

**City of Westminster Local Development Framework**

<p><b>Climate Change and sustainable development</b></p> <p><b>Option 1 (A)</b></p> <p>The UDP currently has policies to <u>encourage</u> sustainable measures in buildings. Should this approach continue, or should the policies be made stronger, <u>requiring</u> sustainable measures without which applications will be refused permission? For example:</p> <p>(i) Should we require large new commercial and residential schemes to demonstrate low energy demand and that the energy they do use is from low-carbon sources?</p> <p>(ii) Should there be more specific and stronger policies making it mandatory for all developments over a certain size to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and other means to reduce the risk of flooding?</p> <p>(iii) Should we introduce criteria-based policies for water efficiency in buildings or specific design-led policies to ensure effective adaptation of buildings to climate change?</p> <p>(iv) Should we require living roofs, where practicable, in all or just certain parts of Westminster.</p>	<b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Where the policy is strengthened to “require” there should be positive effects for society: buildings will be healthier to spend time in, housing standards will be raised, public realm layouts will allow for good inclusive access as well as encourage more walking and cycling. All these factors will also benefit health. Designing out crime will lower incidents of crime and make places safer and more enjoyable for everyone, and not cause the exclusion of particular groups such as women, parents with small children, and older people. The design and orientation of buildings will take account of noise and air pollution, improve energy efficiency, build in adaptations to climate change; also have positive effects on health over time.</p> <p>Although, initially, requiring higher standards of sustainability in design and construction could make elements of building construction more expensive, over time there will be efficiencies in running costs and energy-efficient buildings will become more appealing to businesses.</p> <p>Environmental improvements will include more efficient transport; energy efficiencies which help to reduce the impact on climate change; support to biodiversity and better facilities for waste collection, management and disposal. Levels of recycled waste will also be improved, helping to meet targets and reduce waste to landfill.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>The option of requiring high standards of sustainability has the potential to bring environmental benefits but initially could have some negative economic effects. Raising awareness with and having an ongoing dialogue with developers and the construction industry generally, will be important for the success of this policy option.</p>
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>Rating</b>	
	1. cohesive, safe communities	=	
	2. reduce crime/ fear	+	
	3. housing types	=	
	4. health and well-being	+	
	5. climate change	+	
	6. sustainable design	+	
	7. flood risk and water quality	+	
	8. biodiversity	+	
	9. air quality	+	
	10. noise	+	
	11. reduce travel	=	
	12. reduce waste	+	
	13. cultural heritage	-	
	14. public realm/streets	+	
	15. open space	=	
	16. equality of opportunity	=	
17. economic diversity and growth	=		
<p><b>Social</b>    +    <b>Economic</b>    =    <b>Environmental</b>    +</p>			

<p><b>Climate Change and sustainable development Option 1 (B)</b>  <b>The Mayor of London is aiming to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% by 2010 as the crucial first step on a long-term path to a 60% reduction by 2025. The draft further alterations to the London Plan state that Boroughs should, therefore, set targets for the generation of renewable energy and establish at least one ‘showcase’ renewable energy project in their area in order to raise the profile of renewable energy best practice. Do you have any comments on a renewable energy target?</b></p> <p><b>(i) Should Westminster introduce a target, together with policies requiring that a specific % of a new building’s energy requirement be derived from on-site renewables?</b></p> <p><b>(ii) Should the City Council actively seek and designate development sites for new community heating combined heat and power (CHP) stations, and require</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b>                      Generating more renewable energy will reduce the reliance on traditional fuels which will have a positive effect socially, through the health benefits as well as environmentally. Cleaner fuels will help improve air quality, which in turn will help improve health levels. Noise from wind turbines has been raised as a potential problem, and if this is proven to be the case, their construction in Westminster would have a negative effect on people’s quality of life.</p> <p>Relying more on renewable energy will help address climate change, and over time raise energy efficiencies and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, this positive effect will be very small whilst the bulk of the building stock in Westminster is older and of historical construction.</p> <p>Although, initially, requiring higher standards of sustainability in design and construction could make elements of building construction more expensive, over time there will be efficiencies in running costs and energy-efficient buildings will become more</p>
	<b>objective</b>	<b>rating</b>	
	1. cohesive, safe communities	=	
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=	
	3. housing types	=	
	4. health and well-being	+	
	5. climate change	+	
	6. sustainable design	+	
	7. flood risk and water quality	=	
	8. biodiversity	=	
	9. air quality	+	
	10. noise	-	
	11. reduce travel	=	
	12. reduce waste	+	
	13. cultural heritage	-	
	14. public realm/streets	=	
	15. open space	-	
16. equality of opportunity	=		

