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PART ONE: DEVELOPING THE SA FRAMEWORK FOR THE LDF

1. INTRODUCTION

The Local Development Framework (LDF) is part of the emerging development plan for Tunbridge Wells Borough. LDFs are the new form of spatial development plan introduced by the Government’s planning reforms in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). Unlike the current development plan system, the preparation of the LDF will be a continual process, with new Local Development Documents (LDDs) adopted and included in the LDF at different stages.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires Sustainability Appraisals (SAs) to be carried out on Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS), Development Plan Documents (DPD), and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). SAs help planning authorities to fulfil the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development, by testing policy options considered for inclusion in the development plan against sustainability objectives.

The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) which implement European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive, require SEA of a wide range of plans and programmes, including LDFs, if they are likely to give rise to significant environmental effects. The objective of the SEA Directive is to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans, with a view to promoting sustainable development.

SEA and SA are very closely linked. SA aims to integrate sustainability issues into decision making by appraising the plan or strategy using environmental, social and economic objectives. SEA also aims to facilitate sustainable development but its emphasis is on integrating environmental considerations into decision making through a thorough analysis of environmental issues.

Although the requirement to carry out both an SA and SEA is mandatory, it is possible to satisfy the requirements of both pieces of legislation through a single appraisal process, and this is the approach advocated by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). From hereon, SA is used to represent the combined SA/SEA process.

In order to fully comply with both sets of legislation detailed above, this report adheres to the most recent guidance produced by the ODPM ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks – Consultation Paper’ (2004) and the subsequent ‘Interim Advice Note on Frequently Asked Questions’ (ODPM, 2005). The methodology used for the SA is described in detail in Section 2: Sustainability Appraisal Methodology.

This document describes the first stage of the SA; that is to set out the context and objectives, establish the environmental, social and economic baseline of the Borough and decide on the scope and structure of the SA Report. The scope has been determined through a review of planning and other relevant documentation, baseline information and key sustainability issues applicable to Tunbridge Wells Borough. This Scoping Report has been divided into two Parts to aid clarity. Part One addresses the SA of the LDF in its entirety. Part Two deals specifically with the SA of some of the earlier Local Development Documents (LDDs) contained within the LDF.

The Report is structured as follows:

PART ONE: DEVELOPING THE SA FRAMEWORK FOR THE LDF

Section 1 summarises the Sustainability Appraisal context and provides an introduction to the report;
Section 2 summarises the Local Development Framework context and outlines the DPDs and SPDs within the Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF;

Section 3 provides an overview of the SA assessment process, explaining how this Scoping Report forms part of the assessment. It details the timescales of the SA process with specific regard to the preparation of the Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF;

Section 4 identifies links to other relevant plans, programmes and policies and their implications for the LDF and SA;

Section 5 provides an overview of baseline information, including current trends, relevant to the Borough and surrounding area. Where baseline information was not available the outstanding information is highlighted;

Section 6 outlines the key sustainability issues in the Borough that have been identified based upon the review of planning documentation and baseline information;

Section 7 sets out the proposed framework for the SA which sets out the sustainability objectives and indicators;

PART TWO: SPECIFIC INFORMATION RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS

Section 8 addresses the Core Strategy DPD. It provides an overview of the planning background and context, identifies the key sustainability issues, the objectives of the DPD and outlines the options for the document. It concludes with the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 9 Conservation Area Appraisal SPDs. It outlines the planning background and context relevant to the SPD, highlights the key sustainability issues, the objectives of and options for the document and the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 10 addresses the Benenden Primary School Allocation DPD. It provides an overview of the planning background and context, identifies the key sustainability issues, the objectives of the DPD and outlines the options for the document. It concludes with the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 11 addresses the Recreation and Open Space SPD. It outlines the planning background and context relevant to the SPD, highlights the key sustainability issues, the objectives of and options for the document and the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 12 addresses the Alterations and Extensions SPD. It provides an overview of the planning background and context, identifies the key sustainability issues, the objectives of the SPD, outlines the options for the document, and the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 13 addresses the Royal Victoria Place Development Brief SPD. It outlines the planning background and context relevant to the SPD, highlights the key sustainability issues, the objectives of and options for the document and the considerations for the SA Framework;

Section 14 addresses the Affordable/ Key Worker Housing SPD. It outlines the planning background and context relevant to the SPD, highlights the key sustainability issues, the objectives of and options for the document and the considerations for the SA Framework; and

Section 15 outlines the proposed structure of the SA Report.

Appendices are included as a separate document and will be sent to consultees.
2. **OUTLINE OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENT PLAN SYSTEM**

2.1 **WHAT IS THE LDF?**

Under the new planning system, the development plan will consist of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) prepared by the regional planning body; and Development Plan Documents (DPD) prepared by Borough Councils such as Tunbridge Wells.

Regional Spatial Strategies are now being prepared to replace Regional Planning Guidance (RPG). RPG takes the development policies and principles outlined in National Planning Guidance and translates these on a regional level. The relevant RPG for Tunbridge Wells Borough is currently Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG 9) March 2001.

However, RPG 9 is being replaced by the new RSS called ‘The South East Plan’. The South East Plan Consultation Draft was published in January 2005. The first stage of public consultation closed on 15 April 2005. Public consultation and further work on the Plan will take place from Summer 2005 until the end of the year. The final full draft of the South East Plan is to be submitted for Government approval in Spring 2006.

Informed by RPG 9 and the draft South East Plan, the Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF further refines policies and principles, to guide development on a Borough level.

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) has produced a Local Development Scheme (LDS), available at http://www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/MASmedia_SB/viewSite?requestType=viewPage&siteId=232&pageId=4524, which sets out the Council’s intended approach and content for the new LDF for the Borough. The Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF, as illustrated in Figure 1, overleaf, will consist of the following DPDs and SPDs prior to 2007.
3. **Sustainability Appraisal Methodology**

3.1 **The Integrated Approach to Appraisal - Standard Methodology**

The core guidance document describing the methodology for undertaking SAs and integrating the requirements of SEA into SA is the ODPM draft guidance ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks Consultation Paper’ published in September 2004. The final version of the guidance is expected to be published in September 2005. This provides detail on the process of implementing SA and has recently finished its consultation period. Figure 2, below, outlines the SA methodology and illustrates how SA fits into the DPD plan preparation process.

![Figure 2: The DPD Preparation Process in Relation to the SA Process](image-url)
Figure 3, below, outlines the SA methodology and illustrates how SA fits into the SPD plan preparation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPD Process</th>
<th>SA Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stage 1 - Pre-Production**  
  - Survey and evidence gathering  
  - Determine SPD objectives | **Setting the context & scope**  
  1. Review other plans, policies & programmes  
  2. Review baseline information  
  3. Identify key sustainability issues  
  4. Develop SA framework  
  5. Consult on scope |
| **Stage 2a - Production**  
  - Prepare draft SPD | **Alternatives and Appraising the effects of the Plan**  
  1. Test the plan against framework  
  2. Develop and refine the options using consultation where necessary  
  3. Appraise options and select preferred options  
  4. Predict effects  
  5. Assess effects  
  6. Propose mitigation measures  
  7. Develop monitoring proposals  
  8. Prepare SA report |
| **Stage 2b - Production**  
  - Consult on draft SFD & SA report  
  - Revise SPD where appropriate  
  - Finalise SPD  
  - Report on how SA report & consultees opinions were taken into account | **Consultation**  
  1. Consult on draft SPD & SA Report  
  2. Review & appraise significant changes as a result of consultation  
  3. Decision making and reporting |
| **Stage 3 - Adoption**  
  - Adoption | **No SA activity** |
| **Stage 4 - Monitoring**  
  - Monitoring and review | **Monitoring**  
  1. Monitor significant effects  
  2. Respond to adverse effects |

Figure 3: The SPD Preparation Process in Relation to the SA Process

An ‘Interim Advice Note on Frequently Asked Questions’ (ODPM, April 2005) was published in April, pending the revisions to the guidance based on consultation responses and workshops. This provides supplementary guidance and clarification to the September 2004 Paper and is to be used until it is formally revised. As such the guidance can be considered as in a transitory stage.
3.2 **SA SCOPING METHODOLOGY**

The SA Scoping Study methodology which has been adopted for this study is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and agree appraisal methodology and programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure stakeholder involvement in the appraisal process has been included in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and review other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainable development objectives that will affect or influence the LDF;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect relevant social, environmental and economic baseline information and produce a characterisation of the LDF area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify key sustainability issues for the SA to address;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop the SA framework, consisting of the sustainability objectives and indicators; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produce a Scoping Report for consultation with the four statutory consultees identified by the SEA Directive and additional consultees selected from PPS 12, for a statutory period of five weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This approach is subject to review, with the final published ODPM guidance (Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks) expected in September 2005.

