential for enhancing the setting of the surrounding Conservation Area and Listed Building, but this will depend on the detailed design scheme; proposal needs to take account of the protected view from Richmond Hill
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	?		?	?		?	Uncertain because of loss of community infrastructure, but if surplus to requirements, redevelopment would allow sustainable design and construction techniques
10. Housing	+		+	+	+		Provision of housing including affordable homes
11. Health, well-being, secure communities	-/?					-/?	Loss of social infrastructure, which may lead to a perception of a less secure area
12. Accessible local services	-/?		-/?			-/?	This proposal would lead to the loss of a social/police service and there are no plans to re-provide other local services
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities	-		-	-		-	Loss of opportunity for commercial development

<p>Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Overall considered to have some positive sustainability impacts, with some negative impacts on waste, commercial development opportunities and loss of local service. It would provide some housing, which may improve the townscape and enhance the setting of the surrounding Conservation Area and the Listed Building opposite the site. There are some potential uncertainties in relation to flood risk and travel, which can be mitigated by careful design.</p>
<p>Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> It is recommended that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of this site for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on this site if feasible. Waste – more activity and development on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste. To mitigate flood risk a FRA and Flood Emergency Plan should be required to ensure that development and its users/residents are safe.</p>
<p>Conclusions: compare the different options Option B may be more sustainable, subject to the existing police station being declared surplus to requirements.</p>

Proposal Site: Mortlake and Barnes Delivery Office							
Option A: Retain status quo (sorting office)							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; close proximity to Conservation Area
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral; opposite Mortlake Green
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Site may be declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail, thus retaining the status quo would not be considered the most efficient use of land
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure							Neutral

communities								
12. Accessible local services								Neutral
13. Town centres								Neutral; within Area of Mixed Use
14. Local economy								Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities								Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i>								
Retaining the status quo would not make the most efficient use of land if this site is declared surplus to requirements by Royal Mail.								
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i>								
Not applicable.								
Proposal Site: Mortlake and Barnes Delivery Office								
Option B: A mixed use scheme with employment and residential uses, including affordable housing								
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation	
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term			
1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site	
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral	
3. Travel	?		?			?	As the existing use involves some vehicle movements, it is uncertain whether there would be a net increase or decrease as a result of this option	
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+	+	+	Opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies	
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water	+/-		+/-	+/-			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change adaptation measures; potential for green roofs. In a high risk flood zone - would increase the flood risk vulnerability and number of people in a flood risk area, which needs to be mitigated.	
6. Biodiversity							Neutral	
7. Landscape & townscape	?/+		?/+			?/+	Potential to enhance the setting of the nearby Conservation Area and BTMs, but this will depend on the detailed design scheme	
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral; need to take account of Mortlake Green (Public Open Space)	
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	?		?	?		?	Uncertain because of loss of community infrastructure, but if surplus to requirements, redevelopment would allow sustainable design and construction techniques	
10. Housing	+		+	+	+		Some provision of housing including affordable homes	

11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services	-/?		-/?			-/?	This proposal would lead to the loss of a social infrastructure and there are no plans to re-provide other local postal services
13. Town centres	+		+	+	+		Improvements to the frontage and provision of some retail/commercial uses on the ground floor could add to the vitality of the Mortlake Area of Mixed Use
14. Local economy	+		+	+			Potential contribution to more diverse economy due to retail/commercial offer and provision of jobs
15. Commercial development opportunities	+		+	+			Opportunity for commercial development
<p>Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Overall considered to have some positive sustainability impacts, with some negative impacts on waste, flood risk and loss of local service. Redevelopment may contribute to the vitality and viability of the Area of Mixed Use and provide some opportunity for commercial development, thus resulting in a more diverse economy. It would also provide more housing, which should also improve the townscape, enhance the nearby Conservation Area and BTMs.</p>							
<p>Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> It is recommended that the potential for re-using or redeveloping part of this site for social infrastructure should be further investigated and that some provision of a local social/community service is re-provided on this site as part of a mixed use scheme if feasible. Waste – more activity and development on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste. To mitigate flood risk a FRA and Flood Emergency Plan should be required to ensure that development and its users/residents are safe.</p>							
<p>Conclusions: compare the different options Option B is the most sustainable, subject to the existing delivery office being declared surplus to requirements.</p>							

Proposal Site: St Mary's University College							
Option A: Retain status quo (University, hall of residence and sports ground)							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy

mitigation							efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; adjacent to Strawberry Hill House and Gardens (Grade I Listed Building)
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral; partly within and adjacent to Strawberry Hill Historic Park & Garden; large majority of site designated as MOL
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction							Neutral
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Largely neutral.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> Not applicable.							
Proposal Site: St Mary's University College Option B: Retention and upgrading of university facilities, retention of playing field and some upgrading/rebuilding of out-dated facilities							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral, subject to no intensification of uses on the site
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral, subject to no intensification of uses on the site
4. Climate change mitigation	+		+	+		+	Opportunity to incorporate some low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies, subject to the preservation of historic assets
5. Climate change	+		+	+			Potential to rebuild facilities with climate change