**City of Westminster Local Development Framework**

<p><b>such facilities on future large development sites?</b></p>	<p>17. economic diversity and growth</p>	<p align="center">=</p>	<p>appealing to businesses. Technologies should become less costly over time as they are more widely used.</p> <p>Having more combined heat and power systems would cut energy costs, reduce fuel poverty and minimise waste from power generation. It would have environmental, social and economic benefits.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Although the Mayor is seeking the introduction of targets for achieving renewable energy on new developments, in practice this can only be achieved on very large developments, so the overall effect on reducing the carbon footprint of Westminster would be small.</p> <p>The option of imposing a renewable energy target has the potential to bring environmental benefits over time but initially could have some negative economic effects. Raising awareness with and having an ongoing dialogue with developers and the construction industry generally, will be important for the success of this policy option.</p> <p>Requiring combined heat and power systems would be of benefit.</p>				
			<p><b>Social</b></p>	<p><b>+</b></p>	<p><b>Economic</b></p>	<p><b>=/+</b></p>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p>

<p><b>Climate Change and sustainable development Option</b></p> <p><b>1 (C)</b>  <b>Should the City Council i) seek to allocate sites for waste management within Westminster or ii) work more closely with other Boroughs in London to seek a sub-regional waste management solution</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>It is always preferable to dispose of waste close to where it is generated. This results in fewer vehicular journeys and is best from an environmental perspective. However, in Westminster there are no sites available for waste treatment. Land is of such a high value that no waste treatment operation would be economically viable.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>The only practicable solution to the waste management and disposal issue for Westminster is to reach agreement with other boroughs and the Mayor of London. Westminster will be unable to dispose of all its waste within its own boundaries for the foreseeable future.</p>				
	Objective summarised	Rating i) ii)					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	= =					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	= =					
	3. housing types	- +					
	4. health and well-being	- +					
	5. climate change	+ =					
	6. sustainable design	= =					
	7. flood risk and water quality	- +					
	8. biodiversity	- +					
	9. air quality	= =					
	10. noise	- =					
	11. reduce travel	+ -					
	12. reduce waste	= +					
	13. cultural heritage	- +					
	14. public realm/streets	- =					
	15. open space	- +					
	16. equality of opportunity	= =					
17. economic diversity and growth	= =						
		Social	= +	Economic	= =	Environmental	+ +