3.3 **WHAT THE SEA DIRECTIVE REQUIRES**

There is a legal obligation under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004) to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive. The requirements relevant to the SA Scoping Report are presented below:
3.4 Specific Approach

This section outlines the approach taken by TWBC and their consultants, Waterman Environmental, to undertake the first part of the SA process; Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope. In accordance with current ODPM guidance ('Interim Advice Note on Frequently Asked Questions', ODPM April 2005) it is possible for Local Authorities to prepare a single SA Scoping Report when consulting on the scope of multiple LDD’s. This SA Scoping Report has followed this guidance and it consists of two parts, as detailed below:

Part 1 details the context, reviews relevant plans, programmes and strategies, presents Borough-wide baseline information, details key sustainability issues and provides a draft SA Framework for consultation. These elements are seen as ‘common’ for all the LDDs to be appraised. LDF objectives have not been developed yet as evidence gathering is still ongoing in relation to the Core Strategy DPD.

Part 2 presents information relating to specific LDDs. For each LDD the following topic areas are addressed:

- Planning background and context;
- Key sustainability issues specific to the LDD;
- The objectives for each LDD;
- The broad options to be considered; and
- Considerations for the SA Framework.

Each time an LDD is assessed, it is recognised that there may be a requirement to change some of the sub-objectives, indicators and targets within the SA Framework, to enable a more focused and relevant assessment. Where there are no specific details available for the LDD at the time of scoping, this is clearly stated.
3.5 NEXT STEPS

Once the SA Scoping Report has been agreed with the relevant consultees, the next stage will involve the assessment of each of the LDDs (refer to Figure 2 and Figure 3). This will happen independently for each LDD keeping to the LDS timetable subject to information and evidence gathering.

3.6 SA IN ADVANCE OF THE CORE STRATEGY

It is likely that some SPDs and DPDs will require assessment prior to the SA of the Core Strategy DPD. Where this is the case the following ODPM guidance is stated:

"Where a saved plan has not undergone SA, the SA of the SPD will first need to assess the significant effects of the saved policy or policies which the SPD is helping to implement. This will establish the baseline against which the effects of the SPD can be compared. However it is not necessary for a SA of a SPD to document the significant effects of the saved plan as a whole or of alternatives to the saved policy or policies."

The SA of the Benenden Primary School Allocation DPD is only required to assess the sites that have been considered.

3.7 CONSULTATION

A copy of this SA Scoping Report has been sent out to the following organisations:

Statutory consultees
- Countryside Agency
- English Heritage
- English Nature
- Environment Agency

Non-Statutory consultees
- South East England Regional Assembly
- South East England Development Agency
- Regional Health Authority
- South West Kent and Maidstone Weald Primary Care Trusts
- Kent County Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Parish and Town Councils within Tunbridge Wells Borough
- Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities (Ashford, Maidstone, Rother, Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Malling, and Wealden)
- Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum

The consultees selected above are in accordance with current Government guidance, but have been expanded to include for example Parish and Town Councils. All consultation methods will be fully compliant with the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), which may be accessed through TWBC or on their website:

http://www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/MASmedia_SB/viewSite?requestType=viewPage&site%20ID=232&pageId=4553
3.8 Plan Preparation and SA Timetable

Figure 4, overleaf, shows the timetable of the SA process and how it relates to that of the LDF preparation. The timetable is based on the Tunbridge Wells Borough LDS, April 2005.
4. **Relevant Plans, Programmes and Strategies**

4.1 **Plans, Programmes and Strategies Review Summary**

The LDF may be influenced, in various ways, by other plans and programmes, and by external sustainability objectives, such as those laid down in policies or legislation. International, National, Regional and Local policies, plans, programmes and strategy documents have been reviewed as part of this SA Scoping Study to determine the objectives and targets relevant to the Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF, and to identify synergies and opportunities as well as conflicts and challenges. The full list of documents studied and the review of relevant plans, programmes and strategies are presented in Appendix A. Key themes are likely to relate to numerous relevant plans, programmes and strategies.

Following the review, the key issues for the preparation of the LDF and the SA have been summarised in Table 1, below:
### Table 1: Key issues for the LDF preparation and the SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the LDF preparation</th>
<th>Key issues for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>Consider objectives and targets from the RSS, Integrated Regional Framework and the Regional SA when developing the LDF.</td>
<td>Utilise the targets and indicators in the SA where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td>Enhance the local economy (consistently maintain unemployment below national and county rates until 2011). Promote tourism to increase prosperity and employment. Promote small businesses in rural locations. Promote vitality and viability of town and village centres. Retain a portfolio of employment sites/ premises to provide a range of employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Include objectives, indicators and targets to establish and monitor economic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>The LDF should make provision for an appropriate supply of housing. The LDF should seek to maximise housing density where appropriate. Maximise new dwellings to be developed on previously-developed land. Provide housing which meets the needs of the local population. Prioritise affordable / Key Worker housing. Ensure adequate provision of affordable housing in all new developments. Advocate the use of the SEEDA / BRE sustainability checklist for new housing. Enhance access to healthy lifestyle choices and to healthcare facilities. Create and sustain vibrant mixed communities, but also adapt to the needs of an ageing population. Provide sufficient local services to meet local needs. The LDF should provide policies which promote a wide range of high quality and enjoyable leisure opportunities. Increase the provision of recreation areas and open space and ensure policy proposals take account of the impact of developments on all open public space. Reduce crime and the fear of crime.</td>
<td>The SA should recognise and address social objectives identified in the Regional Housing Strategy. SA should recognise and include objectives to tackle social exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key issues to be considered in the LDF preparation</td>
<td>Key issues for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Environmental      | Ensure all reasonable opportunities are taken forward to encourage development which is energy efficient.  
Prioritise policies that protect environmentally designated sites including SSSIs, Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest, the AONB, and Conservation Areas in relation to renewable energy developments and encourage development of renewable energy facilities.  
Promote and improve safe, convenient and sustainable transport options to work, school, health and leisure facilities. In doing so, the LDF would be contributing to the air quality, human health, climate change and social inclusion objectives of its SA.  
Ensure that the LDF is co-ordinated with rural transport service plans.  
LDF should avoid unnecessary development in the floodplains that might decrease storage/increase runoff, and compromise human safety.  
Ensure that proposed development will avoid harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. These interests should be maintained, enhanced and restored in association with development.  
Protect and enhance key open spaces and designated sites. Increase opportunities for education regarding key open spaces and designated sites.  
Protect and enhance the high quality landscape of the Borough.  
Expand existing woodland or create new woodland areas.  
The LDF could influence the historic environment. Heritage issues should be taken into account when considering proposals affecting buildings of special architectural or historic interest, or their settings.  
Policies should be developed that require remediation of contaminated sites.  
Maximise use of previously developed land, whilst minimising loss of greenfield sites.  
Certain land uses and development might hinder accessibility to open country and common land. The LDF should consider these issues which have relevance to SA objectives on human health, population, and severance.  
Improve air quality in locations where objectives have already been, or are likely to be exceeded in | The SA should include objectives for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.  
Surface water run off from paved surfaces and built up areas can cumulatively pollute watercourses. SA should include objective on water quality/quantity.  
SA should consider the capacity of groundwater resources to support new development without harming connected ecological systems.  
SA should consider biodiversity impacts within its objectives. It should take a holistic view of ecosystems rather than a focusing on ‘islands’ of protected species.  
Objectives pertaining to the openness of landscape in greenbelt (no reduction of or development within the greenbelt, other than that as set out in the Local Plan) and the protection of biodiversity (habitat connectivity implications) will be included within the SA.  
Objectives regarding maximising use of brownfield, rather than greenfield sites should be included in the SA.  
New developments should take into account any emissions caused by new transport links (and new ‘need’ to travel), along with emissions from new industry. SA will include objectives for air quality.  
Archaeological sites can be potentially damaged through construction of new buildings. Archaeological and cultural objectives should be included within the SA.  
Protect (no loss of Scheduled Ancient Monuments by 2011) and enhance the historic environment. The SA should include objectives for Conservation Areas.  
Policies should be developed that assist in determining the location of potentially polluting development. Ensure that SA includes noise, air quality, and water quality objectives.  
The SA should include objectives relating to the protection and enhancement of key open spaces within built up areas. |
### Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues to be considered in the LDF preparation</th>
<th>Key issues for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources from which key issues have been established, are included in Appendix A.

4.2 LIMITATIONS AND OUTSTANDING DATA

Implementation of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act has involved a wholesale review of the current planning system resulting in many updates to planning guidance, for example the gradual replacement of PPGs with PPSs. It will be important to keep track of changes in policy throughout the SA, keeping the process iterative and current.
5. **Baseline Information Applicable to the Borough**

5.1 **Documents and Bodies Consulted**

An extensive search for baseline information has been undertaken, using a range of sources including web-based databases and publications, personal communications, published reports and stored information. A list of data sources is provided in Appendix B.

5.2 **Baseline Information**

A summary of the baseline information currently available is presented in Table 2, below. The detailed baseline characterisation is included as Appendix C of this report. The information is representative of the current situation of Tunbridge Wells Borough.

The information included in Table 2 is not exhaustive. Research is an on-going process and will continue throughout the SA process. Where possible, more baseline information will be gathered to assist in the SA of the LDF. The source(s) of the baseline information are highlighted in bold text within Table 2.

