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## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Appropriate Assessment</td>
<td>NLWP</td>
<td>North London Waste Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Area Action Plan</td>
<td>NPPF</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>Authority Monitoring Report</td>
<td>PINS</td>
<td>Planning Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Community Infrastructure Levy</td>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Planning Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Core Strategy</td>
<td>SA/SEA</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFRA</td>
<td>Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Local Plan</td>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Sustainable Community Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
<td>SFRA</td>
<td>Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>SWMP</td>
<td>Surface Water Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALP</td>
<td>Site Allocations Local Plan</td>
<td>SED</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMLP</td>
<td>Development Management Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability Appraisal Report
Hackney’s Development Management Local Plan

This Sustainability Appraisal provides an assessment of the predicted social, environmental and economic impacts of Hackney’s proposed Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) policies. It has been prepared in accordance with the European Directive EC/2001/42 (The SEA Directive).

If you have any comments on this report or would like more information please contact Hackney’s Spatial Planning Team on:

STRATEGIC DELIVERY TEAM, SPATIAL PLANNING SERVICE, FREE POST RSLH-ARTC-GXRA, DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT LP CONSULTATION, PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES, LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY, 3RD FLOOR, 2 Hillman Street, E8 1FB

Email: ldf@hackney.gov.uk
Tel: 020 8356 8074
Fax: 020 8356 8087
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1 Introduction

Overview

1.1 Hackney’s Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) is an emerging statutory planning document that will support and help implement the Core Strategy by setting out detailed planning policies that the Council will use when determining applications for planning permission in the Borough. It will be a key tool in achieving the objectives of the Core Strategy and the vision set out in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

1.2 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is an assessment process which aims to improve statutory planning policy documents. It identifies potential social, environmental and economic impacts of the DMLP policies (Publication Version), and, where negative impacts are identified, proposes changes to reduce negative effects. It also helps to meet sustainability objectives by identifying how Local Plan policies are likely to impact on the Borough. The SA incorporates the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive EC/2001/42 (SEA Directive). This Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR) has identified the social, economic and environmental impacts of the policies contained within the Borough’s draft Development Management Local Plan (DMLP). This SAR reports on the Publication Version of the DMLP after responses from Regulation 18 were taken into account. The structure of this report is divided into ten parts as set out below:

Section 2: Hackney’s Proposed Development Management Local Plan – Publication Version Overview
Section 3: Social, Environmental and Economic Objectives
Section 4: Hackney Baseline Characteristics
Section 5: Hackney Borough Wide Characteristics
Section 6: Assessment Methodology
Section 7: Objective Assessment Findings
Section 8: Policy Assessment Findings
Section 9: Conclusions and Proposals for Monitoring
Section 10: Compliance with the SEA Directive

Section 11: Quality Assurance Checklist

1.3 Strategic Environmental Assessments are required by the SEA Directive. This involves the systematic identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts of a strategic action. The Directive was incorporated into UK law on 21 July 2004 and applies to a range of English plans and programmes including Local Development Frameworks (LDFs).

1.4 The Government’s approach is to incorporate the requirements of the SEA Directive into a wider process that considers economic and social as well as environmental effects. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), enacted through the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations (2012), Local Authorities must undertake SAs incorporating the requirements of the SEA Directive on Local Plans (LPs).

1.5 The overall aim is to ensure that each document contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

1.6 The purpose of this document is to assess the performance, in sustainability terms, of the policies, predict implications for sustainable development and put forward recommendations for improvement where necessary.

1.7 The scoping report was the first stage in incorporating the SA into the LDF process. It sets out a review of the baseline information that has been collected so far which gives an understanding of the current state of Hackney and how it may change in the future. It included a draft SA framework from which the Development Management policies will be assessed.

1.8 To make the Sustainability Appraisal process more efficient and proportionate this SAR does not repeat the baseline information already gathered in the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report, February, 2010, the accompanying Updated Scoping Report, June 2009, and the Development Management Scoping Report, March 2010. It summarises and cross references these documents as appropriate.

1.9 This SAR will end with an evaluation of the likely effects of the DMLP’s strategic objectives and Development Policies against the Council’s SA Framework.

To view the above documents please follow the link to the Council’s evidence list:

http://www.hackney.gov.uk/core_strategy_preferred_options.htm
Sustainability Appraisal Purpose and Requirements

1.10 The purpose of the sustainability appraisal is to promote the objectives of sustainable development within planning policy. This is done by appraising the social, environmental and economic effects of a plan from the outset and in doing so, helping to ensure that sustainable development is treated in an integrated way in the preparation of development plans. For this reason, a sustainability appraisal was carried out during the first stage of the local plan adoption process, and is now being carried out again for the second stage.

1.11 The sustainability appraisal process is governed by European and national legislation and supported by government policy, which includes:
- The requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC (often known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive) which requires the preparation of an environmental report that considers the significant environmental effects of a plan or programme.

1.12 This sustainability appraisal incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive, by combining the more environmentally-focused considerations of SEA with wider social and economic effects.

Sustainability Appraisal Context and Objectives

1.13 The context and objectives of the sustainability appraisal were established during an earlier stage (often referred to as the scoping stage) of the sustainability appraisal process. This involved compiling background information needed before a sustainability appraisal can be undertaken. It established an evidence base for ongoing appraisal work and culminated in a framework of sustainability objectives.

1.14 Key tasks in this scoping exercise involved:
- Identifying relevant policies, plans and programmes
- Collecting baseline information
- Identifying key sustainability issues in Hackney
- Establishing sustainability objectives
This evidence base work was published by Hackney Council in a Scoping Report in March 2010 after a comprehensive and wide ranging public consultation exercise. The Scoping Report, although a separate document, forms part of the environmental report required by the SEA Directive and is available to view or download from the Council’s website.

**Sustainability Appraisal Framework**

The sustainability appraisal framework consists of sustainability objectives which were established during the scoping stage; these objectives provide a way in which the effects of the DMLP can be described, analysed and compared and they form the basis of the assessment of the DMLP.

Sustainability appraisal objectives are different in concept and purpose from the objectives of the DMLP, though there is a degree of overlap. They are not necessarily intended to be achievable, but are more aspirational in nature, and address the full cross-section of sustainability issues, including social, economic and environmental factors laid down by the law or policy.
2 Hackney’s Proposed Development Management Local Plan – Publication Version Overview

Introduction

2.1 The DMLP will contain the development policies that elaborate the Core Strategy adopted in November 2010. Together with the London Plan and the Council’s Core Strategy, the DMLP will form the development plan which Hackney Council will use to determine planning applications. The DMLP, when formally adopted will replace Hackney’s Saved UDP Policies.

2.2 The draft DMLP for public consultation sets out detailed, generally criteria-based proposed planning policies which the Council will be using to assess planning applications.

2.3 The Core Strategy commits the Council to prepare DM policies on issues including: housing, economic development, retail, health and wellbeing, design, sustainability, energy, open space, education and social infrastructure and places of worship. Policies to address issues arising from the demographic growth of the student residences, take away food shops, betting shops and the night time economy are also anticipated.

2.4 The development policies which are formulated must be consistent with the broader Core Strategy, the London Plan and the National Planning Policy framework.

Development Management Local Plan Objectives include:

- Maximising the efficient use of employment land in the Borough to help reduce poverty and increase local employment opportunities;
- Supporting the provision of educational facilities in the most appropriate locations both now and in the future to support residents in becoming better qualified and to raise educational aspirations;
- Enhancing access to healthcare facilities and improving wellbeing for all;
- Helping make Hackney a vibrant, safe, well designed urban environment that local communities take pride in; and
Promoting access to well-designed affordable housing.

**Hackney’s other Local Development Framework documents**

2.5 In addition to Development Management Policies, Hackney’s Local Development Framework contains a number of other documents. These are:

**Core Strategy** – This is the primary and strategic document in the LDF. It sets out a long term spatial vision and strategic objectives for future development in the Borough. It is characterised as the ‘spatial expression’ of Hackney’s Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS).

**Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP)** – This will help deliver the objectives of Hackney’s Core Strategy. The Site Allocations Local Plan will provide site specific policy on a number of key strategic sites in the Borough on which change and development is expected and generally includes mainly large sites that assist in delivering future development for new housing, employment, retail, community, leisure and transport.

**Area Action Plans (AAPs)** – These provide specific planning policy and guidance for areas where significant regeneration or investments needs to be managed. AAPs address the specific challenges of areas and specify the required land uses in particular locations and identify key strategic interventions. The Council has four AAPs: Dalston; Hackney Central; Hackney Wick; Manor House.

**North London Waste Plan** – This will set out the spatial arrangement and site proposals for facilities to handle the municipal, commercial, industrial and construction in the London Boroughs of Barnet, Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Waltham Forest.

**CIL and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)** – The Council is working on the production of a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and commencing revision of supplementary planning guidance (e.g. Planning Contributions SPD and Affordable Housing SPD).

**Evidence Base** – Policies are based on a robust set of information on Hackney’s economy, housing, transport, health and other issues. Policies are informed by wide-ranging local research as well as by national and regional policy.
3   Social, Environmental and Economic Objectives

3.1 Those objectives of the central documents which set the policy framework for the Development Management LP are set out below. The comprehensive borough list of relevant plans and programmes is located on the LB of Hackney Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report, February 2010.

The London Plan Objectives, July 2011

- A city that meets the challenges of economic and population growth in ways that ensure a sustainable, good and improving quality of life and sufficient high quality homes and neighbourhoods for all Londoners and helps tackle the huge issue of deprivation and inequality among Londoners, including inequality in health outcomes.
- An internationally competitive and successful city with a strong and diverse economy and an entrepreneurial spirit that benefit all Londoners and all parts of London; a city which is at the leading edge of innovation and research and which is comfortable with – and makes the most of - its rich heritage and cultural resources.
- A city of diverse, strong, secure and accessible neighbourhoods to which Londoners feel attached, which provide all of its residents, workers, visitors and students – whatever their origin, background, age or status – with opportunities to realise and express their potential and a high quality environment for individuals to enjoy, live together and thrive.
- A city that delights the senses and takes care over its buildings and streets, having the best of modern architecture while also making the most of London’s built heritage, and which makes the most of and extends its wealth of open and green spaces, natural environments and waterways, realising their potential for improving Londoners’ health, welfare and development.
- A city that becomes a world leader in improving the environment locally and globally, taking the lead in tackling climate change, reducing pollution, developing a low carbon economy, consuming fewer resources and using them more effectively.
- A city where it is easy, safe and convenient for everyone to access jobs, opportunities and facilities with an efficient and effective transport system which actively encourages more walking and cycling, makes better use of the Thames and supports delivery of all the objectives of this Plan.

The Council’s Sustainable Community Strategy, December 2008

- Reduce poverty by supporting residents into sustainable employment, and promoting employment opportunities.
- Help residents to become better qualified and raise educational aspirations.
- Promote health and wellbeing for all, and support independent living.
- Make the borough safer, and help people feel safe in Hackney.
- Promote mixed communities in well-designed neighbourhoods, where people can access high quality, affordable housing.
The Core Strategy Objectives, November 2010

- Be a sustainable community, where all citizens take pride in and take care of Hackney and its environment, for future generations.

- Tackle inequality amongst Hackney residents and contribute to enhancing community cohesion across Hackney’s neighbourhoods through raising the quality of development and by building on Hackney’s distinctive strengths.

- Ensure that the housing needs and aspirations of Hackney’s current and future residents are met in a way that is sustainable.

- Work in partnership with partners to deliver quality infrastructure that provides residents, workers and visitors with the essential services and facilities to enjoy Hackney and improve their quality of life.