<p><b>Climate Change and sustainable development Option</b></p> <p><b>1 (D)</b>  <b>How should new parking for residential developments be provided in the future? For example:</b></p> <p><b>(i) Bearing in mind the high level of access to the public transport network across most of Westminster, should the City Council introduce policies for encouraging car-free housing developments in specific areas and/or specific schemes?</b></p> <p><b>(ii) Should the City Council introduce different parking standards for different types of housing (taking into account number of bedrooms /tenure, i.e. market / social housing) or by different geographical areas?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>						
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	+					
	3. housing types	=/+					
	4. health and well-being	+					
	5. climate change	+					
	6. sustainable design	+					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	=					
	9. air quality	+					
	10. noise	+					
	11. reduce travel	+					
	12. reduce waste	-					
	13. cultural heritage	+					
	14. public realm/streets	+					
	15. open space	+					
	16. equality of opportunity	=					
17. economic diversity and growth	=						
		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Reducing parking overall will benefit people socially because walking and cycling could be encouraged as a result. There would be a localised reduction in traffic noise and air pollution with the reduction in car journeys to car-free developments. Those people who for whom it was essential to use a car would have the choice of finding non car-free homes.</p> <p>Any policy to restrict vehicular use will have environmental benefits; air quality will improve as will ambient noise levels. There will be positive knock-on effects on biodiversity. Social benefits would also accrue, particularly in terms of health and safety. By giving pedestrians priority in the public realm, areas of Westminster will become much more pleasant to be in and there should be fewer road casualties. People with disabilities would still have special user rights.</p> <p>Care would need to be taken to ensure that the impact of vehicular traffic is not merely shifted from one area to another. Servicing arrangements would need to be accommodated.</p> <p>This option is for housing alone, so there is no reason why there should be any economic disbenefits from taking up this policy option.</p> <p><b>Overall Assessment</b></p> <p>In Westminster where access to public transport is excellent, it would be sensible to consider a policy for car-free developments for the central part of the city.</p> <p>Varying parking standards in different parts of Westminster would also be appropriate to not only alleviate the pressure on on-street parking but to bring social and environmental benefits from reducing non-essential private car journeys.</p>					
		<b>Social</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>+</b>

<p><b>Central Activity Zone Option</b></p> <p><b>2 (A)</b>  <b>Should we extend the CAZ boundary as proposed in the draft further alterations to the London Plan?</b></p>	<b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b>						
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	=					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=					
	3. housing types	-					
	4. health and well-being	=					
	5. climate change	-					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	-					
	9. air quality	- / =					
	10. noise	-					
	11. reduce travel	-					
	12. reduce waste	-					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	=					
	15. open space	- / =					
16. equality of opportunity	+						
17. economic diversity and growth	+	<b>Social</b>	=	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>	-

**Commentary**

Enabling more mixed use activities could have a positive effect on social and economic objectives. More opportunities could arise for business expansion and for new firms to locate in Westminster. There could be opportunities for a more diverse office base with job opportunities for people with a range of different skills, thus broadening the workforce.

Land taken up by commercial activity reduces opportunities for more housing development. This could affect the ability of the City Council to achieve housing targets set by the Mayor for London.

Increases in commercial activity could place more pressure on existing community services. But generation of jobs would benefit people.

There would be possible increases in materials, energy and water demand and there could be more traffic with a commensurate reduction in air quality and biodiversity. Noise could increase as well as generation of more waste. All these factors could mean a worsening in the overall environment of Westminster.

**Overall assessment**

If this option were to be pursued then mitigating measures would need to be introduced such as more controlled parking, sustainable design and construction in buildings, s 106 agreements to ensure that community facilities were provided at optimum levels.

<p><b>Opportunity Areas Option</b></p> <p><b>2 (B)</b>  <b>Should the Victoria and Tottenham Court Road ‘Areas of Intensification’ be re-designated ‘Opportunity Areas’ as proposed in the draft further alterations to the London Plan and can the projected increase in jobs and homes be accommodated?</b></p>	<b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Bringing forward additional commercial and residential development could have positive effects and meet social and economic objectives, particularly if they resulted in more sustainably designed and constructed buildings. There could be some worsening of traffic and other environmental impacts which would have to be mitigated through other policy measures. Redevelopment could provide opportunities to improve accessibility and to improve the public realm</p> <p>There may be a wider range of job opportunities which in turn can help meet objectives for social cohesion and reducing poverty amongst vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Intensification of land use could worsen air quality and noise pollution as well as increase opportunities for crime. It would also put more pressure on existing community services Mitigating measures could offset some of these elements.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Mitigating measures such as requiring sustainable design and construction and “green” management plans would be needed to offset the cumulatively negative effects of the intensification of land uses considered through this policy option. S 106 agreements to ensure that the area provides sufficient community facilities will also be important.</p>			
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>				
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+				
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=				
	3. housing types	= / +				
	4. health and well-being	-				
	5. climate change	- / =				
	6. sustainable design	=				
	7. flood risk and water quality	=				
	8. biodiversity	-				
	9. air quality	-				
	10. noise	-				
	11. reduce travel	=				
	12. reduce waste	-				
	13. cultural heritage	-				
	14. public realm/streets	=				
	15. open space	-				
16. equality of opportunity	+	<p><b>Social</b> = <b>Economic</b> + <b>Environmental</b> -</p>				
17. economic diversity and growth	+					