It is important to note that baseline data is drawn from both current quantitative sources, where known, and also current qualitative data to provide a comprehensive baseline characterisation as detailed in ODPM guidance (September 2004).
### Table 2: Baseline Information Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | Borough population (Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft 2005): 104,000 people live in the Borough. | Mid-2003 estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census/ 1991 Census/ 2001 Census, National Statistics and KCC data: | • Population of the Borough has grown over the last 20 years but is predicted to decline slightly (0.3%) to 2021. | • LDF should ensure a sufficient mix of services to provide for the population.  
• The SA includes objectives for meeting local housing and service/ facility needs. |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • Population of the Borough (Census data 1991, 2001 and mid-2003 estimates)                                 |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • 104,000 people live in the Borough.                                                                       |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • Mid-2003 population estimates based on the adjusted 2001 Census predicted 104,600 people residing in the Borough. |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • 99,538 people lived in the Borough in 1991.                                                                |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • The Borough population grew by 5.2% between 1982 and 2002. It is predicted to decline slightly between 2001 and 2021 (by 0.3%). |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
|SOCIAL        | Demographics                                                              | • The population of the South East region grew by 10.5% between 1982 and 2002. Therefore, the population of the Borough has grown at approximately half the rate of growth experienced across the South East region as a whole. |                                                                                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                                                  |
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic split of males and females (Census data 1991, 2001 and mid-2003 estimates)</td>
<td>• Demographic split of males and females (Census data 1991, 2001 and mid-2003 estimates)</td>
<td>• 48.3% male / 51.7% female in Borough (2003). More females than males in the following age categories: up to 15 years, 16-24 years, 35-44 years, 45-59 years, and 65 and over. More males than females in the 25-34 years age category. Equal number of females and males aged between 60 and 64 years.</td>
<td>• 47.8% male / 52.8 % female in Borough (1991).</td>
<td>• No sustainability issue identified</td>
<td>• None – however demographics should continue being monitored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic profile (Census data 1991, 2001 and mid-2003 estimates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Age split in Borough (2003):</td>
<td>- Up to 15 years – 22,000</td>
<td>Between 1991 and 2003, the number of under 16 year olds grew by 1,900. The number of 16-64 year olds grew by 1,300. The number of people aged 65 and over decreased slightly. Overall, the population of the Borough grew by 3,100 over this period.</td>
<td>The number of people aged 0-44 years is set to decline between 2001 and 2021. The number of people aged 45 and over is predicted to increase in this period.</td>
<td>The LDF will need to respond to changing demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 16 – 64 years – 65,600</td>
<td>- 65 years and over – 17,000</td>
<td>Population projections to 2021 forecast a decline of 11.8% for under 16 year olds; a decline of 6.5% for 16-24 year olds; and a 20.5% decline in the number of 25-44 year olds. The number of 45-64 year olds is predicted to increase in this period by 16.1%; the number of 65-84 year olds is predicted to increase by 30.1% and people aged 85 and over are predicted to increase by 16.4%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are below average levels of young adults living in the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More females (10,000) living beyond retirement age than males (7,000) in Borough (2003)</td>
<td>• In 1991, there were 13,193 females of retirement age and over; and 6,285 males of retirement age and over in the Borough. Between 1991 and 2003, the total number of people of retirement age and over rose from 17,000 to 19,478.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is an increasing number of people of retirement age and over in the Borough. The number of females is higher and increasing when compared to males.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The LDF will need to respond to the needs of an ageing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</td>
<td>Comparators, Targets and Trends</td>
<td>Issue Identified</td>
<td>Implications for LDF/ SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic make up of the Borough (Census data 1991; 2001 and mid-2003 estimates)</td>
<td>In 2001, with regard to ethnicity, 97.6% of the Borough’s residents were White; 1% were of mixed origin; 0.7% were Asian; 0.2% were Black; 0.4% were Chinese and 0.3% were classed as belonging to another ethnic group.</td>
<td>In 1991, 98.7% of the Borough’s residents were White. No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.</td>
<td>No sustainability issues identified.</td>
<td>None – however demographics should continue being monitored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people claiming income support (Audit Commission Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators and Census data 2001)</td>
<td>In February 2005, there were 2,400 people claiming Income Support. 2% of Income Support claimants were aged under 20 in 2001.</td>
<td>In 1997, there were 5000 people claiming Income Support, in 1998 there were 5200; in 2000 there were 4600; in 2003 there were 4645. The number of 18 to 24 year olds claiming work-related benefits reduced by 40% between 1999 and 2004. The number of people who had been claiming work-related benefits for over 12 months fell by 11% between 1999 and 2004.</td>
<td>Favourable situation – the number of people claiming income support has fallen since 1997. Favourable situation - Number of 18-24 year olds claiming benefits has fallen. Favourable situation - Number of people claiming benefits for over 12 months has fallen.</td>
<td>The LDF should continue to promote wide ranging and adequate employment opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking of deprivation and employment</td>
<td>The Borough was ranked 233 least deprived out of 354 local authorities on the Income scale in the Indices of Deprivation 2004. The Borough was ranked 268 least deprived on the employment scale.</td>
<td>The Borough ranking cannot be compared to the national scale as the methodology and data used in both the Indices of Multiple Deprivation 2000 and the Indices of Deprivation 2004 studies were different.</td>
<td>The Borough performs very well in terms of deprivation in the County Context.</td>
<td>The LDF should monitor performance and provide positive opportunities for the most deprived areas within the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deprivation**

- **Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft 2005/ National Statistics:**
- **National Statistics:**
- **Number of people claiming Income Support:**
  - In February 2005, there were 2,400 people claiming Income Support.
  - 2% of Income Support claimants were aged under 20 in 2001.
- **Comparators, Targets and Trends:**
  - In 1997, there were 5000 people claiming Income Support, in 1998 there were 5200; in 2000 there were 4600; in 2003 there were 4645.
  - The number of 18 to 24 year olds claiming work-related benefits reduced by 40% between 1999 and 2004.
  - The number of people who had been claiming work-related benefits for over 12 months fell by 11% between 1999 and 2004.
- **Issue Identified:**
  - Favourable situation – the number of people claiming income support has fallen since 1997.
  - Favourable situation - Number of 18-24 year olds claiming benefits has fallen.
  - Favourable situation - Number of people claiming benefits for over 12 months has fallen.
- **Implications for LDF/ SA:**
  - The LDF should continue to promote wide ranging and adequate employment opportunities.
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative) Comparators, Targets and Trends Issue Identified Implications for LDF/ SA

- **Index of Local Deprivation (Quality of Life Counts, DETR)**
  - Pockets of deprivation do exist and the ward of Sherwood was ranked just outside the top 25% most deprived wards in the Country in 2004.
  - The ward of Sherwood and its performance in terms of deprivation cannot be compared to the figures supplied in the Indices of Deprivation 2000 as the ward boundaries have changed and Super Output Areas are demarked by different geographical boundaries.
  - The ward of Sherwood has been identified as one of the most deprived parts of the Borough.
  - The LDF should guide development within Sherwood to encourage vibrant communities and mixed use development, easy access to services and improved employment opportunities.

- **Indices of Multiple Deprivation (ODPM, 2004)**
- **Indices of Deprivation (ODPM, 2000)**
  - Overall, with regard to average score on the indices of deprivation in the Kent County Council area, the Borough was ranked 10th out of 12 local authorities. (Index of Multiple Deprivation, 2004)
  - In 2000 (Index of Deprivation, 2000), Tunbridge Wells Borough was ranked 10th out of 12 local authorities. Therefore, there is no change.
  - None
  - None