- Make the borough one of London’s most competitive and affordable business destinations by supporting the main growth areas to attract a distinctive mix of enterprises through providing a quality environment around industrial locations and ensuring all employment areas offer high quality, affordable units.

- Develop Hackney’s main town centres into some of the most inclusive and vibrant places in London, by supporting the further development of Hackney Central as a civic and cultural hub, Dalston to become a thriving, vibrant and well-connected centre with strong commercial, retail and cultural industries, and the borough’s street markets to remain an essential feature of their neighbourhoods.

- Tackle climate change through higher standards in new buildings, retrofitting existing buildings and promoting local energy centres as a way of providing cheaper and cleaner energy. Reduce resource consumption through ensuring efficient use of water, sustainable waste management, promoting waste minimisation and recycling.

- Shape Hackney’s environment to promote healthy and active lifestyles by improving health facilities, encouraging a shift from car usage to public transport, walking and cycling, and providing a safer and more secure environment across the whole borough.

- Ensure that Hackney’s natural environment, including wildlife habitats and landscape character is protected and conserved, and that new development identifies, protects and enhances important assets. Look for opportunities to create new wildlife habitats.

- Protect and enhance the quality of Hackney’s historic environment through a sensitive approach to existing character.

- Ensure the benefits of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and its legacy are harnessed to support economic, social and environmental improvements over the long-term.

To view more details on the Borough’s Social, Environmental and Economic Objectives please see the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, 2011 which is available on the Council’s website at http://www.hackney.gov.uk
4 Hackney Baseline Characteristics

Figure 1

Index of Multiple Deprivation (2010)
Source: Team Hackney, Facts and Figures, July 2011

Figure 2

Hackney Land Use Map
Source: GIS
Energy consumption in Hackney

Source: BERR 2004 energy statistics (www.berr.gov.uk)
Hackney’s Regeneration Delivery Framework
Source: Hackney’s Regeneration Delivery Framework, 2009
Figure 5

Areas of Deficiency in Access to Nature

Source: Hackney’s Consultation Draft Local Biodiversity Action

Figure 6

Location of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation

Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation Designation
- Site of Metropolitan Importance for Nature Conservation (5)
- Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation – Grade 1 (4)
- Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation – Grade 3 (4)
- Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation (11)
Area Characteristics – Hackney South

This section provides a summary of the key social, environment and economic conditions in the Haggerston, Hoxton, De Beauvoir, Victoria and Queensbridge wards (figure 7).

Area Delivery Priorities: As set out in Section 2, the two key growth locations in Hackney South are the Improved Railway Corridors and the City Fringe and South Shoreditch where due to increased accessibility by public transport and its connection to London’s Central Activity Zones pose significant opportunities for further urban intensification and renewal.

A Sustainability Appraisal baseline was gathered as part of the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report, February 2010. Subsequent updates were made in the Development Management Scoping Report, March 2010. This evidence in combination formed the basis for the assessment. Below are key ward based extracts of the social, environmental and economic conditions effecting areas in the south of Hackney.

Social Issues: There are small pockets of areas in the Hoxton and Haggerston wards which rank in the top 3 per cent on the indices of multiple deprivations for being the most deprived. Within these wards there are also pockets of areas which are the least deprived nationally and which illustrate the diversity that exists with Hackney. De Beauvoir, Queensbridge and Victoria wards also have a diverse range between high and low deprivation figures. However on average figures show high levels of poverty.

Environmental Issues: Shoreditch and Haggerston Parks are the two key green spaces Hackney’s south wards. These are protected Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs). Hackney’s Biodiversity Action Plan 2012-2017, on Housing and Homes; The Built Environment; Parks and Green Spaces; School Grounds; and Wetlands, Waterways & Woodlands are all relevant to Hackney South wards particularly as the majority of Hoxton, De Beauvoir and Queensbridge are denoted as areas with deficiency in local access to nature. Energy consumption is
higher south of the Hackney. Consumption levels are the highest in Haggerston and east of Hoxton, especially along the key transport connections into central London (see figure 3).

**Economic Issues:** The majority of Hackney’s designated employment land is located in the south of the Borough. Figure 2 illustrates that much of Haggerston and large sections of east Hoxton are Priority Employment Areas. The employment land designations in this part of Hackney play a significant Borough-wide role to the local economy which is under increasingly testing times in light of the country’s current economic recession. The cultural and creative sector in addition to traditional employment uses play a large role in Hackney’s economy accounting for roughly 10% of employment in the Borough and almost 13% of businesses (Hackney’s Employment Growth Options Update, February, 2010).

**Area Characteristics – Hackney North**

This section provides a summary of the Springfield, New River, Wick, Brownswood, Cazenove, Hackney Downs, Chatham, Dalston, Stoke Newington Central, Clissold, Leabridge and Lordship wards (figure 8).

As discussed above the baseline data for the Borough has already been gathered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal Report, February 2010 and refreshed in the Development Management Scoping Report, March 2010. Below are key ward based extracts of the social, environmental and economic conditions effecting areas in the north of Hackney.

**Hackney North Area Delivery Priorities:** Increased accessibility in both Dalston and Manor House has resulted in significant opportunities for future housing, retail and employment growth.

**Social Issues:** Social deprivation is a significant issue north of the Borough. However, there are also areas of strong positive economic activity. Pockets of Brownswood, New River, Hackney Downs and Stoke Newington Central Wards rank in the top 3 most deprived wards nationally. Neighbourhoods within Brownswood, Leabridge, Lordship and Cazenove, Clissold and Stoke Newington Central wards in contrast contain very affluent neighbourhoods ranking the least deprived nationally. (For more information please see Hackney Facts and Figures, July 2011).
Accessibility in Springfield and Leabridge wards ranks the poorest. High PTAL scores are evident in New River, Brownswood and Lordship wards.

**Environmental Issues:** There are two Local Nature reserves in Hackney both located south of the Borough. These are Springfield Park and Abney Park Cemetery which are protected under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. Opportunities to maximise the biodiversity value as part of the redevelopment of brownfield sites and to enhance it on existing developments is a strong strand running across all of the Local Biodiversity Action Plans mentioned above. There are a large number of designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation north of the Borough. These are set out in figure 6. About 44 percent of Hackney’s population is dependent on the private car. Although lower than the national average, without strategic polices to increase accessibility this is likely to increase. Energy consumption against London standards is generally good. Highest energy consumption is located in Springfield and Leabridge wards. There is open space deficiency identified in Dalston, Hackney Downs, Cazenove, Hackney Central, Lordship and New River wards.

**Economic Issues:** The highest worklessness as set out in the 2001 census is noted in Hackney Central [53%], Springfield [46%], and New River [46%] wards. Those wards with the highest job seekers allowance are Dalston, [8.6%] followed by Hackney Central [8.1%] and Queensbridge [7.9%]. [For more information please see the Census, 2001, JobCentre Plus]. The economic growth projections South of Hackney are based on the Major Town Centre growth anticipated in especially in Hackney Central, Dalston and Manor House. The promotion and control of town centre uses is particularly important to maintain this vibrancy. There are some employment land designations which overlap Town Centre boundaries and a mix of uses in some areas may also appropriate given the diverse nature of Hackney’s economy.
5 Hackney Borough Wide Characteristics

5.1 Population

Baseline data

5.1.1 The 2011 Census carried out by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) identifies the estimated size of Hackney’s population is 246,300. There has been an approximate 20% increase in the past ten years. The borough maintained the 3rd highest population density within London. The average density which is 129 persons per hectare is around 2.48 times the Greater London average of 52 persons per hectare, however it should be noted the average density varies between each of the different wards. (Census 2011)

5.1.2 Hackney’s social profile reflects one of the youngest and most ethnically diverse communities in the country. Approximately 25% of Hackney’s residents are under the age of 19, compared to 24.5% in London and 24% in England & Wales (Census 2011).

5.1.3 The diversity of population is also reflected in the fact that in 2008, 55% of primary school pupils and 48% of secondary school pupils were listed as speaking a first language other than English. 20% of households in the borough speak another language instead of, or in addition to, English. Other main languages spoken in the borough include Turkish, Yiddish, Bengali and Gujarati. (Hackney Facts and Figures, April 2010)

Likely future conditions

5.1.4 Hackney’s population is forecasted to grow significantly - by approximately 15% over the next sixteen years. (GLA Population Projections 2009 & DMAG Update, April 2010). Projected trends in population for Hackney are predicted up to 2041. Over this time period a growth of around 70,000 persons is expected, with most of this growth taking place in the working age (16-64) population (Census 2011).

5.1.5 In addition to broad population increases, a significant increase in density is anticipated in Hackney’s key growth areas primarily: the railway corridors of the East and North London Line, Shoreditch, Hackney Wick, Woodberry Down, Dalston, Hackney Central and other district and local centres.

5.1.6 It is anticipated that Hackney will remain one of the most culturally diverse in London.
Issues and problems

5.1.7 Projected population increases and higher densities place a greater the demand on essential community facilities and infrastructure i.e. the provision of housing and social infrastructure such as schools and hospitals.

5.1.8 An ethnically diverse population makes it important that the Council continues to provide a range of facilities to meet a wide set of needs across different faiths and communities.

5.2 Health and Wellbeing

Baseline data

5.2.1 Statistics show that women in the borough generally have a longer life expectancy than men. The life expectancy at birth rate between 2008-2010 was estimated at 77.4 for males and 83.0 for females. This was lower than both the London and national average for males (79.0 and 78.2 respectively) and was lower than the London average but higher than the national average for females (78.2 and 82.2 respectively).

5.2.2 There is significant ward variation on health and life expectancy standards in the borough i.e. Chatham’s average male life expectancy is 71.1 years in comparison to 79.4 in the New River ward. Hackney Central’s average female life expectancy is 78.7 in comparison to 86.1 in the Victoria ward. The gap in male/female life expectancy varies by 10.4 years between Stoke Newington and Victoria wards, as opposed to the Hackney average of 6.8 years (GLA, 2009 data).

5.2.3 The crude prevalence of severe mental illness (SMI) - schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and other psychoses - in GP practices in Hackney was 1.2% (3,363 individuals) in 2010/11. This was the fifth highest recorded prevalence in London which had an average prevalence of 0.9%. This rate has been stable over the last five years. (NHS Information Centre: Quality Outcomes Framework 2011)

5.2.4 The main causes of death for residents of Hackney are circulatory disease and cancer. Hackney also has higher proportion of people who are suffering from mental illness, and it is anticipated will remain on current levels without continued investment (SA Scoping Report, July 2009).

5.2.5 The rate of incidence of Tuberculosis in Hackney has fallen by half in the last four years, against the trend elsewhere in east London. The rate is now lower than the London average. (The City and Hackney Health and Wellbeing Profile: our joint strategic needs assessment, 2011/12)
The incidences of HIV amongst Hackney’s population have steadily been increasing in the past four years and are much higher than the London average. In 2010, 1,352 residents of City and Hackney between the ages of 15 and 59 years accessed care for HIV, compared to 1,105 in 2006 - an increase in the rate over four years of 18% from 6.5 per 1,000 to 8.2 per 1,000. This is the fourth highest rate in London after Lambeth (13.8), Southwark (11.2) and Islington (9.0). (ONS: 2010 mid-year estimates)

Hackney’s local PCT area figures show a better average ratio of GP accessibility to patients than in other North London boroughs (Hackney Infrastructure Assessment, Nov 2009).