adaptation, flood risk & water							adaptation measures; potential for green roofs
6. Biodiversity							Neutral
7. Landscape & townscape	?		?	?	?	?	adjacent to Strawberry Hill House and Gardens (Grade I Listed Building); it will depend on the detailed design scheme whether it will have positive or negative impacts
8. Parks & open spaces	?		?	?	?	?	partly within and adjacent to Strawberry Hill Historic Park & Garden; large majority of site designated as MOL; there should be no new buildings on designated land
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	?		?	?	?	?	Very limited potential for development without encroaching into MOL or Historic Park & Garden as the majority of the site is designated; some potential for incorporating sustainable construction techniques
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services	+		+			+	Potential for dual use and making some services accessible to the local community, but this will depend on the details of the scheme
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i> Overall some positive impacts but also some uncertainties, which will depend on the details of any scheme.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i> MOL, Historic Park & Garden – no new development and ensure no harm to the setting of the Grade I Listed Building and Gardens							
Conclusions: compare the different options There would be no harm as a result of keeping the status quo. In relation to Option B, this is a very constrained and sensitive site, with very limited opportunities for new development or intensified uses. Any renovations or refurbishments need to be very sensitively designed, take account of the historic environment and ensure that there will not lead to any harm.							

Proposal Site: Cassel Hospital

Option A: Retain status quo (West London Mental Health Trust premises)

SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		
1. Waste							Neutral
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel							Neutral
4. Climate change mitigation	-			-	-	-	It is unlikely that the existing buildings incorporate energy efficiency measures
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity							Neutral; partly designated OSNI; badger setts are present
7. Landscape & townscape							Neutral; Listed Building (Cassel Hospital), within Conservation Area; generally sensitive area/environment
8. Parks & open spaces							Neutral; majority of grounds is designated OOLTI; opposite Ham Common (MOL, POS)
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction							Neutral
10. Housing							Neutral
11. Health, well-being, secure communities							Neutral
12. Accessible local services							Neutral
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral
Summary of assessment: <i>(likely sustainability impact of the option)</i>							
Largely neutral.							
Possible Mitigation: <i>(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)</i>							
Not applicable.							
Proposal Site: Cassel Hospital							
Option B: Conversion of buildings for residential/community use							
SA objectives	Geographic scale		Assessment / Length of effect			Cumulative	Commentary/explanation, uncertainties, proposed mitigation
	Local	Trans-boundary	Short-term	Medium-term	Long-term		

1. Waste	-		-	-	-	-	New and intensified uses would be likely to increase the waste stream from this site
2. Pollution & soil							Neutral
3. Travel	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Converting the exiting buildings and intensifying the use of this site is likely to lead to an increase in traffic, particularly as the site has a “very poor” PTAL rating and therefore very limited public transport accessibility.
4. Climate change mitigation	-/?		-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Although there may be an opportunity to incorporate low/zero carbon and renewable energy technologies, this is likely to be limited due to historic building constraints. An increase in traffic would also lead to an increase in CO2 emissions.
5. Climate change adaptation, flood risk & water							Neutral
6. Biodiversity	?		?	?	?	?	This site is designated OSNI and an intensification in uses could impact on the biodiversity.
7. Landscape & townscape	+/?		+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	A proposal for residential / community use is likely to contribute to the preservation of the Conservation Area, Listed Building and general character of the local area.
8. Parks & open spaces	?		?	?	?	?	This site is designated OOLTI and located opposite Ham Common, which is designated MOL, Public Open Space, and which also includes a Historic Park and Garden. There should be no new buildings on any designated land and no harmful impacts from the conversion onto the character of the area.
9. Best use of land & sustainable construction	+/?		+/?				If the site is declared surplus, it could be considered that it would make better use of land.
10. Housing	+		+	+			Opportunity for more new homes, possibly affordable homes
11. Health, well-being, secure communities	?		?			?	Potential loss of social infrastructure, although it is expected that some community provision will be re-provided on this site.
12. Accessible local services	-		-	-	-	-	This area is poorly provided with local services as it is outside of (including outside the 400m of) town centres and areas of mixed use.
13. Town centres							Neutral
14. Local economy							Neutral
15. Commercial development opportunities							Neutral

Summary of assessment: *(likely sustainability impact of the option)*

Overall some positive as well as some negative impacts but also some uncertainties, which will depend on the details of any scheme. Although it would lead to a loss of a social infrastructure, it would provide for some new homes and for community use. The proposal should contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area and the Listed Building, including taking account of the sensitive local character.

Possible Mitigation: *(measures to mitigate likely negative effects and enhance positive effects)*

To mitigate the loss of the social infrastructure, there should be some re-provision on this site, possibly in the form of community use. There should be no new development on designated OOLTI. Biodiversity – this is a very sensitive site and designated OSNI; any proposal needs to ensure that it will conserve and enhance the on-site biodiversity. Travel – ensure any proposal would have no impacts on local traffic and parking provision. Waste – more activity and intensification on this site will inevitably generate more waste but this can be mitigated through the application of waste hierarchy and reuse of demolition waste.

Conclusions: compare the different options

Overall, if the site is declared surplus to requirements, it is considered that Option B is more sustainable. However, it is a very sensitive site with very limited development opportunities and potential for intensified uses. Any proposals for a conversion need to be very sensitively designed, take account of the historic environment and ensure that there will not lead to any harm to the adjacent and nearby open land and biodiversity designations.