### Education and Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications at degree level or above (National Statistics/ Census data 2001)</td>
<td>In 2001, 24.3% of the population of the Borough had qualifications at degree level or higher.</td>
<td>The national average for degree-level qualifications or higher for the same year was 19.8%.</td>
<td>Past performance of the Borough cannot be established as this question was not asked in the 1991 Census.</td>
<td>Favourable situation - The educational level of the Borough’s residents is above average.</td>
<td>LDF should include policies to improve accessibility to a wide range of educational facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of people in the Borough with no qualifications (National Statistics/ Census data 2001)</td>
<td>• A high proportion of residents have very high skill levels. This masks those with low skill levels. In 2005, 38% of the Borough’s residents had no or low qualifications.</td>
<td>• 2001 and 2003 data are different and cannot be compared.</td>
<td>• Unable to identify situation. Due to lack of comparative data.</td>
<td>• Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In 2001, 22% of people in Tunbridge Wells Borough had no qualifications. This was lower than the 2001 national average of 29.1%</td>
<td>• A trend cannot be established between 1991 and 2001 as this question was not asked in the 1991 Census.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Records of violence against the person, robbery offences, burglary and sexual offences (Neighbourhood Statistics (NeSS)/ National Statistics)</td>
<td>• Within the Borough, from 2003 to 2004: 939 “Offences for Violence Against the Person”; 42 “Robbery Offences”; 329 “Burglary in a Dwelling Offences”; and 36 “Sexual Offences” recorded by the Police.</td>
<td>• The number of “Violence Against the Person” Offences has risen since 2000.</td>
<td>• Unfavourable situation – increasing violence (rate of increase greater than national average).</td>
<td>• LDF policies should promote opportunities to design out crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Within the Borough, the number of “Violence Against the Person” Offences has more than doubled between 2001/02 and 2002/03. There was a slight reduction in the number of offences in 2003/04. However, the figure still doubled that of 2001/02. Violence against the person offences rose by approximately one third during the same period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comparative data for Kent can be identified at present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative) Comparators, Targets and Trends Issue Identified Implications for LDF/ SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>No. of households (Census data 2001).</td>
<td>2001 Census: 42,700 households in the Borough (2001).</td>
<td>Housing Needs Survey 2000/ Kent County Council 2000/ 1991 Census: There were 39,159 households in the Borough in 1991. Therefore the total number of households has risen. There were 42,700 households in the Borough in 2001. The number of households is predicted to continue to rise to 44,200 by 2006 and to 45,600 by 2011. The number of single person households has increased since 1991. The number of married couple households has fallen since 1991.</td>
<td>The total number of households is rising. Increase in (single person) households and in the number of houses being built.</td>
<td>New development should ensure new development reflects appropriate type of housing. The LDF should try to accommodate demand for housing where possible to maximise social and economic benefits. The LDF will need policies to maximise the density of housing whilst avoiding adverse environmental effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>No. of housing completion figures (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).</td>
<td>There were 247 housing completions in 2001. There were 406 housing completions in 1991.</td>
<td>The number of housing completions has fluctuated between 1991 and 2001 with no observable trend, as housing completions are subject to market forces. However, there were less housing completions in 2001 (247) than in 1991 (406).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Average house prices (House Price Index ODPM, 2005: Housing Needs Assessment, 2005)</td>
<td>The average house price in the Borough in 2002 was £206,199. In 2004, it was £242,990 and in 2005, it is £276,830 (Halifax House Price Index 2005). The average house price in the UK in June 2005 was £184,152 (House Price Index – ODPM 2005). The average house price in the South East in 2005 was £205,000 (Halifax House Price Index 2005).</td>
<td>The average house price in the Borough is high, relative to average wages. It is considerably higher than the national figure and the figure for the South East. This is a considerable constraint for first-time buyers and low income earners.</td>
<td>The average house price in the Borough is high, relative to average wages. It is considerably higher than the national figure and the figure for the South East. This is a considerable constraint for first-time buyers and low income earners.</td>
<td>LDF policies should provide adequate numbers of affordable and key-worker housing in new developments. SA to include objective relating to provision of affordable houses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative) Comparators, Targets and Trends Issue Identified Implications for LDF/ SA

• Housing tenure Census data 2001). Housing tenure: -30.7% owned outright; -40.4% owned with a mortgage/loan; -0.61% rented from the Council; -15.21% rented from housing association or a registered social landlord; -9.58% rented from a private landlord or letting agency; and -3.06% were rented from another individual/ body.

• No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.

• High percentage of home owners

• None. However, housing tenure should continue to be monitored.

Health

• Number of people unfit for work (Benefits Agency, Department for Work and Pensions) In 1998, there were 2,300 people claiming Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disability Allowance.

• 2003: 2,570 people aged 16 to 65 years claimed Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance because they had been unable to work for at least 28 consecutive weeks because of illness or disability. Of these people, 13% were under the age of 30.

• There has been a gradual but continuous rise in numbers of people claiming Incapacity Benefit/Severe Disablement Allowance.

• The situation appears unfavourable, however the reason for this rise cannot be attributed to any specific cause.

• No apparent implications for the LDF.

• Percentage of residents with good health (Census data 2001). 2001: 72.9% of residents described their general health as being ‘good’.

• This cannot be compared to previous data as this question was not asked in the 1991 Census.

• Trend cannot be identified but statistics look favourable.

• Maintain provision of open space and leisure and recreation facilities.
## Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Percentage of residents with long-term illnesses (Census data 2001). | • 2001: 14.5% of residents living with long-term illness. | • 1991: 9.36% of residents living with long-term illness.  
• The number of residents living with long-term illness has increased. | • Unable to identify situation as the cause of ill health is unknown. | • Unknown. |

### ECONOMIC

#### Employment

|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| • No. of economically active people in the Borough (Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough 2004). | • 77% (73,840 people) of the Borough’s population is economically active. | • There were 52,500 economically active people in the Borough in 2003. 55% (29,000) of these were male and 45% (23,500) were female.  
• In 2001, there were 49,396 economically active people in the Borough.  
• There was a decline of 2.2% in the number of employees in the Borough between 1995 and 2000. | • There has been a rise in economically active people. | • Maintain and improve a wide range of employment opportunities and initiatives. |
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Employers by sector (Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough 2004) | • The largest employment sectors are retail, hotels and restaurant, with 15,400 jobs. | • Employment in primary industries declined between 1995 and 2003. Agricultural employment in the Borough declined by a third between 1995 and 2002.  
• 2.2% decline in employees between 1995 and 2003 in the Manufacturing, Transport & Communications and Public Administration & Health sectors.  
• Growth was experienced in the Distribution, Hotels & Restaurants sector and the Banking, Finance & Insurance sector between 1995 and 2003. | • Employment patterns are changing by industry. | • LDF to identify appropriate locations for a range of employment opportunities across different sectors. |
| • Average income (National Statistics). | • The average gross household income in the Borough is £24,589. | • The average household income in Kent is £23,946.  
• The national average household income of £20,500 | • The average household income in the Borough is greater than the county and national averages. | • Although high, the average household income in the Borough is a constraint for purchasing houses. The LDF should provide for affordable housing. |
| • Percentage unemployment (National Statistics and Census data 2001) | • In 1991, unemployment in the Borough was 4.1%.  
In 2002, unemployment in the Borough was 1.4%. | • Unemployment rates in the Borough rose from 4.1% in 1991 to 6.5% in 1993 and have since fallen (to 1.4% in 2003). | • Favourable situation – unemployment is falling. | • None |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of agricultural businesses could lead to a loss of low-skilled, local jobs, increasing pressure on travel and skills matching opportunities.</td>
<td>• LDF to maintain and provide opportunities for local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The tourist industry generates significant investment. It contributed £153.9m to the Borough’s economy in 2003.</td>
<td>In 2000, tourist expenditure for all visitors to the Borough was £124.8m</td>
<td>• Favourable situation – tourist expenditure in the Borough has increased.</td>
<td>• SA should contain an objective to protect tourist assets, whether they are historic, environmental, leisure or cultural.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>No. of SAMs (English Heritage/ Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>LDF + SA should protect and where possible, enhance this finite resource.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Grade I + Grade II Listed Buildings (English Heritage/ Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>Over 3,000 Listed Buildings.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>LDF and SA should protect and enhance cultural assets and their settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Conservation Areas (English Heritage/ Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>25 Conservation Areas.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>LDF and SA should protect and enhance cultural assets and their settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Historic parks and gardens (English Heritage/ Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>14 sites on English Heritage’s ‘Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England’.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>N/A.</td>
<td>LDF + SA should protect and enhance these designated sites and their settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The A21 trunk road is the major north-south road corridor for traffic accessing Royal Tunbridge Wells.</td>
<td>The A21 has become very congested between Tonbridge and Royal Tunbridge Wells at peak periods.</td>
<td>Unfavourable situation due to road traffic congestion at peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road traffic in Royal Tunbridge Wells in particular has risen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupancy rates for off-street car-parks have reached approximately 90% of capacity in Royal Tunbridge Wells.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Subject Indicator Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                 | Number of households without a car *(Census data 2001)*                   | • In 2001, 18.7% of households in the Borough did not have a car.                                             | • The national figure in 2001 for households without a car was 26.8%. The Borough figure is below the national figure.  
  • In 1991, 23.4% of households in the Borough did not have a car  
  • The number of households in the Borough without a car has decreased. | • Car ownership in the Borough has increased since 1991  
  • Residents in the Borough have a higher level of car ownership than the National average. | • LDF should improve public transport facilities and cycling and walking facilities to encourage travel choice. |
|                                 | N/A                                                                       | • There are good rail services from Royal Tunbridge Wells to Tonbridge and London.                           | • Facilities for cycling and public transport are poor and have resulted in the comparatively low usage of public transport services. | • Unfavourable situation – low level of public transport use.                                             | • LDF should improve public transport facilities and encourage travel choice.                             |
| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna    | N/A                                                                       | • Over 70% of the Borough is designated as part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). | • N/A                                                                                                                                               | • The High Weald AONB is a large environmental asset, located across much of the Borough.                 | • LDF should maintain, enhance and complement this area.                                                  |
|                                 | **Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002/English Nature Website (Reports and Statistics)** |                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                      | **SA will require objectives relating to countryside and biodiversity.**                                        |                                                                                                                                                                      |
**SA Scoping Report, Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</th>
<th>Comparators, Targets and Trends</th>
<th>Issue Identified</th>
<th>Implications for LDF/ SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of SSSI in favourable condition</td>
<td>(English Nature)</td>
<td>• 10 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</td>
<td>Area of designated land (SSSIs) has increased across the country, however, the percentage of sites in a favourable condition decreased from 59% in 2000 to 56% in 2002 and to 54% in 2005.</td>
<td>• Meet Government’s Public Service Agreements to bring 95% of England’s SSSIs into favourable or recovering condition by 2010.</td>
<td>• SA to protect, maintain and enhance SSSIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In 2005, 54.5% of SSSI’s in favourable condition, 0.5% unfavourable recovering; and 1.09% unfavourable no change. (Data is based on the area of all SSSI in the Borough in favourable etc condition as a % of the total area of SSSI’s in Borough).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of designated sites</td>
<td>(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>• 17 Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 Local Nature Reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. and percentage of Ancient Woodland</td>
<td>(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>• There are 25 known areas of Ancient Woodland in the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of tree Preservation Orders</td>
<td>(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>• 410 Tree Preservation Orders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ancien[t woodland is irreplaceable and requires special protection and careful management.</td>
<td>• LDF should seek to ensure no further loss and preserve and enhance existing designated sites. • LDF should encourage further designations in the interests of nature conservation and biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Open Space</td>
<td>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Baseline Data (Quantitative and Qualitative)</td>
<td>Comparators, Targets and Trends</td>
<td>Issue Identified</td>
<td>Implications for LDF/ SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         | • Amount of open space and recreational facilities (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council) | • There are 44.9 hectares of gross play space within the Borough.  
• There are 115 hectares of youth and adult space  
• Deficiencies in open space and recreational facilities. | • The 115 ha (1.1 ha per 1,000 pop) of youth and adult space within the Borough falls below National Playing Field Association Standards. | • Deficiencies of recreation open space within the Borough, when compared to National Playing Field Association standards. | • LDF to promote quality, quantity and accessibility to open space and recreational facilities. |
|         | • N/A | • Topography and land ownership limit further provision. | • N/A | • N/A | • None. |
|         | • N/A | • Southborough has the lowest provision of open space at 0.6 hectares per 1000 of the population. | • Figure in 1996 plan for Southborough was 0.6 hectares per 1000 of the population | • This provision remains the same since 1996. | • LDF should seek to improve the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space, particularly in the worst affected areas across the Borough |
|         | • N/A | • 19 residential areas within Royal Tunbridge Wells do not have reasonable access to equipped area of play. | • No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend. | • Poor access to equipped area of play and inadequate provision. | • As above. |
| Land and Soil | Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002: | • Agricultural Land is predominantly arable and of Agricultural Land Classification Grade 3 quality.  
• Some areas of Grades 2 and 3a quality agricultural land. | • N/A | • N/A | • If agricultural land is required for potential development, lower quality agricultural land should be used. |
### Ground contamination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Land Register (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>Hectares of contaminated land (currently under research).</td>
<td>None at present. The BVPIs are new for this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV216a - Number of ‘sites of potential concern’ [within the local authority area], with respect to land contamination (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td>Contamination may be present on sites such as redundant gas works, petrol stations, railway land and landfill sites. 1100 individual sites identified as requiring further investigation.</td>
<td>No sites have been formally declared as contaminated land under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The remediation of sites is being achieved via the development control process. There are a large number of sites that require further investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV216b - Number of sites for which sufficient detailed information is available to decide whether remediation of the land is necessary, as a percentage of all ‘sites of potential concern’ (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• LDF to include policies that encourage the reuse and remediation of brown field sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Air Quality