After rising sharply, the prevalence of adult obesity in Hackney has fallen for two years in a row, against an ongoing rise in London as a whole. However, more than one in nine adults registered with a GP in Hackney is obese - the fifth highest rate in London. It is still regarded as a significant health issue in the borough, in particularly amongst the young children (The City and Hackney Health and Wellbeing Profile: our joint strategic needs assessment, 2011/12).

**Likely future conditions**

It is anticipated that life expectancy in Hackney will continue to increase along current trends. Mortality rates from circulatory disease and cancer have been falling in the past 10 years but are still high. They are anticipated to continue to decrease in line with current trends.

Hackney also has a higher proportion of people who are suffering from mental illness. This is anticipated will remain on current levels without continued investment.

The rate of HIV infections is anticipated to remain on current levels.

Obesity and being overweight is regarded as a significant health issue anticipated to remain on current levels without education, training and planning change.

**Issues and problems**

Tackling Hackney’s health issues rely on better use of Section 106 planning policy to ensure all opportunities to secure funding for new community facilities are maximised. This has yet to be developed.
5.2.14 Continued funding and support into local support services is required to ensure current trends improve. However, this is likely to be affected by the current global economic recession.

5.3 Poverty and Social Exclusion

Baseline

5.3.1 The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF), 2012 published its annual report on the state of poverty and social exclusion in the United Kingdom. The level of poverty has varied over different indicators over the years. The proportion of pensioners in poverty has halved since the early 1990s, while that of working-age adults without children has risen by a third. There has been a fall in child poverty and the rate is much lower than it was 20 years ago. There are fewer children in poverty in workless households, however over the past 20 years the number of children in poverty in working families has hardly changed and is at a rate of six in ten children. 2.6 million people are unemployed. Unemployment has remained static in the last three years due to the increase in people taking up part time work. The rate of mortgage repossessions peaked in 2009 but has not fallen significantly since. Landlord repossessions are much more common than mortgage repossessions and are increasing across the country.

5.3.2 The 2010 DCLG Indices of Multiple Deprivation ranked Hackney as the most deprived Local Authority in London and 6th most deprived out of 354 in England and Wales

5.3.3 71.5% of Hackney residents state they were generally content with their local area. (AMR, 2010/2011)

Likely future conditions

5.3.4 The national campaign in England of tackling poverty has not delivered the intended results over the last 10 years. The current global economic recession will also inhibit these national objectives.

5.3.5 According to the Indices of Deprivation 2004, 2007 and 2010, Hackney is ranked as one of the most deprived boroughs nationwide. This may continue with the current economic forecasts.

Issues and problems

5.3.6 Hackney’s levels of deprivation may remain high if investment does not continue to be channelled in economic recovery and social reform.

5.3.7 Cross-sectorial demands on health, education, community facilities and economic regeneration.
5.4 Crime and Safety

Baseline

5.4.1 Crime dropped by 1.3% between the period of April 2012 and April 2013. During this period 27,544 recordable offences were committed, and this ranks the borough as having the 6th highest crime rate in London in 2012/13. This is an improvement for as recently as 2011/12/07 the ranking was 4th highest (Metropolitan Police, 2013).

5.4.2 Across London, the average crime rate was 7.97 offences per 1000 population between 2012-2013 compared to Hackney’s 10.49 (Metropolitan Police 2013).

Likely future conditions

5.4.3 It is predicted that crime will continue to fall in Hackney but remain above the London and national average due to the levels of poverty and deprivation experienced in the borough.

5.4.4 It is predicted that fear of crime will remain high especially at night.

Issues and problems

5.4.5 Crime levels are higher in Hackney compared to the other boroughs. It was noted people who live, work or visit Hackney don’t feel safe to walk on the street especially after dark.

5.5 Education

Baseline data

5.5.1 The percentage of residents of Hackney who hold Level 4 and above qualifications (41%) is now higher than the average of London (38%) and the rest of the country (27%) (Census, 2011).

5.5.2 The proportion of residents in Hackney who hold Level 1 and above qualifications (70%) is lower than the London average (72%) but is higher than the national average (67%) (Census 2011).
Almost a quarter of residents in Hackney have no qualifications (24.3%). This is higher than the London (18%) and national (23%) averages.

**Likely future conditions**

It is anticipated that there will be continued improvements to local educational standards. However these are likely to remain behind London standards without additional investment.

Data sets which currently show local trends of poor access to skilled jobs locally are anticipated to remain at current levels unless further initiatives and investment is provided to assist people in obtaining higher skilled jobs.

**Issues and problems**

The Building Schools for the Future project is likely to be subject to government cuts resulting from current recession.

Residents of Hackney have a relatively low level of educational attainment when compared with London and the rest of the country.

The weekly wages of those living in Hackney is almost two times lower than those working in London, which suggests that residents are short of skills to access employment, especially highly skilled jobs.

**Housing**

**Baseline**

There is a strong correlation between social renting and high numbers of benefit claimants. At the time of the Census 2001, in each of the 10 Super Output Areas (SOAs) with the highest benefit claimant rates in Hackney between 34% and 39% of all working age adults were in receipt of state benefits (Census, 2001).

House prices in Hackney are above the London average. In the January 2012 the average price in Greater London was £347,960 and in Hackney it was £387,660. In January 2013 the gap between these averages further widened, with a house in Greater London averaging £370,253 and in Hackney averaging £431,263. (Land Registry website, May 2013).

Hackney is exceeding the current London Pan targets for housing delivery. The AMR 2010/2011 projects that around 2,499 new additional homes of all tenures will be developed through the renewal of housing estates over the period 2011-19. The Five Year
Supply is comprised of 9867 units that would be constructed during 2011 to 2016 if all permissions are implemented. (LBH AMR, 2010/2011).

**Likely future conditions**

5.6.4 Continue to exceed the London Plan targets for housing delivery. Hackney is on target to exceed the London Plan target of 5800 set for 2011-16 by over 4,000 units.

5.6.5 House prices will continue to increase and remain above the London average.

5.6.6 Continued demands for a wide mix of housing including affordable units and family housing.

**Issues and problems**

5.6.7 Despite the increased delivery of new units, housing needs i.e. demands for affordable and family housing are not being fully addressed (LBH AMR, 2010/2011).

5.6.8 The continued high delivery of housing in this borough could be threatened by proposed cuts in affordable housing delivery grants with private housing delivery unable to fully make up any shortfall.

**5.7 Biodiversity and Open Space**

**Baseline**

5.7.1 Hackney has 24 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and 2 Local Nature Reserves.

5.7.2 As recently as 2005, Hackney only had one Green Flag award for its parks, yet in July 2012 Keep Britain Tidy awarded Green Flags to a further two parks in Hackney, which brings the total to 15 – this is one of the highest numbers in London (Press release, LBH website, July 2012).

5.7.3 Green open space accounts for 16.9% of the boroughs area. This is four times as much as in Waltham Forest (4.2%) and three times as much as Haringey (5.5%). There are 255 Open Spaces in Hackney. The actual level of Green Space varies significantly between wards with public open space deficiency experienced in Dalston (Atkins Open Space Assessment, June 2005).
5.7.4 It is anticipated that performance levels will be higher next year as work continues to incorporate biodiversity into management plans and wider park maintenance work. 63% of sites have management arrangements in place. (LBH AMR, 2010/2011).

5.7.5 The new Green Flag awards illustrate an increase in the quality of open space. However, there may be a reduction in the quantum of open space due to development pressures.

5.7.6 Development pressures and increases in densities that are predicted in some wards are likely to pose a threat to some habitats and species and open space provision.

5.8 Air Quality

5.8.1 In Hackney, domestic energy use accounts for 45% of all CO$_2$ emissions in the borough. The majority of direct investment to improve the energy efficiency of housing stock has been through incorporation of energy measures within planned investment schemes undertaken by Hackney Homes, rather than by stand alone energy projects (Hackney Climate Change Strategy, 2009).

5.8.2 Hackney Council was one of 10 local authorities across Britain to join the 10:10 agreement on carbon emissions. This agreement was signed on 1 September 2009 and committed signatory councils to a simple idea: the delivery of a 10% cut in carbon emissions during calendar year 2010 (DECC data, November 2009). Hackney has also committed to reduce its carbon emissions by 80% by 2050 as a central part of a local approach on ensuring local development is sustainable. There was a slight reduction between 2005 and 2009, when carbon emissions from the local area declined from 917,000 tonnes to 828,000 tonnes CO$_2$ (approximately 9%); this is in line with a slight decline nationally (Review of Hackney’s Sustainable Community Strategy, February 2012).

5.8.3 In 2012/13, the average SAP rating on a Council property was 76. The proposed targets are 77 for the year 2013/14 and 78 for 2014/15 (Hackney Homes Delivery Plan 2013/14).

5.8.4 The Hackney SAP rating is in the top quartile (25%) for London and has improved steadily from 2003 when the average rating was just 50 (Hackney Climate Change Strategy, 2009).
5.8.5 Hackney and other inner London neighbours share air quality which is among the worst in Europe. The principal threat to clean air in London comes from road traffic (LBH, AMR 2009/2010).

**Likely future conditions**

5.8.6 Hackney is meeting its targets for the reduction of CO₂ levels.

5.8.7 Air quality is extremely poor and with increased densities and population growth is not likely to decrease.

5.8.8 The average SAP rating is continuing to improve.

5.8.9 Progress will be made in improving the design and quality of new developments.

**Issues and problems**

5.8.10 Poor air quality may have a significant impact on local health in the borough.

5.9 **Flood Risk**

**Baseline**

5.9.1 The main source of flood risk to Hackney is from fluvial flooding associated with the Lower Lee Valley. The Lee is one of the largest tributaries of the River Thames and drains a rural catchments of around 1400 km², extending as far north as Luton and covers large parts of Hertfordshire and Essex. The Lee flows along the eastern edge of Hackney.

5.9.2 Approximately 2,650 homes lie within Flood Zone 2. There are approximately 1,400 homes and a school in Flood Zone 3. There are pockets of extreme risk in this area (LBH, SFRA L2, 2010). Hackney works with the EA and developers to mitigate and concerns over flood risk.

5.9.3 In recognition of the importance of addressing surface water flooding in Hackney, a Surface Water Management Plan has been produced that outlines the preferred surface water management strategy for the borough. The SWMP identifies areas at greatest risk of surface water flooding including ‘Critical Drainage Areas’ (CDA) and ‘Local Flood Risk Zones’ (LFRZ) and these are shown in appendix 2 of the DMLP and highlighted in the individual site profiles.
5.9.4 A site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) may be required for developments within Local Flood Risk Zones subject to a number of considerations including; the size and type if development, the location of the site and the degree of flood hazard.

**Likely future conditions**

5.9.5 Extreme danger in a flooding event to homes, property and human life will remain in absence of flood mitigation.

**Issues and problems**

5.9.6 Waste discharges pose extreme danger in a flooding event to homes, property and human life.

5.9.7 Development pressures for additional housing and employment could pose danger in areas of high flood risk; however alleviation and mitigation measures are in place in Core Strategy and proposed DMLP policies to counteract flood risk.

5.9.8 Developers and Landowners must consider potential impact on infrastructure at an early stage of any development process, developers should contact service providers particularly utilities about possible; capacity issues. In the individual profiles of the sites where issues regarding capacity has been identified by service providers and neighbouring boroughs. This has been reflected in the individual sites concerned.

5.9.9 Flood mitigation measures along the Lee Navigation are required.

5.9.10 A site emergency plan is required to deal with evacuation and other relevant procedures if an event were to occur.

5.10 **Waste and Recycling**

**Baseline**

5.10.1 Recycling rates have continued to increase year-on-year in Hackney. Back in 2002, only 1% of waste was recycled by residents. Hackney exceeded the Government target of 20% recycling for the first time in 2007/08 (LBH AMR, 2009/2010).