Economic activity in North Westminster Option	Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives summarised		Commentary
	Objective summarised	rating	
<b>2 (C)</b> <b>In order to encourage economic activity in the north of the City, should we:</b>  (i) <b>Extend the Paddington Special Policy Area to include the North Westminster Community School and Dudley House sites?</b>  (ii) <b>Extend the Edgware Road and Marylebone Road CAZ Frontage designations?</b>  (iii) <b>Allow greater flexibility for non-retail commercial uses in the Church Street and Harrow Road District Shopping Centres?</b>  (iv) <b>Designate an 'Enterprise Zone' in the north-west of the City where 'affordable business space', similar to affordable housing, should be provided in certain</b>	1. cohesive, safe communities	=	<b>Commentary</b> Bringing forward additional commercial and residential activities can help meet social and economic objectives, such as creating more jobs, and the additional provision of community services, particularly if they resulted in more sustainably designed and constructed buildings. There could be some worsening of traffic and other environmental impacts which would have to be mitigated through other policy measures. Redevelopment could provide opportunities to improve accessibility for pedestrians and to improve the public realm for everyone.  Intensification of land use could worsen air quality and noise pollution as well as increase opportunities for crime. Mitigating measures could offset some of these negative elements.  Encouraging a range of uses in Church Street and Harrow Road shopping areas can contribute to social vitality and encourage training opportunities and a wider range of job opportunities. This would support objectives for equality of
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=	
	3. housing types	-	
	4. health and well-being	=	
	5. climate change	-	
	6. sustainable design	=	
	7. flood risk and water quality	=	
	8. biodiversity	=	
	9. air quality	-	
	10. noise	-	
	11. reduce travel	=	
	12. reduce waste	-	
	13. cultural heritage	=	
	14. public realm/streets	=	
	15. open space	-	
	16. equality of opportunity	+	

**City of Westminster Local Development Framework**

<p><b>schemes?</b></p>	<p>17. economic diversity and growth</p>	<p align="center">+</p>	<p>opportunity. There could be some detrimental effects from certain non-retail uses such as bars and late-night cafes. Generally there would be economic benefits. There would be a negative environmental effect caused by additional traffic and increased numbers of people with associated activities.</p> <p>An Enterprise Zone would help meet social and economic objectives, particularly if it resulted in more sustainably designed and constructed buildings. Training opportunities would bring economic and social benefits. There could be some worsening of traffic and other environmental impacts which would have to be mitigated through other policy measures. Redevelopment could provide opportunities to improve accessibility and to improve the public realm thereby bringing social benefits.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b> There could be some social and economic conflicts although overall there would be positive effects of pursuing these options; effects of additional servicing would need to be mitigated in order to minimise inevitable environmental disbenefits from the intensification of land use and attraction of more people to the areas.</p>			
			<p><b>Social</b></p>	<p><b>=</b></p>	<p><b>Economic</b></p>	<p><b>+</b></p>

<p><b>Housing and Employment Option</b></p> <p><b>3 (A)</b>  <b>Should the City Council allow for greater flexibility in the consideration of the residential component of commercial mixed-use schemes?</b>  <b>For example:</b></p> <p><b>i) By not always requiring residential use as the first requirement when an increase in commercial floorspace triggers the application of the mixed use policy?</b></p> <p><b>By not requiring the residential component to be provided 'in the vicinity' of the mixed-use scheme but anywhere within Westminster?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>						
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	-					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=					
	3. housing types	-					
	4. health and well-being	=					
	5. climate change	=					
	6. sustainable design	+					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	-					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	-					
	11. reduce travel	-					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	=					
	15. open space	=					
16. equality of opportunity	+						
17. economic diversity and growth	=	<b>Social</b>	-	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>	=