- Development and implementation of an Action Plan (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).
- Air quality monitoring and modelling data (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).

- 1 Air Quality Management Area is to be designated in October 2005 covering the A26 through Southborough and into Tunbridge Wells.
- Link to air quality review and assessment home page [http://212.24.85.90/MAS/media_SB/viewSite?requestType=viewPage&siteId=233&pageId=4217](http://212.24.85.90/MAS/media_SB/viewSite?requestType=viewPage&siteId=233&pageId=4217).
- 2 further AQMA proposed by the Borough Council.

- Nitrogen Dioxide levels have increased and there is now the potential for the national annual mean air quality objective to be exceeded along the A26.
- Unfavourable situation – potential for declining air quality.

### Water Resources

- Percentage of public water drawn from groundwater (Environment Agency).

- 80% of Kent’s public water supply is drawn each year from groundwater.
- Water abstraction has increased and has given rise to a progressive depletion in base flows and water tables in the County.

- Unfavourable situation – depletion of County’s water resources.
- LDF to consider how it can input into increasing efficiency of water usage and waste water.
### SA Scoping Report, Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>River quality</strong> (Environment Agency Southern Regional Office)</th>
<th><strong>94% of the Borough’s watercourses can be regarded as good or fair quality.</strong></th>
<th><strong>No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unable to identify situation.</strong></th>
<th><strong>SA objective to maintain and improve the water quality of the Borough’s rivers.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 2000 and 2002, Barden Mill Stream Tributary was classed as a grade B (good quality) water course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LDF should avoid locating heavily polluting industry near watercourses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 2000 and 2022, Somerhill Stream was classed in chemical terms as a grade B (good quality) water course, however in biological terms it was assessed as being of grade F (very poor) quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Flooding</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Environment Agency Southern Region Flood Risk Maps.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Principal areas at high risk of flooding - Paddock Wood, Five Oak Green and Lamberhurst.</strong></th>
<th><strong>The SA Framework includes an objective on climate change, greenhouse gases and risk from flooding.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unable to identify situation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Waste</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of landfill sites (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council/Environment Agency).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The transport of waste to Essex will result in indirect environmental impacts and is not sustainable over the long term.</strong></td>
<td>The LDF should ensure include policies to maximise reduction, re-use and recycling, where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>There are currently no landfill sites, within the Borough, with waste being transported to Essex.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No previous data available therefore not able to identify trend.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The SA Framework will need to include an objective relating to waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **82a** 1% of household waste recycled *(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).* | **82b** 1% % of household waste composted waste recycled *(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).* | **21%** of household waste in the Borough was recycled / composted in 2002/03. The figure for 2003/04 was 24.5% and in 2004/05 it was 32.1%. | The percentage of household waste recycled or composted within the Borough is rising.  
This exceeds the statutory target set by Central Government of 20% recycled or composted household waste by 2003/04 and 30% by end of 2005/06. | Favourable situation – amount of recycling/composting is in the upper quartile but pressure to increase rates further and provide facilities for recycling wider range of materials, including plastics. | LDF policy should seek to ensure that new developments incorporate Neighbourhood recycling facilities and reflect the developing Regional and County waste strategies with regard to processing facilities for recycled materials. |
5.3 LIMITATIONS AND OUTSTANDING DATA

The baseline data collected at this stage is intended to provide an overview of the sustainability issues faced by Tunbridge Wells Borough. This data will be updated, where appropriate, as the production of LDDs including the Core Strategy, continues. Trends were not available in all cases due to lack of available data. In many cases studies are not repeated, and consequently provide only ‘snapshot’ information. In some cases, archiving, data storage and management have meant that the retrieval of data relevant to the baseline has not been possible at this stage. During the assessment process, if the baseline data needs to be expanded, further research and / or studies will be undertaken as relevant.

The requirement to monitor the sustainability of the LDF in the long-term (Section 3.1 – Standard Methodology) will provide further relevant and detailed baseline information suitable for use in subsequent SAs.
6. **Key Sustainability Issues in Tunbridge Wells Borough**

Key sustainability issues for the Borough have been identified following a review of the planning documentation and baseline information and are described below.

### 6.1 Economic

The economy of Tunbridge Wells Borough has been classed by the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) as advanced, high cost, high income. It is supported by a strong workforce. The numbers of retired and permanently sick or disabled people in the Borough are below national averages. Employment rates are high and make a contribution to the labour market in London, also attracting in-migration. The average gross household income in Tunbridge Wells Borough in 2000 was £24,589 per year compared with a national household income, which averaged £20,500 in the same year. However the local average conceals wide differences: over 60% earn less than the average figure which is inflated by the smaller proportion of very high salary earners, and over 10% of households have no earned income at all. Future development needs to provide wide-ranging and adequate employment opportunities to meet the Borough's needs, and ensure that net out-migration does not increase as a result of a lack of suitable job opportunities.

A net loss of economic floor space ('employment land') occurred in the Borough between 1998 and 2003. The Borough's narrowing economic base is also of note, with an increasing amount of employment being service sector based. Loss of floor space; general economic change in the Borough, including the reduced profitability of agriculture and its subsequent decline; the major restructuring of the financial services sector, resulting in the loss of major employers in Royal Tunbridge Wells; and the conversion of employment land/ premises into housing, due to the greater investment return; have all been identified as contributors to the narrowing economic base of the Borough.

Growth has occurred in relatively low-paid service industry jobs, including in retail and restaurants, which has required people to travel into the Borough as residents of the Borough are generally highly skilled. There is the potential for the Borough to become a 'dormitory', with a limited range of local employment and where people live in the Borough but work elsewhere.

The tourist industry is significant in terms of the investment and employment that it generates. The area forms part of the 'Garden of England' and much of the countryside falls within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Future development needs to facilitate the provision of a wide range of leisure opportunities in accessible locations throughout the Borough to encourage the full use of leisure time and contribute to raising the standard of health of the Borough's residents. Both leisure tourism and business tourism are essential elements of the commercial infrastructure of the Borough, and any future development must be sustainable.