5.10.2 The performance has continued to improve; 25% of waste in the borough is now recycled, and it is aimed for 50% to be met by 2020 (LBH website, 2013).
5.10.3 In response to The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009 in which a target was set for 2012 which required 25% of portable batteries to be recycled, battery recycling bins were placed in all libraries across the borough to enable all residents to conveniently deposit their household batteries for recycling.

**Likely future conditions**

5.10.4 Hackney has achieved its targets for residual waste per household. It is predicted this will continue.

5.10.5 The North London Waste Plan (NLWP) identifies that North London has sufficient capacity to manage waste self-sufficiently.

**Issues and problems**

5.10.6 There are residential areas in close proximity to the two safeguarded sites for waste management. Impacts need to be monitored.

5.10.7 Fly-tipping and other dumping in the borough can cause issues in regard to water pollution and other adverse effects.

5.11 Hackney's Historic Assets and Environment

**Baseline**

5.11.1 There are approximately 1,300 listed buildings in Hackney. Hackney has approximately 29 Conservation Areas (LBH, State of the Historic Environment, 2008).

5.11.2 In July 2010, there were a total of 34 entries on the 'Heritage at Risk' register for Hackney, comprising 33 building entries, and one Conservation Area at Risk (LBH, State of the Historic Environment, 2008).

5.11.3 Hackney's archaeology is considerable and includes finds from the Palaeolithic era near Stoke Newington, and medieval and Elizabethan remains (LBH, State of the Historic Environment, 2008).

**Likely future conditions**

5.11.4 Hackney's historic environment will remain protected and preserved. However, it is predicted that there will be increased pressures for higher density development where these and the Borough's growth areas overlap.
5.11.5 Some of the Borough’s conservation areas are located next to the key areas of predicted growth i.e. Dalston, Hackney Central, Shoreditch, and railway corridors. There is potential for adverse impacts as a result of this.

5.11.6 The urban character may be threatened by the cumulative effects of piecemeal and small scale changes, such as replacement windows, unsympathetic extensions, and alterations to street frontages.

5.12 Transport and Travel

5.12.1 Rates of car ownership are very low in Hackney at 35% of households, a fall from 44% in 2001. This is low in comparison to surrounding boroughs.

5.12.2 Hackney is served by 49 bus routes during the daytime and a further 23 night bus routes. 7 of the 12 most heavily used bus routes operate through Hackney. These routes provide easy and low-cost methods of travelling to numerous destinations within London, including some of Central London’s famous tourist attractions and interchanges with both National Rail services and London Underground at Seven Sisters, Finsbury Park, Stratford, Victoria and London Bridge stations (LBH, AMR, 2009/2010).

5.12.3 Hackney is seen as one of the leading boroughs for cycling in London, and levels of cycling continue to increase. As with walking, it can help in promoting a healthy and active lifestyle. In 2010, the Council adopted a target of increasing the proportion of residents travelling to work by bicycle as the main mode of transport from 13% to 15%, and to 20% by 2031 (AMR 2010/11). In light of the 2011 Census it was revealed that around 15% of Hackney residents now commute to work by bicycle, compared with 12% who commute by car. The London-wide average of journeys made to work by cycle is 4.3% and the inner London average is 7.2% (census 2011).

5.12.4 The national road safety target is for a 50% reduction in the level of people Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI) by 2010, against a baseline average from 1994 -1998. The average for those years was 209 KSI and for 11 of the 12 years from 1998 to 2010 the level was below the 209 average. This has been achieved in Hackney (LBH AMR, 2009/2010). There was a 6% reduction in number of people killed or seriously injured in the borough in 2010/11 compared to 2009/10. (LBH AMR, 2010/11).

5.12.5 The Council has had its own travel plan in place since 2004. There has been a significant increase in the number of staff walking, cycling and using public transport (up from 32% in 2004 to 75.3% in 2007), and a reduction in car usage (down from 37% in 2004 to 23.8% in 2007). 10.04% of children travelled to school by car in 2010/11, which surpassed the target of 15%. (LBH AMR, 2009/2010).
Likely future conditions

5.12.6 The East London Line is now open and bringing benefits in terms of increased tourism. This is significantly improving accessibility in the Borough. It is anticipated that densities will increase around these transport nodes. Crossrail (Chelsea – Hackney Line) and Crossrail 2 are also anticipated to bring about increased densities around the proposed station locations.

5.12.7 Increases in workspace and School Travel Plans are encouraging positive trends of sustainable transport.

5.12.8 Continued improvements in road safety are anticipated which will be supported by the emerging Local Implementation plan anticipated to be adopted in 2011.

Issues and problems

5.12.9 Increases in densities and population growth around transport nodes may result in air and noise pollution and other associated impacts.

5.12.10 Increases in accessibility are likely to increase property values in the area. This could inhibit access to affordable housing however policies are in place in the Core Strategy and proposed DMLP to help ensure affordable housing provision.

5.13 Employment

Baseline

5.13.1 Growth forecasts for 2011 were downgraded by the Office for Budget Responsibility from 3.5% to 2.6% following the change of Government in May 2010.

5.13.2 The latest figures for Hackney demonstrate that the percentage of residents in work has fallen from 70.1% in the 12 month period to June 2010 to 66.3% in the 12 month period to September 2011 (ONS via Nomis, May 2012). The main employers in Hackney are public sector organisations such as the NHS Primary Care Trust, Network Rail and Hackney Council (Borough Profile, 2009).

5.13.3 From April 2005 to the present the national employment rate has fallen steadily from around 72.5% to 70%.and London’s has fluctuated between 67.6% and 69.7%. Hackney’s employment rate increased from well below national and regional averages, at 53.3% in April 2005 to a figure of 70.1% in June 2009 which was close to the national average and above the London average. This was before its drop a year later. (ONS via Nomis, May 2012)
5.13.4 Nationwide, the numbers of people claiming benefit fell in the late 1990s and early 2000s. In Hackney, Job Seekers Allowance claims increased from 4.8% in May 2005 to 7.3% in February 2012. This latest figure surpasses the London (4.4%) and national (4.1%) averages (ONS via Nomis, May 2012).

5.13.5 Hackney’s employment base has altered hugely in the last couple of decades with regard to the reduction of manufacturing and related industry and the growth of largely service-based activities. Industrial employment has declined from nearly 11,000 in 1991 to 6,000 in 2001. There has been a growth in public sector employment and small and medium size businesses. There is also a growing presence in the cultural, creative and leisure sectors (ONS/BERR – VAT registrations/deregistration by industry, 2007).

5.13.6 Analysis carried out by Atkins for the Employment Growth Option Study update of 2010 indicates there is a current oversupply of approximately 132,000 sqm of B1 office space throughout Hackney and an undersupply of suitable premises for micro, small and medium businesses. (Atkins, 2010)

**Likely future conditions**

5.13.7 It is predicted that there will be a continued demand for micro, small and medium sized businesses.

5.13.8 There is a possible decline of the public sector as a key local employer in the Borough resulting from Government cuts to public spending.

5.13.9 It is predicted that there may be a continued loss of employment floorspace through mixed use development schemes.

**Issues and problems**

5.13.10 Hackney’s high reliance on the public sector for employment will make it particularly vulnerable to the impacts of spending cuts which was imposed from 2011. Government cuts have seen £82 million taken out of the Council's budget over four years, including the 2013/2014 year (LBH Website, 2013).

5.13.11 Hackney currently does not provide quantum of floorspace best suited to micro, small and medium sized businesses.

5.13.12 Reductions in Central Government funding will have knock-on effects at the local level, as many local authorities now must adjust their own day-to-day operating costs. With this, the potential risks of a reduction in service delivery cannot be discounted (LBH, AMR, 2009/2010).

5.14 **Town Centres**
Baseline

5.14.1 Hackney has one Major Town Centre (Dalston), three District Town Centres (Hackney Central, Stoke Newington High Street and Finsbury Park) and fourteen Local Centres including Manor House, Stamford Hill and Broadway Market. Dalston and Hackney Central currently provide a poor retail offer when compared to equivalent level centres elsewhere in London. Smaller businesses, independent traders and entrepreneurs tend to dominate the Hackney scene, but on one hand while this can contribute to the ‘non-conformist’ label Hackney is noted for, on the other, it can translate into a weakness from an economic standpoint for the lack of large ‘high street’ retailers in many areas of the borough contributes to retail leakage to other areas (LBH, AMR, 2009/2010).

5.14.2 Across London Town Centres, the average vacancy rate is 8.5% of all retail units. This rises to 12.9% within Central London. Both are below the UK average 14.8%. The average vacancy rates within all Hackney centres equate to 10% (LBH, Retail Survey, 2010).

5.14.3 Over the period 1999 to 2008 there was a 0.9% decline in the overall level of retail floorspace in the Borough. However despite this, over the last four years Hackney has seen a net gain of 9,667 sq m of A1 retail floorspace granted permission in the borough, with a 261 sq m gain in the designated town centres (Retail Floorspace Development 2006/210, London Development Database, 2010).

5.14.4 The evening and night-time economy is vibrant with concentrations in and around the Shoreditch and Hoxton areas, which bring many people into the borough (LBH AMR, 2010/11).

Likely future conditions

5.14.5 Continued demands for evening and night-time uses especially in the Shoreditch area.

5.14.6 Continued rise in the demand for A1 retail use and applications for mixed use including in areas designated for employment use.

5.14.7 It is anticipated that there may be probable decline in business start-ups as a result of the economic recession, however there will still be a need to provide office workspace in the Borough.

Issues and problems

5.14.8 Concentrations of night-time alcohol related uses will be inhibited even where there is continued demand due to impacts on local residents. Licensing arrangements will be put in place to assist in managing this.
Decline in investment and business support may increase the vacancy rates in Hackney.

**Arts and Culture**

**Baseline**

The contribution of arts, culture and entertainment is significant to Hackney's economic development and regeneration. Hackney Empire, Vortex Jazz Bar, Arcola Theatre, the Geffrye Museum, Sutton House and White Cube Art Gallery are all widely recognised attractions and cultural homes based in the borough. Hackney is home to a significant number of artists, designers and other creative professions, many internationally renowned. Creative Industries (i.e. Arts, Entertainment, Recreation and Other services) comprise a significant percentage of the local economy as the third largest sector after Professional, Scientific & Technical and Information & Communication (LBH, AMR, 2010/2011).

Tourism was worth £208m to Hackney in 2007 (The London Development Agency’s 'Local Area Tourism Impact Model, 2009), and is likely to have increased, particularly during the Olympic Games. For example Hackney Museum was one of only two Museums in London to not see a decrease in visitor numbers, but in fact saw an increase of 25% of visitors in 2012 compared to 2011, with 291 more visitors in June and 558 more in July. Takings at the museum shop almost doubled. (Museumassociation.org, 2012).

**Likely future conditions**

Creative activity projected to continue to rise in Hackney.

Demands for the arts and cultural activity are likely to continue and increase. Increases in demands may result in higher rents. This could push out the artist population.

Planning regulations on design standards may restrict the use of space for artists who require affordable and flexible spaces.

**Issues and problems**

Opportunities to foster creative activities in vacant shops temporarily should be maximised. Neighbourhood disturbance can be generated from late night related uses.