**Commentary**

If this option led to the building of fewer homes then there would be a social cost. However, there would be economic benefits if market forces were allowed to influence the mix of uses on sites. This in turn might be of social as well as economic benefit. Space could be used more efficiently and planning gain could ensure the provision of social facilities to meet increase in demand.

There would not necessarily be any worsening of environmental conditions unless the activities were to be intensified, in which case mitigation measures would need to be put in place. Some environmental cost would be inevitable.

**Overall assessment**

Economic benefits may outweigh any social loss in terms of additional housing. Intensification of uses could have a detrimental effect on the environment. By not requiring a residential component to be in the vicinity could lead to further polarisation, less mixed use areas in central London, and increase the need to travel. Requiring sustainable design and construction would help to offset the worst environmental effects.

Housing and Employment Option	Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives		Commentary
	Objective summarised	Rating	
<p><b>3 (B)</b>  <b>How could the City Council increase the supply of affordable homes?</b>  <b>Should we:</b></p> <p><b>clause</b></p> <p><b>i) Require an affordable housing contribution on all developments, including those below 10 units?</b></p> <p><b>ii) When a proposed housing scheme contains exceptionally large units, calculate the affordable housing requirement based on a floorspace proportion rather than the current approach that uses a unit based proportion?</b></p> <p><b>iii) Reassess the proportion of affordable housing that is assigned to intermediate housing and social housing?</b></p>		<b>clause i, ii, iii</b>	<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Requiring affordable housing in all developments would help meet social objectives but may affect the economic viability of many schemes, making redevelopment less attractive. This in turn could adversely affect both economic and social objectives.</p> <p>If this were the effect then curbing redevelopment would minimise adverse effects on the environment since there would be less demolition, construction and therefore noise and air pollution. Existing wildlife would perhaps be less disrupted.</p> <p>However, there would be negative consequences for economic and social prosperity.</p> <p>Very large residential units are often proposed in to minimise the amount of affordable housing required. This has clear economic benefits for the developer but has a negative effect on the achievement of affordable housing targets, and on housing target figures as a whole.</p> <p>If the development led to building at higher densities then the intensification of activities will have negative effects on the environment – more waste, water and energy consumption, for</p>
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+ + +	
	2. reduce crime/ fear	= + +	
	3. housing types	= + =	
	4. health and well-being	= + =	
	5. climate change	= = =	
	6. sustainable design	+ + +	
	7. flood risk and water quality	= = =	
	8. biodiversity	= = =	
	9. air quality	= = =	
	10. noise	= = =	
	11. reduce travel	= + +	
	12. reduce waste	= = =	
	13. cultural heritage	= = =	
	14. public realm/streets	= = =	
	15. open space	= = =	
	16. equality of opportunity	= + =	
17. economic diversity and growth	= + =		

			<p>example.</p> <p>Requiring more intermediate housing would in theory help house people on moderate incomes, thereby creating more socially mixed communities and also provide community services with the staff needed, combined with a reduced need to travel. However, in practice, intermediate housing is unaffordable for most key workers in Westminster.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Policies which enable optimal levels of affordable housing will benefit both social and economic objectives. It is important to ensure that community uses are maintained and enhanced where more housing is provided, including medical facilities and childcare provision to ensure equality of opportunities. Intensification of uses and possibly building at higher densities will have negative environmental effects which will require mitigation e.g. more waste generation, noise etc. but if buildings are constructed to excellent standards of sustainable design, then there could be no worsening of the environmental baseline.</p> <p>There could be social benefits but negative economic effects (on developers) of requiring affordable housing in all schemes. Floor space should be used to calculate affordable housing requirements. Housing more less skilled labour and key workers could be of benefit to the local economy and social and community facilities.</p>					
			<p><b>Social</b></p>	<p>+++</p>	<p><b>Economic</b></p>	<p>==</p>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p>	<p>= = =</p>