### 6.2 Social

Tunbridge Wells is a Borough of high housing demand, limited housing supply and high costs. This situation is likely to get worse if the regional economy in the South East continues to overheat. There is a limited supply of land, particularly in view of the fact that a high percentage is under some category of protective planning designation. The combination of higher salaries (particularly for those working in London) and limited land availability results in increased house prices, which are beyond the affordability, in terms of renting or purchase, for many people. Future development needs to concentrate on providing affordable housing and smaller dwellings.
Within the Borough, Royal Tunbridge Wells shows the most significant deficiencies in open space and recreational facilities. 19 residential areas within Royal Tunbridge Wells do not have reasonable access to equipped area of play. This shortage of open space needs to be addressed if sustainable communities are to be achieved. Existing open space should be retained wherever possible despite the limited supply of land of the Borough.

The Borough’s positive key social issues include low levels of crime and deprivation, high levels of educational achievement, and good level of health experienced by residents. These trends should be maintained and continued.

6.3 ENVIRONMENTAL

The Borough has a diverse and distinctive landscape. More than 70% of the Borough is covered by the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The skylines in the area are significant in establishing the character of the Borough and the relationship of buildings, roof lines, trees and related spaces play a key role in establishing the character of the built up area. A large proportion of the Borough remains as rural, undeveloped land, which constitutes a vast resource for agriculture, leisure, nature conservation and other countryside activities. Around 30% of this land is incorporated in the Green Belt. Future development should seek to protect the landscape, nature conservation interests and rural character of the Borough, whilst ensuring that the rural population is not marginalised in terms of employment and service provision.

Whilst limited in quantity, the archaeological remains in the Borough make an important contribution to the understanding of the area’s history. Tunbridge Wells Borough has a rich architectural heritage. There are 25 Conservation Areas and more than 3,000 Listed Buildings in the Borough. As one of its most valuable assets, the direct and indirect impacts of development on cultural heritage within the Borough must be carefully considered. Similarly, opportunities to encourage and develop the educational, recreational or tourist potential of cultural assets through development should be encouraged.

With regard to biodiversity, there are currently 10 designated SSSIs within the Borough and 4 Local Nature Reserves. The Borough supports extensive areas of woodland, a large number of which are of ancient origin, together with numerous small woodlands, copses, hedgerows and individual trees. The Borough also supports a wealth of native species, many of which are protected under European and national legislation. It is therefore important that future development looks after existing biodiversity and that every opportunity is taken for protection and enhancement.

About 80% of Kent’s public water supply is drawn each year from groundwater. Whilst Kent is self-sufficient in water supply, increases in abstraction have given rise to a progressive depletion in base flows and water tables in the County. Over-abstraction threatens the sustainability of water supplies and can harm wetlands and surface water habitats. Development needs to take place within this context and should only be permitted in locations where an adequate water supply can be provided without harming groundwater resources. The Borough contains areas at high risk of flooding. This needs to be considered with regard to flood risk and the location of future development.

There are no landfill sites within the Borough and at present waste is transported to Essex. 21% of household waste in Tunbridge Wells Borough was recycled or composted in 2002/03. This figure rose to 24.5% in 2003/04. This exceeds the statutory target set for this Council by Central Government of 20% recycled or composted household waste by 2003/04. Future development must continue to support the minimisation of waste production.

An Air Quality Management Area is to be designated in October 2005 covering the A26 through Southborough and in to Tunbridge Wells. The more recent Detailed Assessment of air quality, undertaken in April 2004, has shown that there are some higher levels of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2) in certain areas of the Borough. These raised levels are related to the high traffic levels and congestion along the A26 London Road in Southborough, Grosvenor Road and the A264 Mount Ephraim/A26 London Road junction.
Future development should prevent any further increases in pollution levels in order to conserve the natural environment and the quality of life of residents. Where possible, it should seek to improve air quality in AQMAs.

The A21 forms the major north-south road corridor for traffic accessing Royal Tunbridge Wells and considerable congestion is experienced on the A21 between Tonbridge and Royal Tunbridge Wells at peak periods. There are reasonable rail services from Royal Tunbridge Wells to Tonbridge, Sevenoaks and London but in general there is a comparatively low provision and usage of public transport services and poor facilities for cycling and public transport. There is particular concern regarding the volume of traffic, forecast growth, peak hour congestion and delays, the impact of traffic on the local environment and limited parking opportunities in Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough. Occupancy rates for off-street car parks in Royal Tunbridge Wells have reached approximately 90% of capacity. Future development must aim to minimise the need to travel by private car by enhancing public transport provision and sustainable transport options. Planning should reinforce reduced reliance on the private car through ensuring that housing, employment and public facilities/services are located so as to encourage walking, cycling and public transport.
7. **The Sustainability Appraisal Framework**

7.1 **Introduction**

The following section presents the SA Framework, through which the LDF will be assessed. The SA Framework may be amended as a result of consultation and as the baseline information resource expands and the SA progresses.

In accordance with best practice, the objectives, sub-objectives and indicators are derived from the Integrated Regional Framework - A Better Quality of Life in the South East (SEERA, 2004) and the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Consultation Draft of the South East Plan (ERM, 2005). There are some changes and these reflect the requirement to tailor regional SA objectives to the Borough level and in particular to address the key sustainability issues for the Borough of Tunbridge Wells.

The economic, social and environmental SA objectives and indicators are presented in Table 3 below. The following notes are applicable:

- In some cases, the dates of the references supplied with indicators refer to the date of origin as opposed to the date the information was collected. For the majority of indicators, information is collected annually;

- Some themes have indicators that are potentially very accurate, such as unemployment figures. Other themes such as leisure and recreation may have considerably less quantitative indicators, due to their more subjective nature;

- When establishing monitoring programmes in the future, it may not be applicable to use all of the indicators listed, but rather selecting those which are of most relevance or accuracy; and

- Whilst the indicators provided will respond directly to the key objectives, they may not address all of the sub-objectives.
## Table 3: The Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objective / Sub-Objective</th>
<th>Indicators and source where known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent, sustainably constructed and affordable home</strong></td>
<td><strong>• Affordable housing (house price/ earnings affordability ratio) (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Will it increase the amount of housing across the Borough to meet local needs?</td>
<td><strong>• Housing completion figures (TWBC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Will it increase the supply of affordable housing both in numbers and as a proportion of total housing stock?</td>
<td><strong>• Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Will it reduce the percentage of unfit/non-decent homes in the Borough?</td>
<td><strong>• Availability of decent housing for all social groups including low-income households, lone parent households, ethnic minorities, disabled and young people (Information should be collated from organisations listed on Tunbridge Wells Housing Register)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Will it ensure the provision of housing to serve the needs of rural areas?</td>
<td><strong>• EcoHomes ratings for all new residential development (BRE and TWBC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Will it promote the adoption of sustainable design and construction practices in housing (e.g. energy/water/land/materials efficiency, incorporation of biodiversity/natural assets etc)?</td>
<td><strong>• Access to a hospital (Source unknown)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Will it promote the development of mixed communities through a range of housing sizes, types, tenures and levels of affordability to reflect changes in population?</td>
<td><strong>• Proportion of journeys on foot or by cycle (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To improve the health and well-being of the population &amp; reduce inequalities in health</td>
<td><strong>• Participation in sports and cultural activities (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Will it promote healthy, active lifestyles through the protection and provision of facilities and locations of sporting/recreational activities (e.g. playing fields, sports facilities, cycleways, footpaths etc)?</td>
<td><strong>• Access to a GP (DETR Indices of Deprivation, 2000)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Will it promote informal recreation through access to the countryside?</td>
<td><strong>• Access to the countryside (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To reduce poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td><strong>• Unemployment rates by Ward (KCC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Will it promote or support employment opportunities across the Borough for the most deprived wards?</td>
<td><strong>• Proportion of children under 16 who live in low-income households (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Percentage of population of working age who are claiming key benefits (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>• Deprivation indices by Ward (KCC)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Objective / Sub-Objective

#### 4. To raise educational achievement across the Borough and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the lifetime skills needed to find and remain in work and support the long term competitiveness of the Borough

4.1 Will it increase opportunities for education/ training for everyone?

4.2 Will it increase opportunities to improve the level of basic skills and/ or information/ communication technology?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators and source where known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Household income in rural areas (Source unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number and quality of schools (KCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion of 19 year olds with Level 2 qualifications (5 GCSEs A*-C or NVQ equivalent) (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of further education (KCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of population of working age (16 to 64/59) with qualifications to either NVQ Level 1/2 equivalent, NVQ Level 3 or 4 or a trade apprenticeship or with no formal qualifications (DTI Business Competitiveness Indicators (Unitary/Local Authority/Learning and Skills Council areas/NUTS areas))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion of adults with poor literacy and numeracy skills (Learning and Skills Council)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. To reduce crime and the fear of crime

5.1 Will it reduce crime or fear of crime through good urban design measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators and source where known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Level of crime (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fear of crime (Local Quality of Life Counts (DETR, July 2000)) (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. To improve accessibility to all services and facilities, including employment, education, health services, shopping, green space, culture, leisure, recreation (CLR) facilities and a sustainable tourism sector

6.1 Will it offer opportunities for participation in CLR activities by tourists and local people?

6.2 Will it provide support for CLR providers?

6.3 Will it promote mixed-use development with good accessibility to local facilities and services (e.g. employment, education, health services, shopping, leisure, green spaces, culture etc), that reduce the need to travel?