Cuts in government spending may result in the decline of grants and other initiatives to support the development of local arts and cultural activities.
6 Assessment Methodology

Method of Assessment

6.1 The SA assessment was carried out using the SA/SEA objectives developed in the SA Scoping Report, March 2011 (http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Assets/Documents/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report.pdf). The SA Framework consists of twenty objectives and decision making criteria. Additionally, key Hackney specific borough sensitivities identified in the baseline review are flagged in the right hand column. This is set out in table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sustainability Appraisal Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability Appraisal Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>To protect and enhance the biodiversity, flora and fauna of the borough</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>To ensure efficient use of land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 | To improve air quality by reducing emissions of pollutants | • Does it impact on local density levels?  
• Will it impact on soil or groundwater quality?  
Locations can increase the use of the private car and generate air pollution.  
Levels of nitrogen dioxide and fine particulate matter are above recommended levels in Hackney. Community facilities such as schools, old people’s homes and areas where there are protected habitats and species are examples of locations that are particularly vulnerable to increases in air pollution. All of Hackney falls within an Air Quality Management Area.  
• Will it impact on air quality in the short, medium or long term?  
• Will it reduce emissions of pollutants particularly Nitrogen Dioxide and fine particulate matter?  
• Will it impact on locations that are sensitive to air pollution?  

| 4 | To reduce noise and pollution | • Does it impact on air quality in the short, medium or long term?  
• Will it reduce emissions of pollutants particularly Nitrogen Dioxide and fine particulate matter?  

| 5 | To minimize flood risk and encourage Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) for new developments | • Does it impact on water resources?  
• Does it improve water quality?  
• Will it impact on the character of Hackney’s inner-city waterfronts?  
The London Plan Policy 5.15 requires residential development to meet water consumption targets of 105 litres/head/day. The LB of Hackney has a high population with high water demands and limited water availability. It is categorised by the EA as an area of ‘serious’ water stress. The EA highlight that Hackney’s watercourses are in poor condition and fall below the standards advised in the Water Framework Directive.  

| 6 | To protect and enhance water resources and water quality | • Does it impact on the risk of flooding to people and property in Flood Zones 2, 3a and 3b?  
• Will it promote the sustainable urban drainage systems in the new developments?  
• Will it impact on ground and surface water flooding?  
• Will it deliver Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?  
Hackney Wick which contains Flood Zones 2 and 3a. Flood Zone 3a is extremely sensitive to flooding. Critical Drainage Areas have been identified in Hackney. Surface water flooding is a risk with increases of urbanisation anticipated in the borough. Hackney Central and Stoke Newington are classified as areas at risk to groundwater pollution.  

| 7 | To improve connectivity, reduce the need to travel and encourage use of public transport including walking and cycling | • Does it impact on traffic congestion?  
• Will it encourage the public transport?  
• Is it in a location with appropriate PTAL levels?  
• Will it have a positive impact on climate change?  
The New East London Line improves connectivity from Dalston Junction to New Cross.  

| 8 | To tackle climate change through reducing CO₂ emissions, supporting energy | • Does it impact on the emission of by reducing energy consumption?  
The projected population growth for Hackney of 13.3% by 2008 ad 23.5% by 2030 may increase emissions especially around the growth areas. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production form renewable and low carbon sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on the adaptation measures of existing dwellings to support climate change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on the incorporation of renewable technology in new developments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is it in keeping with the principles of sustainable design and construction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are any measures to tackle climate change undertaken sensitively to avoid impacts on the historic environment and urban character of the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According DEFRA in 2005, 45% of carbon emissions are from domestic uses, 32% industrial and commercial and 23% road transport. This highlights households are key sources of emissions. Hackney’s carbon reduction target of 80% reduction by 2050 against 2005 levels. Hackney’s Climate Change adopted in 2009. This sets out a three year action plan which runs to 2011. For reducing carbon dioxide main activities of the borough and provides an overarching strategy of how Hackney’s residents, schools, businesses and organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To protect and enhance the boroughs identified heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment and to preserve the archaeological aspects of the borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Does it promote heritage related tourism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Where sites are being allocated have opportunities been identified which make a contribution to the local character and sense of place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on the settings of heritage assets and supporting new design which enhances local character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Where a new development is being designed will it enhance the local character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does it promote heritage-led regeneration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does it impact on the boroughs identified heritage assets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does it impact on the boroughs wider historic environment i.e. undesignated areas of historic value?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on archaeological remains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on the management or restoration of the boroughs identified historic assets and wider historic environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact to views to the World Heritage site of St Paul’s or the Tower of London?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are large areas of archaeological importance in the growth areas. These are sensitive areas that need to be considered as part of development. Views to the World Heritage Site of Tower of London should be protected. Hackney has 25 conservation areas including in our growth areas of Shoreditch, Hackney Central, Dalston and surrounding Woodberry Down as well as other pockets in the borough. These may be vulnerable to effects stemming from traffic congestion, poor air quality and noise associated with increased densities. These areas are also particularly sensitive to tall buildings and design impacts. Hackney has undesignated areas of high quality landscape character which are also of historic value. Hackney’s waterfronts have very valuable historic character. Hackney has areas of industrial heritage value especially along its railway corridors which will be subject to significant growth and may be vulnerable to the associated impacts upon this. Potential threat to the historic and archaeological environment from increases in densities in Hackney’s identified growth areas. Potential sensitivities around retrofitting of buildings of historic value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To promote exemplary sustainable design which enhances the visual character in the borough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on the local character and appearance of the borough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Will it impact on natural resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have local environmental factors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment uses in proximity to residential or community uses (especially along the boroughs railway corridors) are particularly sensitive and new development should be of high standards of design. It is not just protected areas but the landscape character of wider historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17 | To improve access to an adequate range of social infrastructure | • Will it improve accessibility to key local services?  
• Will it improve the level of investment in key community services? | The projected population increase, estate renewal projects and economic development will increase the Borough’s requirements for social infrastructure significantly. |
| 18 | To minimize waste and maximize recycling in the borough | • Will the new developments add to places as liveable?  
• Will it improve access to facilities, especially for those with special needs/disabilities?  
• Will it increase waste recycling? | Hackney has critical drainage areas which will require particular flood resilient design and sustainable drainage systems. This design of waste management will increase as the population increases. Fly tipping is a problem which needs to be adequately managed. |
| 19 | To maximise opportunities for sustainable economic growth | • Will it improve business development?  
• Will it impact on the environmental economy?  
• Will it improve growth in key sectors? | The global economic recession will restrict growth internationally. The current economic recession is likely to adversely effect the growth of new sectors in the borough i.e. cultural, financial and business services. Will the recession have this impact for the whole life of the plan? |
| 20 | To generate employment opportunities for everyone | • Will it increase employment opportunities?  
• Will it increase training and skilled employment? | Hackney has predominately low skilled jobs. Employment in Hackney is predominantly low skilled jobs. |
|   | Land and open spaces | • Will it impact on existing open spaces or MOL?  
• Will it improve connectivity between existing open spaces?  
• Will it improve the local landscape character? | Employment in Hackney is predominantly low skilled jobs. Not all of Hackney’s open spaces are actively managed. |
| 13 | To improve health in Hackney’s local community and promote healthy lifestyles | • Will it impact on access to health facilities?  
• Will it impact on death rates or life limiting illness?  
• Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? | Mortality rates from circulatory disease and cancer - the main cause of death in Hackney have been declining over the last 10 years but are higher than the London average. Hackney has higher levels of people who are suffering from mental illness and tuberculosis. HIV levels are higher in the City and in Hackney than the rest of London. Teenage pregnancy has been declining since 1998 but Hackney is still the highest of the inner London Boroughs. |
| 14 | To improve educational attainment and the skill level of the population | • Will it improve qualifications and skills of the young people?  
• Will it improve qualifications and skills of adult? | Residents in the Borough have a relatively low levels of educational attainment compared to the London average. A high proportion compared to the London average of residents have no qualifications. |
| 15 | To reduce crime and fear of the crime in the borough | • Will it reduce the actual crime level?  
• Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Although crime has fallen in Hackney by over 30% in recent years incidents still remain higher than the London average. Crime hotspots have been identified in the borough profile. These are sensitive areas. Fear of crime is higher in Hackney than in England as identified in the Borough Profile (2006) |
| 16 | To increase the number of decent and affordable homes | • Will it increase the number of affordable homes built?  
• Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? | There is a significant disparity between the cost of housing and the average earnings in the borough. There is a high demand of 3 bed family accommodation and one bed flats in the borough. |
Table 1. Sustainability Appraisal Framework
Assessment of the Development Management LP Objectives against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework

6.2 The Development Management Local Plan Objectives have been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. This is to provide the opportunity to identify and address any strategic conflicts that might arise with the broad aims and policy intentions early on. This analysis and the summary of the findings are set out in Section 7.

Developing and Refining Policies

6.3 Although alternatives have been considered when drafting policies, the policies contained in this document are considered at present to be the most appropriate in relation to the issue that they are attempting to address, and in light of national and regional planning guidance, and Hackney’s wider corporate policies and strategies. As such, the Council has not considered it necessary to list alternative policy options, however, alternatives and/or new policy suggestions have been invited as part of the consultation on this document in order to ensure the Council has a robust set of key development management policies going forward.

6.4 The Council undertook Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Development Management Local Plan for a 10 week period from the 16th July and 25th September 2012. The consultation responses received were considered and the Publication Version policies developed. The development of the policies in the Publication Version DMLP also took into consideration discussions with elected Members, internal officers and statutory bodies.

6.5 The Council undertook Regulation 19 consultation on the DMLP for also a 10 week period between July 8th and September 15th 2013. The responses received have been considered and addressed in the proposed Schedule of Changes (can be viewed at: http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Development-Management-DPD.htm). This lists all the key proposed changes to the document after the Regulation 19 consultation process, including those changes that are not as a direct result of external consultation responses, but as a result of the Council’s own review of the document. The proposed changes being put forward are considered to be minor in nature for the purposes of clarification and effectiveness. The proposed changes are therefore not considered to alter the substance of the policies as set out in Publication Version of the DMLP. On this basis, no further sustainability appraisal is considered necessary at this stage. However, this will be a considered by the Inspector during the Examination of the DMLP.
**Sustainability Appraisal Effects**

6.6 Table 2 below provides the key to explain the methodology for how each predicted effect was evaluated against the SA objective including the consideration of cumulative/synergistic effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>significant positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>significant negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>sensitive receptor: cumulative negative impacts likely to equate to a significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>cumulatively will increase demands on the Council services for health, education, ground maintenance waste services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Type of effect & nature of the impact

6.7 In the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the social, environmental and economic effects of all DMLP policies (after consultation) have been predicted and evaluated for their significance. Prediction of effects involves identifying what changes might occur to the sustainability appraisal baseline over time – these changes are then evaluated for their likely significance, in term of their probability, duration, frequency, geographical area and size of population/environment likely to be effected. The value and vulnerability of certain areas and populations also affects the evaluation. It is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects when considering plans at such a strategic scale and where uncertainties exist or data gaps uncovered that make evaluation difficult this has been acknowledged.
Consultation

6.8 The Environmental Consultation Bodies (ECBs) were consulted in November 2010 on the development of the Scoping Report for a period of 5 weeks. Their comments were fully taken into account in the scope and the final twenty Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. For more information please visit the Council’s website on: http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Assets/Documents/Sustainability-Appraisal-Scoping-Report.pdf.