<p><b>Family-sized homes</b> <b>Option</b></p> <p><b>3(C)</b> <b>Should the City Council reduce, maintain or increase the proportion of family-sized homes in new residential schemes?</b></p>	<b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Family-sized homes add to the mix of housing in the city and encourage cohesive and inclusive communities. In the affordable sector they ease levels of overcrowding. However, more family-sized homes mean less housing units overall.</p> <p>It is important to ensure that community uses are maintained and enhanced where more housing is provided, including medical facilities and childcare provision to ensure equality of opportunities and prevent any loss of health.</p> <p>Intensification of uses will have adverse environmental effects e.g. more waste generation, which will require mitigation to avoid a worsening of the environment.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>This option needs to be considered against demographic information and characteristics of different areas. Encouraging a mix of tenures can support social cohesion. The protection of family accommodation with gardens is important for health and well-being of children as well as for local biodiversity, and benefiting the Westminster economy as a whole.</p>				
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=					
	3. housing types	+					
	4. health and well-being	+					
	5. climate change	=					
	6. sustainable design	+					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	=/+					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	=					
	11. reduce travel	=					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	=					
	15. open space	=					
	16. equality of opportunity	=					
17. economic diversity and growth	=	<b>Social</b>	+	<b>Economic</b>	=	<b>Environmental</b>	+

<p><b>Local distinctiveness</b> <b>Option</b></p> <p><b>4 (A )</b> <b>Should we designate a West End Special Retail Policy Area (WESPRA) as proposed by the Mayor in the draft further alterations to the London Plan? If so what should the WESPRA seek to do?</b></p>	<b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Promoting an area as a visitor destination can have positive economic and social effects, providing job and training opportunities. The intensification of uses can have a detrimental effect on the environment.</p> <p>A successful West End will complement other aspects of the economy, supporting business and leisure needs. An increase in traffic and congestion will have a detrimental effect on air quality and noise pollution.</p> <p>There may be an increase in waste from packaging.</p> <p><b>Overall Assessment</b></p> <p>A stronger retail centre will have social and economic benefits, but there will be adverse environmental effects, some of which can be mitigated e.g. by more frequent rubbish collections and requiring sustainable design and “green management plans” by retailers.</p> <p>A WESPRA should include a policy to ensure that a full range of shopping needs are catered for, so that the West End is as inclusive as possible.</p>				
	<b>objective</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	=					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	-					
	3. housing types	=					
	4. health and well-being	=					
	5. climate change	-					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	=					
	9. air quality	-					
	10. noise	-					
	11. reduce travel	=					
	12. reduce waste	-					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	+					
	15. open space	-					
	16. equality of opportunity	+					
17. economic diversity and growth	=	<b>Social</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>-</b>

Other special policy areas Option	Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives		<b>Commentary</b>				
	objective	rating					
<b>4 (B)</b> Should we define more Special Policy Areas (SPAs) for areas that have a special local distinctiveness e.g. Savile Row, St. James's, etc?	1. cohesive, safe communities	+	Local distinctiveness can add to social vitality of places, increasing visitor numbers and also have economic benefits.  There could also be benefits to the preserving the historic fabric and heritage value of areas.  Economic vitality can lead to increased land costs, which in turn can force up rents and damage specialist uses and make cost of housing beyond the reach of many people.  The increased attractiveness of areas can lead to influx of people with detriment to the environment and climate change.				
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=					
	3. housing types	=					
	4. health and well-being	+/=	<b>Overall assessment</b> Ensuring the sustainability of activities and buildings will help offset negative effects on the environment. Measures to support small businesses and requiring affordable housing in redevelopments can also help mitigate against any negative social effects of economic buoyancy.				
	5. climate change	-					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	-					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	=					
	11. reduce travel	=					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	+					
	14. public realm/streets	+					
	15. open space	=					
	16. equality of opportunity	=					
	17. economic diversity and growth	+	<b>Social</b>	+	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>