6.4 Will it ensure that facilities and services are accessible to all communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators and source where known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number, quality and accessibility of leisure and recreation facilities (TWBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity of facilities to public transport nodes (Kent County Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Numbers of tourists visiting the Borough (TWBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessibility of Natural Green Space (TWBC/English Nature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Objective / Sub-Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings, including re-use of materials from buildings, and encourage urban renaissance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Will it ensure the provision of new development, including conversions on previously-developed land, as opposed to greenfield sites (in line with the sequential approach) and through conversion of existing buildings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Will it encourage the reuse of materials in construction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Will it require good design to create attractive, high quality environments where people will choose to live work and/or spend leisure time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings, including re-use of materials from buildings, and encourage urban renaissance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Will it ensure the provision of new development, including conversions on previously-developed land, as opposed to greenfield sites (in line with the sequential approach) and through conversion of existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Will it encourage the reuse of materials in construction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Will it require good design to create attractive, high quality environments where people will choose to live work and/or spend leisure time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators and source where known

- Percentage of new housing development on previously developed land *(Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))*
- Housing density of new developments *(TWBC)*
- Vacant land and properties and derelict land *(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))*
- Number and amount of floorspace of rural buildings converted to employment per annum. *(Employment Land Survey KCC)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. To reduce pollution (to land, air and soil) and maintain and improve the water quality of the Borough’s rivers, and to achieve sustainable water resources management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Will it promote more sustainable transport patterns in all areas, particular those of low air quality (e.g. AQMAs)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Will it try to ensure that national air quality strategy objectives are not breached?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Will it promote compliance with river ecology standards needed to meet the requirements of the EU Water Framework Directive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Will it stabilise per capita consumption (PCC) of water at current levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Will it ensure water supply and demand are in balance to maintain security of supply, where appropriate by providing new water resource infrastructure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Will it separate polluting development away from sensitive receptors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 Will development be designed so it is less likely to cause pollution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 Will it prevent inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators and source where known

- Number of days of air pollution *(Local Quality of Life Counts (DETR, July 2000))*
- Number of days per year when air pollution is moderate or higher *(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))*
- Concentrations of NO₂ in AQMAs *(TWBC)*
- Concentrations of selected air pollutants *(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))*
- Population living in AQMAs *(TWBC)*
- Rivers of Good or Fair chemical and biological water quality *(Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))*
- Per capita consumption (PCC) of water *(South East Water/ Mid-Kent Water)*
- Number of incidents of major and significant water pollution *(Environment Agency Southern Regional Office)*
- Capacity during ‘critical periods’ to supply water without the need for restrictions *(IRF)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Will it require that development proposals are guided by ‘climate proofing’ principles (to allow an increase in use of renewables energies in the future)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions from domestic, commercial or industrial sources?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators and source where known

- Emissions of greenhouse gases from energy consumption, transport and land use and waste management *(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))*
- CO₂ emissions by sector and per capita emissions (tonnes per year) *(Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))*
### Key Objective / Sub-Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.3 Will it prevent an increased risk of flooding?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Energy use (gas and electricity) <em>(Local Quality of Life Counts (DETR, July 2000))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Energy use per household <em>(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)) (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002 – 2003))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas of flood risk <em>(Environment Agency Southern Region Flood Risk Maps)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. To conserve and enhance the Borough’s biodiversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Will it protect, enhance and restore the Borough’s national and local designated sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extent and management of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) <em>(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of SSSI in favourable condition <em>(English Nature)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extent of ancient woodlands in the Borough <em>(Kent Habitat Survey 2003)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Net change in natural/ semi natural habitats <em>(Local Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Native species at risk <em>(Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)), especially protected species/ those listed in the Local BAP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of Local BAP targets <em>(KCC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area of designated Local Nature Reserves <em>(TWBC)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the Borough’s countryside and historic environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1 Will it significantly affect the quality of landscapes, in the Countryside or in more urban settings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Condition of the High Weald AONB <em>(Kent High Weald Project)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land covered by management schemes i.e. designated sites including AONB, SSSIs, Local Natures Reserves and Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest <em>(TWBC/ English Nature/ or appropriate management body)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of Grade I and II Listed Buildings <em>(TWBC/ English Heritage)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of Conservation Areas which have been subject to a character appraisal or its review within the last 5 years <em>(TWBC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in areas covered by a Conservation Area as loss and gain <em>(TWBC)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments or historic parks and gardens, and their settings <em>(TWBC/ English Heritage)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Objective / Sub-Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12. To improve travel choice and to reduce the need for travel, particularly by car/lorry to reduce road congestion. 12.1 Will it promote more sustainable travel, particularly in areas with high congestion? | • Number of buildings at risk as a percentage of all Listed Buildings (TWBC)  
• Access to and the use of the countryside (Source unknown)  
• Proportion of travel by mode (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)) |
| 13. To reduce the impact of resource consumption by using sustainably produced and local products and reducing waste generation and disposal. 13.1 Will it promote the use of sustainably-sourced, and recycled, materials in construction and renovation? 13.2 Will it increase efficiency in water (e.g. water meters), energy and raw materials use? 13.3 Will it increase prevention, re-use, recovery and recycling of waste? 13.4 Will it promote sustainable waste management practices through the provision of a range of appropriate waste management facilities? 13.5 Will it reduce use of non-renewable resources? 13.6 Will it increase use of renewable energies? | • Percentage of new house build and conversions meeting EcoHomes Very Good standard (Building Research Establishment/ TWBC)  
• Percentage of new commercial buildings meeting BREEAM ‘Very Good’ standard (Building Research Establishment/ TWBC)  
• Household waste recycling (TWBC)  
• Percentage of the total tonnage of all types of waste (municipal solid waste, construction and demolition and industrial) that has been recycled, composted, used to recover heat, power and other energy sources, and landfilled (KCC/ TWBC) |
| 14. To increase energy efficiency, and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources in the Borough 14.1 Will it increase efficiency in energy use? 14.2 Will it provide for the establishment of renewable energy developments? 14.3 Will it promote the incorporation of small-scale renewables (e.g. photovoltaic cells and Combined Heat and Power Plants) in developments? | • Energy use per capita (Kent Energy Centre/ Kent Renewable Energy Network)  
• Average energy efficiency of housing stock (TWBC)  
• For new development, installed capacity for energy production from renewable sources (TWBC) |
| 15. To ensure high and stable levels of employment so everyone can benefit from the economic growth of the Borough 15.1 Will it provide employment opportunities that match the skills of the local workforce? | • Proportion of people of working age who are in work (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)) (Audit Commission, Voluntary Quality of Life Indicators (Definitions Handbook, Audit Commission, 2002-2003))  
• Number of jobs in the Borough (KCC)  
• Unemployment rates (Census data)  
• Socio-economic profile of the resident economically active population (under investigation)  
• Proportion of young people (18-24 year olds) in...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objective / Sub-Objective</th>
<th>Indicators and source where known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the most deprived areas in full time education (Index of Local Deprivation (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To stimulate and sustain economic growth and competitiveness across the Borough</td>
<td>GVA per capita (Office for National Statistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1 Will it maintain / increase the opportunities for local employment across the Borough?</td>
<td>Percentage increase or decrease in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area (VAT Registrations, Office for National Statistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of people, in the most deprived area, of working age unemployed (Index of Local Deprivation (Quality of Life Counts (DETR, December 1999)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net changes in B1/A2/B2 and B8 Floorspaces (annual decisions monitoring TWBC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO: SPECIFIC INFORMATION RELATING TO INDIVIDUAL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DOCUMENTS

This part of the Scoping Report consists of sections 8 to 14, which detail for each of the first tranche of LDDs:

- Further specific information regarding planning background and the LDD context;
- Key sustainability issues specific to the LDD;
- Key objectives for each specific LDD;
- An outline of the options to be considered; and
- Considerations for the SA Framework.

Where there are no specific details available or limitations in information regarding the LDDs, this is clearly stated. Finally, section 15 outlines the proposed SA Report structure.

8. CORE STRATEGY DPD

8.1 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Core Strategy will set out the vision and spatial strategy for the Borough, with regard to the Tunbridge Wells Borough Community Plan 2003 – 2011 and any new issues arising from the review of the Community Plan, which will take place during 2006.

The Core Strategy will have to be in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy, national Planning Policy Guidance/Planning Policy Statements and, when adopted, the Kent and Medway Structure Plan, which is saved for three years from adoption (or until such time as the South East Plan is adopted - whichever is the earlier).

All other DPDs and SPDs will conform with the Core Strategy.

Various studies are being undertaken, which will provide an evidence base to help inform the objectives that should be in the Core Strategy. These studies include: -

- Local Housing Needs Assessment;
- Open Space, Sports Needs and Recreational Assessment, and Playing Pitch Assessment;
- Retail Study Update;
- Urban Capacity Study Review;
- Employment Land Study; and
- Hotel Needs Study Update.
8.2 Key Sustainability Issues

Due to the nature of the Core Strategy, there are unlikely to be any additional sustainability issues, to those identified in Part 1 of the Scoping Report, specific to this DPD.