Integration with Other Assessments

6.9 The Habitats Directive Regulations Assessment:

6.10 The Habitats Directive applies the precautionary principle to protected areas (Special Areas of Conservation, SACs and Special Protection Areas, SPAs, collectively known as European sites and which comprise the Natura 2000 pan-European network). Walthamstow Marshes and Reservoirs SSSI are located within Lea Valley SPA are the closest European sites to Hackney. The London Borough of Hackney undertook a Habitats Regulations Screening Assessment in April 2008 and a full Habitats Regulations Assessment in May 2009 as required by Regulation 48 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c) Regulations 1994 (as amended in 2007) for the Core Strategy, 2010. This process was undertaken in consultation with Natural England. The quantum and level of growth proposed was not deemed likely to have significant effects on the European Sites. It was concluded in Section 5.6.1 of the main report that “Issues of recreational pressure and air quality have all been considered in relation to impacts of the Core Strategy on Epping Forest SAC and following consultation with Natural England it has been possible to conclude that an adequate policy mechanism is in place to ensure that development to be delivered under the Core Strategy will not lead to adverse effects on Epping Forest (when considered in conjunction with the increased populations of surrounding authorities).” A further Habitats Regulations Assessment has been carried out in June 2012 of the emerging DMLP and it was concluded that the Development Management LP does not contain any policies which exceed the levels of predicted growth set out in the Core Strategy, nor does it propose a new direction in regard to the areas for development but rather aims to provide a more detailed framework to implement these goals.

6.11 For more details on Hackney’s Habitats Regulations Assessment please visit the Council Website or follow the link below: http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Assets/Documents/habitat-regulations-assessment-2009.pdf
6.12 **The Equalities Impact Assessment:** The London Borough of Hackney, Equalities Team has an established process of carrying out Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) on Council documents. The EqIA was carried out on the Council’s Core Strategy, 2010 which assessed and evaluated the strategic planning framework for growth and considered the implications of the diverse equalities groups in the Borough. An EqIA has been carried out for the DMLP alongside this sustainability appraisal in June 2012.

6.13 For more details on Hackney’s Strategic Equalities Impact Assessment please visit the Council Website or follow the link below: [http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Assets/Documents/full_equality_impact_assessment_form_oct09-2.pdf](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/Assets/Documents/full_equality_impact_assessment_form_oct09-2.pdf)

6.14 **Strategic Flood Risk Assessment:** A joint North London Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 1, published in August 2008, was carried out for Hackney, Barnet, Camden, Islington, Enfield, Haringey and Waltham Forest boroughs'. The London Borough of Hackney also carried out the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Sequential Test, May 2009 and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Level 2 Exception Test, October 2010. This identified flood risk in Hackney Wick. The Council is currently carrying out a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and a Surface Water Management Plan. Updates will be posted on the Council’s website.

6.15 For more details on Hackney’s flood Risk Assessments can be obtained from the following link: [http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ep-evidence-base.htm](http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ep-evidence-base.htm)
7 Objective Assessment Findings

The Development Management Local Plan Objective Appraisal

7.1 Table 3 sets out the Development Management LP Objectives and assesses them against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework to identify if there are any conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Management LP Objectives</th>
<th>Employment and poverty reduction</th>
<th>Key issues/recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/recommendations</td>
<td>The Council’s aim is to protect and develop upon designated employment areas and employment uses through the Development Management LP and improve the Borough’s economic prospects. Where negative environmental impacts could occur as a result of development, the Core Strategy and emerging DMLP policies have measures in place to help alleviate and mitigate these impacts, and also produce positive environmental impacts. Initiatives to help get local people into jobs will also help achieve employment and poverty reduction objectives. No significantly negative impacts affecting employment and poverty reduction are identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and community facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/recommendations</td>
<td>The objective to improve, protect and deliver educational and community facilities is predicted to deliver largely positive social impacts. It will help promote education which can provide a platform for reducing poverty, improving the job prospects of local residents and reducing crime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to health and community wellbeing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/recommendations</td>
<td>The objective for improving access to health and community wellbeing is also predicted to deliver largely positive social impacts. This objective can deliver affordable housing and health facilities which can in turn lead to a number of other benefits including poverty reduction. This objective is therefore also key in supporting the other objectives for improving the quality of life and reducing deprivation in the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe well designed communities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/recommendations</td>
<td>The number of positive impacts across all of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives illustrates the importance of sustainable design in delivering the wide range of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. This objective is essential in ensuring negative impacts of development arising from the other objectives are minimised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Sustainability

++ ++ ++ | - ++ ++ ++ | ++ - + ++ - + 0 + ++ + ++ + ++

Key issues/recommendations
This objective will help balance and mitigate the negative impacts of development as well as protect Hackney from environmental problems such as climate change, flood risk, waste management and air pollution.

Table 3: Summary of the Development Management Objective Sustainability A assessment findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>significant positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>significant negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~</td>
<td>sensitive receptor: a cumulative negative impacts likely to equate to a significant effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>cumulatively will increase demands on the Council services for health, education, ground maintenance waste services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Effects key

Summary of Significant Effects

- There are no significant conflicts between the proposed Development Management LP Objectives and the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. Where negative environmental impacts could occur as a result of development, sustainable design and environmental sustainability objectives contained within the proposed DMLP are designed to help alleviate/mitigate these impacts, as well as help deliver positive and sustainable developments.
- The Development Management LP Objectives appropriately balance economic, social and environmental goals.
- Initiatives that help disperse the benefits of these objectives to the Borough’s residents are important.
- The land use implications of the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan particularly the education and health aspirations that are predicted as a result of the planned renewal should be considered.
8 Policy Assessment Findings

8.1 The text and tables below align the proposed DM policies (Publication Version) against the SA objectives and predicts the effects of them being developed as part of the planning process. Each assessment is split into chapters and policy numbers consistent with the draft DMLP document.

Chapter 3: Delivering Sustainable Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Policy and No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM1: High Quality Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM2: Development and Amenity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM3: Promoting Health and Well-Being</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM4: Communities Infrastructure Levy and Planning Contributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM5: Protection and Delivery of Social and Community Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM6: Arts, Culture and Entertainment Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary on Policy and Potential Effects:

**Proposed Policy DM1: High Quality Design** - Policy DM1 would have a number of positive effects and would help achieve several sustainability objectives relating to design and climate change. The policy ensures sustainable design that takes into account a variety of criteria including waste/recycling, heritage assets, climate change, and the reduction of crime. No negative impacts have been identified. Any necessary upgrades to the existing water and wastewater infrastructure that are required to support development are required to be provided ahead of the occupation of development.

**Proposed Policy DM2: Development and Amenity** - Policy DM2 is associated with several positive impacts. It will help ensure that new development takes account of and reduces negative amenity impacts of new schemes and therefore make these places more attractive to live, work and socialise in. In doing so it contributes to London Plan and Core Strategy Objectives. The requirement for well-designed residential development also contributes to providing decent homes.

**Proposed Policy DM3: Promoting Health and Well-Being** - Policy DM3 is associated with several positive social and environmental sustainability objectives. The promotion of integration with public transport will contribute towards climate change as well as sustainable transport objectives. Ensuring supporting infrastructure such as health care facilities and leisure provision is in place will contribute to healthy communities. Ensuring development has no adverse impacts on amenity will also significantly improve the quality of life for local residents. Restricting proposals for unhealthy hot food takeaways around secondary schools will also contribute to improving child health, particularly in relation to obesity.

**Proposed Policy DM4: Communities Infrastructure Levy and Planning Contributions** - The effectiveness of Policy DM4 is dependent on the types of developments proposed, however significant positive impacts are identified. Social, economic and environmental objectives can be met through the effective use of CIL and planning contributions, however these contributions mitigate site-specific impacts of development rather than actively contribute. No negative impacts are identified.

**Proposed Policy DM5: Protection and Delivery of Social and Community Facilities and Places of Worship** - Significant positive social impacts are identified with Policy DM6 as they promote the retention of facilities beneficial to local communities, and set out requirements before such facilities can be removed. This policy helps achieve objectives set out in the London Plan and Core Strategy aimed at promoting healthy communities. The policy helps retain community, social and educational facilities and will therefore contribute to social cohesion, improved education and a reduction in crime.

**Proposed Policy DM6: Arts, Culture and Entertainment Facilities** - Policy DM6 aims to promote and protect arts, culture and entertainment facilities and also aims to locate them in Growth Areas and Shopping Centres. This can have a positive amenity impact as it helps to reduce
noise in areas other than Growth Areas and Shopping Centres. Other positive impacts are identified with this policy helping to make Hackney a lively and attractive place to live, work and visit.
## Chapter 4: Dynamic and Creative Economy

### Commentary on Policy and Potential Effects:

### Table 6: DMLP Policy Appraisal - Chapter 4: Dynamic and Creative Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Policy and No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM7: New Retail Development in Shopping Centres</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM8: Small and Independent Shops</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM9: Changing the Use of Shops in Town Centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM10: Change of Use of Shops Outside Shopping Centres</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM11: Evening and Night-time Economy Uses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM12: Hot Food Take-Aways and Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM13: Street Markets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM14: Retention of Employment Land and Floorspace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM15: New Business Floorspace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM16: Affordable Workspace</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM17: Development Proposals in Priority Employment Areas (PEAs)</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM18: Railway Arches</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Policy DM7: New Retail Development in Shopping Centres - Policy DM7 supports new retail development in designated town centres, which would have a number of positive sustainability impacts. One of the key requirements contained within the policy is that new or extension to existing edge or out-of-centre retail or leisure development in excess of 200sqm gross floorspace will not be permitted unless they meet the sequential requirement set out in NPPF. This approach would generate a number of positive sustainability impacts through ensuring access to an adequate range of key local services (most notably shopping and personal services) in one location, thus reducing the need for making multiple trips since one trip to town centres could be used to access other services at the same time. Also, by supporting retail and leisure facilities within the town centres this approach would encourage business development within town centres given that similar uses concentrated within a locality will benefit from each other, which will in turn maximise opportunities for sustainable economic growth and promote employment opportunities for all. One other key requirement contained within the policy is that the type and scale of any retail and leisure proposal should be appropriate to the role, function and character of the town centre. This approach would generate a positive sustainability impact by ensuring that shopping centres are allowed to develop in ways that allow them to strengthen their local distinctive offers, thus maximising their opportunities for sustainable economic growth. By promoting and encouraging intensification of use of town centre locations this approach ensures efficient use of land as it seeks optimisation on the use of previously developed land, buildings and existing infrastructure.

Proposed Policy DM8: Small and Independent Shops - Policy DM8 encourages the provision of small shop units suitable for local independent businesses. This approach would have a number of sustainability impacts by ensuring access to key local shopping facilities, and the maximisation of opportunities for sustainable economic growth through improving growth in key retail sector. It will also lead to a reduction of poverty and social exclusion and the promotion of equalities and diversity through encouraging access to employment opportunities for local residents. However, as many of the borough’s heritage assets and features of local historic interest are concentrated in the borough’s town centres, e.g. Stoke Newington, and Stoke Newington Church Street as well as parts of Hackney Central town centre, etc. there is potential threat to these historic assets and features from increases in densities arising from significant retail development in the town centres. This negative impact would however be mitigated by the strength of the LDF policies on design and historic environment.

Proposed Policy DM9: Changing the Use of Shops In Town Centres - Policy DM9 seeks to safeguard the vitality and viability of the borough’s town centres by controlling the change of uses within designated frontages in order to encourage diversity of uses with a high proportion of retail A1 uses, and avoid concentration and clustering of non-retail uses which would diminish the attractiveness of the centres. This approach would have a number of positive sustainability impacts by ensuring accessibility to key local shopping facilities, and maximising opportunities for sustainable economic growth through ensuring that those retail uses which have high footfall and therefore draw high spending power from shoppers are dominant in the town centres. This approach will also improve business development opportunities with increased employment opportunities retained within the borough.
Proposed Policy DM10: Change of use of shops outside Town Centres - Policy DM10 encourages retention of shops units outside shopping centres as well as protects them from changes of use to other uses. This approach will have positive sustainability impacts by ensuring improved access to key local services (i.e. shops) that are within walking distances of communities, and thus reducing the need for travel and encouraging walking and cycling. This in turn will improve health in Hackney’s local community and promote healthy lifestyles.