<p><b>Building communities</b> <b>Option</b></p> <p><b>5 (A)</b> <b>How can the Core Strategy support the work of the Local Area Renewal Partnerships (LARPs)? What would be the implications for areas outside of the LARPs?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>LARPS are very important networks for supporting local communities and helping to steer investment where it is most needed. This assists social objectives as well as economic ones.</p> <p>There need not be additional environmental pressures</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>If there were to be a channelling of investment to LARPs areas then there would be commensurately less available to other areas. Consideration must be given to areas outside LARPs and to whether boundaries need to be reviewed to ensure that no social groups are excluded from potential benefits.</p>				
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	+					
	3. housing types	+					
	4. health and well-being	+					
	5. climate change	=					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	=/+					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	=					
	11. reduce travel	=/+					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	=/+					
	15. open space	=/+					
16. equality of opportunity	+	<b>Social</b>	+	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>	=/+
17. economic diversity and growth	+						

<p><b>Building communities</b> <b>Option</b></p> <p><b>5 (B)</b> <b>Can you think of ways in which the City Council could work better with key organisations like the Primary Care Trust, Colleges, Universities, Police, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and the utility companies, to better deliver their services to Westminster's communities?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Narrative</b></p> <p>Effective working with other stakeholder groups is vital for supporting social cohesion and social equalities, and in planning for growth.</p> <p>As well as the social benefits, there should also be economic benefits because fewer people will be left in poverty and without adequate care, and people will have more opportunities to be employed..</p> <p>There should be no negative effects on the environment from this option.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Effective working with other stakeholder groups is vital for supporting social cohesion and social equalities</p> <p>There could be greater efficiencies in working methods over time and this could have a small positive effect on the environment, other factors remaining equal.</p>				
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	+					
	3. housing types	+					
	4. health and well-being	+					
	5. climate change	=					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=/+					
	8. biodiversity	=/+					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	=					
	11. reduce travel	=					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	=					
	14. public realm/streets	=					
	15. open space	=					
	16. equality of opportunity	+					
17. economic diversity and growth	+	<b>Social</b>	+	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>	=

<p><b>Night time economy Option</b></p> <p><b>6 (A)</b>  <b>Should the City Council expand the West End Stress Area or create new Stress Areas to include areas inside the CAZ adjacent to the main entertainment areas (e.g. parts of St. James's, Mayfair and Fitzrovia)?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>There would be some social benefits from imposing greater controls over late night entertainment uses in areas where people live. There could also be a reduction in noise late at night and possibly incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>There may be some economic dis-benefits initially from controlling expansion of certain activities such as bars; however, over time areas will become more attractive because they are better managed late at night and have fewer social and crime problems, and this will raise their economic viability.</p> <p>Entertainment areas pose pressures on the environment in terms of waste generation, noise, energy and water consumption. Controlling the "stress" will help reduce these negative effects, although it is possible that the uses will move elsewhere, thereby cancelling out any overall improvement to the environment</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Expanding the Stress Areas is unlikely to have any effect on traffic levels; incidents of noise late at night may be reduced. There is already so much strain on the public realm from sheer numbers of visitors that the environment is unlikely to improve noticeably. Requiring sustainable measures in business management as well as building design and construction will over time lead to some environmental improvements. Business needs must be considered relative to residents' needs.</p>				
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>					
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+					
	2. reduce crime/ fear	+					
	3. housing types	=					
	4. health and well-being	=/+					
	5. climate change	=					
	6. sustainable design	=					
	7. flood risk and water quality	=					
	8. biodiversity	-/=					
	9. air quality	=					
	10. noise	+					
	11. reduce travel	=					
	12. reduce waste	=					
	13. cultural heritage	=/+					
	14. public realm/streets	+					
	15. open space	=					
16. equality of opportunity	=						
17. economic diversity and growth	=	<b>Social</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>Economic</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>=</b>