Proposed Policy DM11: Evening and Night-Time Economy - Policy DM11 sets out a range of considerations for the managed expansion of evening and night-time economy uses in town centres, and in other locations within the borough. This approach will have a number of positive sustainability impacts, most significantly concerning amenity and minimising the impact of noise and pollution for adjacent noise sensitive uses, and reducing crime and fear of crime through the requirement for anti-social behaviour measures by way of a local management plan and other measures such as CCTV and contributing towards street wardens. These positive effects would impact positively on the environmental economy resulting in the improved business development.

Proposed Policy DM12: Hot-Food Take-Aways and Schools - Policy DM12 would not encourage proposals for hot food take-away considered unhealthy to be located 400 metres of a secondary school. This preferred approach would contribute to improving health and promoting healthy lifestyles amongst secondary school children within Hackney. However, many ethnic minority people view the establishment of hot food take-away businesses as business opportunity for self employment, and therefore the requirement of this policy approach is at risk of preventing maximising opportunities for sustainable economic growth and generation of employment opportunities for local people by preventing establishment of such businesses near secondary school premises. This negative impact would however be counter balanced by the strength of the LDF policies on promoting health and well-being.

Proposed Policy DM13: Street Markets - This DM13 policy sets out a number of ways the Council seeks to protect and promote markets in Hackney. This approach would have a number of positive sustainability impacts including maintaining access to key services (i.e. shopping), tackling poverty and social exclusion since markets can provide an affordable range of goods and services for all sections of the community and can also encourage locally-based businesses to become established and trade goods. Markets also provide an opportunity for local employment generation as small local firms and enterprises are most likely to be accommodated. The preferred approach sets out considerations that will be taken into account to ensure that new markets will not cause harm to the local environment. These considerations will have positive sustainability impacts as they take into account the effects of markets on pedestrian and traffic movement, community safety and residential amenity.

Proposed Policy DM14: Retention of Employment Land and Floorspace - Policy DM14 seeks to retain employment land and floorspace that are suitable for business use and resist their loss to other uses. This approach will have a number of positive sustainability impacts, most
notably in maximising opportunity for sustainable economic growth by retaining employment premises and sites wherever suitable. This approach will also bring about retention of and/or generation of employment opportunities as enterprises wishing to expand or come into the borough would be able to be accommodated within the borough.

**Proposed Policy DM15: New Business Floorspace** - Policy DM15 promotes the provision of well designed, flexible, high quality buildings and floorspace suitable for sub-division and configuration for new uses, including by small or independent commercial enterprises. This approach will have a number of positive sustainability impacts including maximising opportunities for sustainable economic growth by improving business development through the provision of high quality, flexible and well designed workspaces, contributing towards reducing poverty and social exclusion and promoting equalities and diversity by providing flexible workspace capable of subdivision to meet the needs of both small and medium businesses, tackling climate change through requiring well designed workspaces. Also, by supporting provision of well designed, flexible and high quality buildings and floorspace suitable for occupation by small or independent commercial enterprises this approach would encourage generation of employment opportunities for everyone.

**Proposed Policy DM16: Affordable Workspace** - Policy DM16 seeks to encourage provision of affordable work space for small and medium sized enterprises. This approach will have a number of positive sustainability impacts, most notably including improving access to a range of key local infrastructure such as affordable employment premises, tackling poverty and social exclusion and promoting equalities and diversity since affordable workspaces would offer opportunities for small and medium sized businesses from the diverse range of the borough’s community to have a business foothold and grow. This in turn would encourage locally-based businesses to establish that would have otherwise been excluded from economic activities, thus creating and increasing employment opportunities for local residents. This approach will also improve business development opportunities as optimal use would be made of previously developed land, buildings and existing infrastructure.

**Proposed Policy DM17: Development Proposals in Priority Employment Areas (PEAs)** - Policy DM17 identifies the employment uses acceptable within Priority Employment Areas (PEAs) as well as set out the considerations when non employment uses may be considered acceptable. This approach will have a number of positive sustainability impacts, most significantly by accommodating sustainable economic growth by maintaining employment premises and sites for specified employment uses so as not to undermine existing clusters of businesses. This approach will maximise the benefits of regeneration by retaining employment opportunities within the borough. In certain circumstances, policy DM17 will accept mixed use development on employment sites, which meets the sustainability objective of ensuring efficient use of land, and ensuring access to a range of key local services.

**Proposed Policy DM18: Railway Arches** - Policy DM18 seeks to protect and support the ‘heavier’ type industries such as B2 and B8 and facilitate other employment-generating uses such as a range of B1 activities, e.g. workshops and other similar Sui generic uses. This approach
will have a number of positive sustainability impacts, most notably through enabling maximisation of opportunities for sustainable economic growth in providing for and maintaining employment premises and sites for a range of employment types which would otherwise be excluded from economic activities. This approach will also improve business development opportunities as optimal use would be made of previously developed land, buildings and existing infrastructure, with increased employment opportunities retained within the borough. The public highway is not to be obstructed by development.
### Chapter 5: Providing Better Homes

| Table 7: DMLP Policy Appraisal - Chapter 5: Providing better homes |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| **Sustainability Objectives**   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| **Proposed Development Policy and No.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DM19 – General Approach to New Housing Development | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM20 – Loss of Housing | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM21 – Affordable Housing Delivery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM22 – Homes of Different Sizes | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM23 - Residential Conversions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM24 – Student Housing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM25 – Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM26 - Shared and Supported Housing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM27 – Hotels | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
Commentary on Policy and Potential Effects:

Proposed Policy DM19: General Approach to New Housing Development - This policy would create positive effects in relation to addressing Housing Need, with further potential benefits on Social Infrastructure through legal agreements, environmental mitigation through new build homes meeting CSH targets on water consumption. Wheelchair accessible housing would be required. This policy will also enable re-use of Brownfield land in the Borough so brings sustainability benefits.

Proposed Policy DM20: Loss of Housing - This policy will have positive effects as it can help to reduce the number of unfit homes in the borough, protect and support the provision of family housing in the Borough, and facilitate regeneration schemes which can allow for the construction of more affordable housing, and social cohesion benefits. However, in some cases the loss of housing to community facilities will be required where no other suitable site is available. This could be viewed as a negative, but could also potentially aid cohesion and helps meet an identified need within the Borough. Overall, the policy is considered to be neutral.

Proposed Policy DM21: Affordable Housing Delivery - This policy would create positive effects in terms of addressing housing need. The delivery of new affordable housing units would enable people to move into decent housing and potentially reduce waiting lists.

Proposed Policy DM22: Homes of different Sizes - There would be very positive effects in relation to addressing Housing Need, and the policy would encourage a balanced supply or smaller and larger units of different tenure within schemes so would be beneficial in terms of community cohesion. The policy would also provide sustainability benefits through new build homes meeting CSH targets on water consumption, and it would ensure re-use of brownfield land in the Borough.

Proposed Policy DM23: Residential Conversions - This policy would have positive effects on housing supply and help meet the need for family units from conversion schemes. It also ensures amenity is protected by setting a threshold of 120 sq m, and conversion of smaller homes would be prohibited. The policy also reduces the need for new development.

Proposed Policy DM24: Student Housing - This policy would have positive effects on housing need as the delivery of purpose built housing for students could help in protecting of family homes from conversion to smaller units/HMO. There would be positive sustainability impacts since it would create and protect housing with shared facilities and would therefore contribute to the provision of a range of housing to meet local needs and would assist social cohesion by providing access to decent housing for a wider group of residents. The policy could have negative impacts on anti social behaviour, as evidence from elsewhere in the UK notes that areas with high concentrations of student housing can be vulnerable to high crime rates due to a temporary and transitional population.
Proposed Policy DM25: Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) - This policy could create positive effects in terms of addressing the housing needs for lower income and/or smaller household groups. The policy could also help to reduce the number of unfit/empty homes. A possible negative could be some possible loss of family homes from stock.

Proposed Policy DM26: Shared and Supported Housing - This policy would increase the supply of housing which meets the needs of vulnerable groups. There are further positive impacts as one of the policy criteria sets out proposals must be accessible by public transport and near to other facilities.

Proposed Policy DM27: Hotels - The policy would bring positive impacts in terms of promoting job creation, as hotels employ people directly on-site but also require a range of ancillary services, and bringing investment in to the Borough. Job creation can also bring benefits in terms of tackling social exclusion and poverty. Facilities are required to be accessible by public transport and the buildings themselves must be rating against BREEAM, which brings benefits in terms of sustainability.
### Table 8: DMLP Policy Appraisal - Chapter 6: Cleaner, Safer, Greener

| Proposed Development Policy and No. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| DM28 – Managing the Historic Environment | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| DM29 - Advertisements | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ~ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ |
| DM30 - Telecommunications | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ~ | ~ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ |
| DM31 - Open Space and Living Roofs | ++ | + | ++ | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + |
| DM32 – Protection and Enhancement of Existing Open Space and the Lee Valley Regional Park | ++ | + | ++ | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | + | + |
| DM33 – Allotments and Food Growing | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | + | - | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM34 – Sites of Nature Conservation Value, Walthamstow Reservoirs Special Protection Area and Walthamstow Marshes Sites of Special Scientific Interest | ++ | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM35 – Landscaping and Tree Management | ++ | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | ++ | + | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DM36 – Residential Moorings | - | + | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ++ | ~ | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Sustainability Objectives**
Commentary on policy and potential effects:

**Proposed Policy DM28: Managing the Historic Environment** - The Policy sets out the Council's planning approach to designated and non-designated Heritage Assets in the Borough. The criteria based policy sets out the considerations and requirement for the preservation and enhancement of the individual asset and the wider environment. Assessed against the 20 sustainability objectives the effect would in the majority of cases be positive, it will result in an efficient use of land (Objective 2) as buildings are being reused rather than being rebuilt. There are a few objectives where there may be a neutral effect or slightly negative, for example, objective 15 seeks to reduce crime and fear of crime, and this policy may constrain the measures available to meet this objective.

There is one significantly negative effect that this policy will have against Objective 9 “To protect and enhance the Borough’s identified heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment and to preserve the archaeological aspects of the Borough.” This is because it explores the substantial harm or loss of a heritage asset. This however would not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that efforts to retain or restore the significance of the heritage asset have been explored and that the public benefits of redevelopment, including securing its optimum viable use, outweighs the adverse impact on the significance of the designated heritage asset. This possible negative impact will also be mitigated by the strength of High Quality Design policy.

**Proposed Policy DM29: Advertisements** - This Policy is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the 20 Sustainability Objectives. Emphasis is placed on the affect they may have on buildings and areas of historic significance. The policy could potentially have a negative effect on the character of the Borough without proper design measures in place (for example sites not located within a Conservation Area), however the character of the Borough could improve due to the strength of the High Quality Design policy which would require that advertisements are placed in the right locations and designed appropriately.

**Proposed Policy DM30: Telecommunications** - This Policy is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the 20 Sustainability Objectives. There could potentially be some negative impact on the local and/or historic environment (Objectives 9 and 10), arising from cumulative impact rather than from a single application. This possibility of negative impact however is mitigated by the criteria of this policy and the strength of the High Quality Design policy.