<p><b>Night time economy Option</b></p> <p><b>6 (B)</b>  <b>Should the City Council designate areas which are either away from the main residential locations and which would benefit from complimentary low impact entertainment uses (e.g. the upper floors of premises on the Prime Retail Frontages of Oxford Street, Regent Street and Bond Street or along Victoria Street) or are in need of regeneration, e.g. Harrow Road and Church Street, where cafes and restaurants would add to the retail mix?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>Making areas more attractive to visitors and residents would be of benefit socially, may create jobs and also strengthen the economic base of these areas. Visitors increase the economic value of areas, which may lead to rent increases, pushing smaller, less viable businesses out; though increased footfall should also increase turnover and make smaller businesses more viable.</p> <p>Increased numbers of visitors will lead to more traffic with its detrimental effect on noise and air quality.</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Servicing arrangements will need to be considered to minimise detrimental effects on the environment. Successful regeneration of areas supports social and economic objectives but there will be a cost to the environment.</p>					
	<b>Objective summarised</b>	<b>rating</b>						
	1. cohesive, safe communities	+						
	2. reduce crime/ fear	=						
	3. housing types	=						
	4. health and well-being	=						
	5. climate change	=						
	7. flood risk and water quality	=						
	8. biodiversity	-						
	9. air quality	-						
	10. noise	-						
	11. reduce travel	-						
	12. reduce waste	-						
	13. cultural heritage	=						
	14. public realm/streets	+						
	15. open space	-						
	16. equality of opportunity	+/=						
17. economic diversity and growth	+	<b>Social</b>	+	<b>Economic</b>	+	<b>Environmental</b>	-/=	

<p><b>Night time economy Option</b></p> <p><b>6 (C)</b>  <b>Should the City Council adopt a strict policy approach of 'no more' entertainment uses in areas or parts of areas where entertainment uses have come to predominate or seek a reduction in high impact uses in some areas?</b></p>	<p><b>Relationship to WCC Sustainability objectives</b></p>		<p><b>Commentary</b></p> <p>There would be some social benefits from imposing tight controls over late night entertainment uses in areas where people live. There could also be a reduction in noise late at night.</p> <p>There may be some initial economic dis-benefits initially from controlling expansion of certain activities such as bars; however, over time areas will become more attractive because they are better managed late at night and have fewer social and crime problems, and this will raise their economic attractiveness.</p> <p>Entertainment areas pose pressures on the environment in terms of waste generation, noise, energy and water consumption. Controlling the "stress" will help reduce these negative effects, although it is possible that the uses will move elsewhere, thereby cancelling out any overall improvement to the environment</p> <p><b>Overall assessment</b></p> <p>Preventing more entertainment uses in areas already saturated with these uses is unlikely to have any effect on traffic levels; or incidents of noise late at night. There is already so much strain on the public realm from sheer numbers of visitors, that the environment is unlikely to improve noticeably in the immediate term. Requiring sustainable measures in business management as well as building design and construction will over time lead to some environmental improvements. Business needs must be considered relative to residents' needs.</p>					
	<p><b>Objective summarised</b></p>							<p><b>rating</b></p>
	1. cohesive, safe communities							+
	2. reduce crime/ fear							+
	3. housing types							=
	4. health and well-being							=/+
	5. climate change							=
	6. sustainable design							=
	7. flood risk and water quality							=
	8. biodiversity							=
	9. air quality							=
	10. noise							+
	11. reduce travel							=
	12. reduce waste							+
	13. cultural heritage							=
	14. public realm/streets							=
	15. open space							=
	16. equality of opportunity							=
17. economic diversity and growth		=	<p><b>Social</b></p>	<p><b>+</b></p>	<p><b>Economic</b></p>	<p><b>=</b></p>	<p><b>Environmental</b></p>	<p><b>=</b></p>