**Proposed Policy DM31: Open Space and Living Roofs** - This Policy seeks new open space in relation to development proposals. It will have a significant positive effect on a number of objectives in particular promoting a healthy lifestyle, helping in minimising flood risk and encouraging Sustainable Drainage Systems for New Development (Objectives 3, 5 and 13). The requirement for useable communal open space within the development means that space will not be available for alternative uses; however roof surfaces can also be used for open space.
Proposed Policy DM32: Protection and Enhancement of Existing Open Space and the Lee Valley Regional Park - This policy will have a significantly positive effect on objectives 1, 4 and 12. Registered parks and gardens are designated heritage assets therefore this policy will both protect and possible provide a means for the enhancement of these areas (objectives 12). Furthermore, the nature of the enhancement could possibly encourage greater of public open spaces and thus increase physical activity (objective 13).

Proposed Policy DM33: Allotments and Food Growing - The promotion and encouragement of allotments and food growing initiatives in particular will have a positive impact on objective 13 and to a lesser extent a positive impact on objective 12. This is because most projects in the Borough will result in the cultivation of existing open space, which does not make a significant difference to the quantitative supply of open space in the Borough, although it is an indication of efficient use of land (objective 2). The dedicated use of space for food growing may mean that other activities for example child play is not possible or allow biodiversity to flourish.

Proposed Policy DM34: Sites of Nature Conservation Value, Walthamstow Reservoirs Special Protection Area and Walthamstow Marshes Sites of Special Scientific Interest - This policy seeks to safeguard those recognised areas of importance for nature conservation. Similar to impact to the policy on the protection and enhancement of open space but is specifically focussed on those sites and the development of opportunities that enhance biodiversity in the Borough. When there is a significantly adverse impact as a result of development, the policy seeks measures that mitigate and/or compensate this impact(s).

Proposed Policy DM35: Landscaping and Tree Management - This policy makes a positive contribution to the objectives 1 and 3. Tree lined streets and areas could encourage people to walk / cycle thus having a positive impact on objectives 7 and 13. Furthermore, they make a contribution to the character and appearance of an area as encouraged by Objective 10.

Proposed Policy DM36: Residential Moorings - This Policy offers an opportunity to utilise the Borough’s waterways thus making efficient use of land (Objective 2), and provides an alternative and relatively affordable homes, thus possibly making a positive contribution to Objective 16. Residential use may have adverse impacts on biodiversity (Objective 1) and increase noise pollution (Objective 4) because of the extra activity on the waterways and their riparian area. This possibility of negative impact however, is mitigated by the strength of High Quality Design policy and proposed policies DM2 (Development and Amenity) and DM43 (Pollution and Air Quality).
## Chapter 7: Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability

### Table 9: DMLP Policy Appraisal - Chapter 7: Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Objectives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development Policy and No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM37 – Performance Targets for Major Residential Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM38 - Sustainability Standards for Minor Residential Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM39 – Sustainability Standards for Other Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM40 – Offsetting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM41 – Heating and Cooling</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM42 – Contaminated Land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM43 – Pollution and Water and Air Quality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM44 – Flooding and Flood Risk</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Commentary on policy and potential effects:**

**Proposed Policy DM37: Performance Targets for Major Residential Development** - There would be positive impacts on air quality arising from this policy due to the requirement for larger proposals to meet higher environmental standards. To achieve the required Code for Sustainable Homes rating, proposals are required to score highly under energy, water and materials which bring positive impacts for air quality. The policy includes measures to protect and enhance water resources and water quality.

**Proposed Policy DM38: Sustainability Standards for Minor Residential Development** - Positive effects are similar to the above.

**Proposed Policy DM39: Sustainability Standards for Other Development** - This policy also has similar positive sustainability impacts to the above policies for other non-residential developments. Other non-residential developments will be designed and constructed to reduce pollution, energy use and carbon emission which will be beneficial from environmental and social perspectives.

**Proposed Policy DM40: Offsetting** – This policy will have significant positive environmental impacts by encouraging the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions as a result of new development.

**Proposed Policy DM41: Heating and Cooling** – This policy will have a number of positive benefits in that it would assist in reducing the heat island effect of development within the Borough.

**Proposed Policy DM42: Contaminated Land** - The policy is considered to have positive effects, as it will help to prevent future contamination of land by ensuring remediation measures are taken prior to development to ensure substances which may be harmful to human health are removed.

**Proposed Policy DM43: Pollution and Water and Air Quality** - This policy would incur a number of positive sustainability impacts, primarily in relation to improving air quality by requiring Air Quality Assessments (AQAs) in full to be submitted where development may be harmful to air quality, and mitigation measures to be included.

**Proposed Policy DM44: Flooding and Flood Risk** - This policy would have positive impacts for it would reduce levels of surface water and sewage flooding. It also restricts the type of development permissible in each flood zone to development which is compatible with the associated risk and contributes to flood risk mitigation infrastructure. This approach would also have the benefit of reducing the amount of waste requiring disposal by requiring developments to limit the amount and rate of waste water.
Chapter 8: Transport

Table 10: DMLP Policy Appraisal - Chapter 8: Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development Policy and No.</th>
<th>Sustainability Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM45 – Movement Hierarchy</td>
<td>0 0 ++ 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM46 – Development and Transport</td>
<td>0 0 ++ 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM47 – Walking and Cycling</td>
<td>0 0 ++ 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM48 – Parking, Car Free and Car Capped Development</td>
<td>0 0 ++ 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 ++ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary on Policy and Potential effects:

**Proposed Policy DM45: Movement Hierarchy** - The policy will have positive impacts as it promotes the use of walking, cycling and public transport ahead of private vehicles. This approach would bring further benefits in respect of improving air quality as a result of fewer CO$_2$ emissions arising from car use.

**Proposed Policy DM46: Development and Transport** - The policy will promote movement by sustainable transport. It requires development proposals to fully consider trip generation and will provide additional air quality benefits as a result of fewer CO$_2$ emissions arising from car use. This approach will have numerous positive sustainability impacts in terms of promoting safe communities, ensuring access to services by requiring developments to be located close to public transport networks, and reducing reliance on private transport.
**Proposed Policy DM47: Walking and Cycling** - This approach will resist development that is dependent on travel by private motor vehicles. The policy would help to promote safer communities by providing pedestrian and cycle routes and safer road crossings, ensure greater access to services by improving public transport infrastructure and contribute to air quality improvement as a result of fewer CO2 emissions arising from car use.

**Proposed Policy DM48: Parking, Car-free and Car-capped development** - The policy has numerous sustainability benefits via encouragement use of public transport, walking and cycling. This can also bring benefits as a result of healthier, more active communities.
9 Conclusions and Proposals for Monitoring

9.1 This SA report identifies the economic, social and environmental issues affecting Hackney and also identifies the negative and positive impacts each policy has on achieving sustainability objectives based on the SA Framework set out in the SA Scoping Report.

9.2 This SA report demonstrates that Hackney’s Visions and Objectives set out in the SCS and Core Strategy are consistent with the Borough’s proposed Development Management Local Plan and the sustainability objectives set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. The SA has identified that the draft document would contribute significantly towards delivering the social, economic and environmental objectives set out in the SA framework.

9.3 Where potentially negative economic, social or environmental impacts were identified, it was concluded that the draft DMLP policies adequately alleviated or mitigated these impacts. Overall, the proposed DMLP will potentially result in positive impacts across the majority of sustainability objectives outlined in the SA Scoping Report.

Proposals for Monitoring

9.4 The Council produces an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) which provides information on the social, environmental and economic effects of planning policy documents and helps to determine the extent to which objectives, targets and programmes are being met. The latest report covers the period 1 April 2011 to 31 March 2012. These operational indicators have been applied to each of the potential significant effects identified and the Council will report on this as part of this annual process (see table 10). It is noted that some National indicators are no longer still in operation. The Council is continuing to monitor some of these areas to ensure that its local data are as up to date as possible. Some future updates to the National indicators may occur over the next year as a result of future central monitoring shifts. The indicator list will be kept as up to date as possible and will be made available on the Council’s website.

9.5 The Council’s current Authority Monitoring Report, 2012 can be obtained at: http://www.hackney.gov.uk/ep-planning-policy-amr.htm
10 Compliance with the SEA Directive

The Requirements of the SEA Directive

10.1 Strategic Environmental Assessments are required by the European Directive EC/2001/42 (SEA Directive). This involves the systematic identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts. The Directive was incorporated into UK law on the 21 July 2004 and applies to a range of English plans and programmes including Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). Table 10 below provides a cross reference to where the sections of this Sustainability Appraisal Report discharge the requirements of the SEA Directive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The SEA Directive's requirements</th>
<th>Section of this report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of information that may reasonably required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment; the contents and level of detail in the plan; its stage in the decision-making process; and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process.</td>
<td>Section 2, 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme; and reasonable alternatives are taken into account. Additionally that the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme are identified, described and evaluated.</td>
<td>Section 2, 6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</td>
<td>Section 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.</td>
<td>Section 4, 6 &amp; 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan. In addition the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during the plans preparation.</td>
<td>Section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The likely significant effects on the environment, including issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. The above mentioned effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects.</td>
<td>Section 6, 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan.</td>
<td>Section 6, 7 &amp; 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with; and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring.</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of consultation with authorities with environmental responsibilities, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report.</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of consultation with authorities with environmental responsibilities and the public, to give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan.</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of consultation with other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan is likely to have significant effects on the environment in these countries.</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making.</td>
<td>Section 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of information on the decision to adopt the plan. Inform the public and any countries consulted under Article 7 on the decision to adopt the plan and make the relevant documents available.</td>
<td>Completed on adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a statement summarizing how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan and how the environmental report of Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 have been taken in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with and measures concerning monitoring.</td>
<td>Completed on next formal preparation stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a quality assurance checklist of the environment report to ensure it is of sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive.</td>
<td>Section 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: The SEA Directive’s requirements
## 11 Quality Assurance Checklist

| Objectives and Context: The plan’s purpose and objectives are made clear. Sustainability issues, including international and EC objectives, are considered in developing the objectives and targets. SA objectives are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate. Links with other related plans, programmes and policies are identified and explained. Conflicts that exist between SA objectives, between SA and plan objectives, and between SA and other plan objectives are identified and described. | ✓ |
| Scoping: The environmental; consultation bodies are consulted in appropriate ways and appropriate times on the content and scope of the SA Report. The appraisal focuses on significant issues. Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit. Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration. | ✓ |
| Options/Alternatives: Realistic alternatives are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented. Alternatives include do nothing and/or business as usual scenarios wherever relevant. The sustainability effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared. Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained. Reasons are given for selection or elimination of alternatives. | ✓ |
| Baseline information: Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and their likely evolution without the plan are described. Characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected are described, including area wider than the physical boundary of the plan area where it is likely to be affected by the wider plan where practicable. Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained. | ✓ |
| Prediction and evaluation of likely significant effects: Likely significant social, environmental and economic effects are identified, including those listed in the SEA Directive (Biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage, and landscape) as relevant. Both positive and negative effects are considered and where practicable, the duration of effects (short, medium or long-term) is addressed. Likely secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are identified where practicable. Inter-relationships between effects are considered where practicable. Where relevant, the prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of accepted methods. | ✓ |
standards, regulations, and thresholds. Methods used to evaluate the effects are described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures: Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset significant adverse effects of implementing the plan are indicated. Issues to be taken into account in development consents are identified.</th>
<th>✔</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sustainability Appraisal: Report: Is clear and concise in its layout and presentation. Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms. Uses maps and other illustrations where appropriate. Explains the methodology used. Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. Identifies sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion. Contains a Non-Technical Summary.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation: The SA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan-making process. The consultation bodies, other consultees and the public are consulted in ways which give then an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the draft plan and SA Report.</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: The Quality Assurance Checklist