8.3 Objectives of the DPD

Many of the strategic policies in the Core Strategy will be spatial policies, rather than land-use policies, because they will be influenced by the RSS, Community Strategy and other local strategies and initiatives. However, most of the major long-term commitments and initiatives underpinning the current development plan will remain in place.

The Core Strategy will set out the long-term spatial vision for the Borough up to 2017 and the strategic policies and proposals required to deliver this vision. There are a number of objectives for the DPD: -

• Identify broad locations for housing and other strategic development needs such as employment and retail;
• Include long-standing strategic land-use policies such as Green Belt;
• Protect the unique high-quality built and natural environmental character of the area from inappropriate development;
• To ensure that all types of development are well designed;
• Protect or enhance the vitality and viability of town, neighbourhood and village centres;
• Protect or enhance community facilities;
• Ensuring sufficient infrastructure to support development;
• To locate development where it will provide the opportunities for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, recreation and other services in locations which minimise the need to travel or are accessible or could be made accessible by a range of travel options; and
• To conserve finite non-renewable resources such as land, energy, water, soil and air quality.

8.4 Outline of Options

Options cannot be outlined until further information has been obtained from data gathering and consultation. Options for the DPD will become apparent as the process develops.

8.5 Considerations for the SA Framework

The Core Strategy will be assessed against the entire SA Framework as presented in Part One, Section 7.
9. CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL SPDs

9.1 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The need for Conservation Area Appraisals (CAAs) is set out in statute, planning policy guidance and best practice. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out key duties – e.g. the need to review area for Conservation Areas and bring forward enhancement proposals.

PPG15 and English Heritage guidance advises that this is best practice and Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) 219 measures the percentage of conservation areas with an up-to-date character appraisal. CAAs will provide local planning authorities with a useful planning tool against which planning applications can be assessed.

9.2 KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

A generic approach to the SA scoping report has been taken, although it is recognised that individual conservation areas may have more specific local issues, which will be identified as part of each CAA. By its very nature a CAA focuses on the historic built environment and associated landscape.

9.2.1 Economic

In rural Conservation Areas, the issue is often one of maintaining local shops and services whereas in urban areas the issue is often more to do with protecting environmental capital and maintaining a balance.

The image of the area could be improved through enhancement. Through the Conservation Area Appraisal itself, this should improve the perception of the area as a business location and for tourism potential.

9.2.2 Social

It will be important to maintain a range of local facilities to meet the needs of the community. CAAs can help to renew interest in heritage by promoting civic pride and helping to strengthen identity.

9.2.3 Environmental

There is often pressure for development and erosion of character as well as a need to address neglect in some areas. CAAs will help to highlight key issues and promote actions for enhancement.

9.3 OBJECTIVES OF CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL SPDs

There are a number of objectives for the CAA SPDs:-

- To define key elements and features that contribute to the special character or appearance and which should be conserved;

- To record those principal elements that detract from the character or appearance and opportunities for enhancement;
To review boundaries of the conservation area;

To provide a basis for making sustainable decisions about its future through planning decisions and through management plans; and

To inform other key agencies, residents etc. whose activities impact on the conservation areas.

9.4 OPTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE SA FRAMEWORK

This section sets the context for CAAs generically. The following options derived from the Goudhurst and Kilndown CAA will be considered. In this instance the ‘do-nothing’ scenario is not relevant as the Council are required to carry out a CAA under current legislation.

**Option 1 – Appraisal to minimum requirements.**

An assessment is carried out of the special interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Areas merely to comply with the minimum requirements of the legislation (i.e. no detractors identified and CAA not adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) to the Local Plan or upcoming LDF).

**Option 2 – Detailed Appraisal Adopted as SPD**

Prepare a detailed CAA (including detractors and opportunities) that is adopted as SPD to the Local Plan/upcoming LDF after public consultation. The CAAs add value to planning policies and become material considerations in development control decisions and can influence other detailed policies and actions including enhancements.

**Option 3 – Detailed Appraisal Adopted as SPD with Enhancement Action Plan.**

Prepare a detailed CAA (including detractors, opportunities and targeted enhancements to the CAs) that is adopted as SPD to the Local Plan/upcoming LDF after public consultation. In addition to Option 2 the CAA would include a programme of targeted enhancements and direct actions.

The most relevant SA objectives for all CAAs are likely to be SA objectives 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 16.
10. BENENDEN PRIMARY SCHOOL ALLOCATION DPD

10.1 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

A case is acknowledged by Kent County Council (KCC) for the replacement of Benenden Church of England Primary School. Currently, the school functions on a split site and the main building is substandard. KCC has confirmed their support for funding the new school in the period from 2006/7 to 2007/8. As a result, TWBC is now charged with preparing a DPD to deliver a site specific allocation within the LDF, and on the Proposals Map, which will denote the preferred location of the new school site. In addition, TWBC is responsible for site selection and evidence gathering to support such a choice. It is the role of the SA process to assess the options (i.e. the sites) that have, and are going to be, considered. The SA will assess each site using the SA Framework and look to identify potential social, economic and environmental effects associated with each site. This information will assist in making the final decision.

For further information, there are certain parameters which must be met in order to put a site forward as an option and they are summarised below:

- It must satisfy the standards set out in Department of Education and Skills (DfES) and KCC Guidance and should seek to address any specific site needs that achieve consensus through the community engagement during the preparation of the DPD and can be funded;
- The site must meet modest future expansion needs to allow for a 7-class one-form entry school;
- As a Church of England Primary School, any redevelopment should enable strong links with the Church to be maintained; and
- It must satisfy TWBC planning requirements.

10.2 KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

10.2.1 Social

If the school is converted, there should be the potential to enhance the rural community by the provision of additional housing in the vacated premises. To strengthen the potential for community cohesion, the shared use of facilities should be pursued in principle, either through new provision in the school being made available for community use or the school using existing facilities that would otherwise be under-utilised, where suitable and appropriate. As a Church of England Primary School, any redevelopment should enable the strong links with the Church should be maintained.

10.2.2 Economic

Any new school provision should meet the educational needs of the catchment population of Benenden in a way that maintains the vitality of the rural community, including the villages in the catchment area. The location of the school, if linked closely to other facilities including shops will give the opportunity to support existing provision.
10.2.3 Environmental

The local area has significant and important characteristics that should be conserved and enhanced by any development. The existing school comprises two Listed Buildings.

Any potential negative impacts from development should be minimised and any identified impacts on recognised environmental assets should be mitigated or compensated for.

10.3 Objectives of the DPD

Subject to confirmation of that need, there are a number of objectives for the DPD are to:

- Conserve and enhances the character or appearance of the local environment;
- Minimise impacts on, and mitigates or compensates for any impacts on, recognised environmental assets;
- Maintain the vitality and viability of the rural community; and
- Achieve sustainable, high quality building(s) that enhance(s) local character and respect(s) their context.

10.4 Outline of Options

For the purposes of this DPD, the options will be sites identified through preparation and early engagement with stakeholders. In addition, and in accordance with ODPM Guidance, the do-nothing scenario will be tested and has been added to the list below:

- Do Nothing – i.e. do not allocate a site for a new school;
- Allocate a site for a new school.

10.5 Considerations for the SA Framework

The most relevant SA objectives will be numbers 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17. In particular, the development on the preferred site should conserve and enhance biodiversity, improve travel choice, be built to a high level of sustainable design and increase energy efficiency.
11. Recreation Open Space SPD

11.1 Planning Background and Context

This SPD will address the provision of recreation and open space in the Borough, arising from new residential development. It will refer to space allocated for sport, active recreation and children’s play. Recreation open space should be large enough in size to support these activities. It should be easily and safely accessed by users.

The SPD is primarily intended to supplement policies R2, R3 and R4 in the Local Plan Review. As part of the SA process, baseline information was collected on recreation open space and used to identify the key sustainability issues described below.

11.2 Key Sustainability Issues

11.2.1 Economic

The deficiency of recreation and open space in many parts of the Borough may have implications for the economy. Incoming residents will place a burden on the existing recreation open space provision in the Borough, which is deficient in many areas. This could lead to a reduction in the quality of life. New housing development will need to ensure that an adequate supply of high quality accessible recreation open space is provided if the Borough is to maintain its competitiveness and remain a desirable location.

11.2.2 Social

There is a recognition that open space and opportunities for sport and recreation are fundamental in delivering the government’s wider objectives for social inclusion and healthy lifestyles, including provision for children and younger people. Sport and recreation have a valuable social as well as an economic role. It is important that existing deficiencies in recreation open space provision are not exacerbated, particularly with regards to the quality of recreation open space.

11.2.3 Environmental

There is a recognition that high quality recreation open space will contribute to the landscape and townscape quality. The careful location of recreation open space, that does not infringe on environmental assets such as designated sites, will allow the overall provision to be increased without any detrimental effects.

It will, however, be important to ensure that sustainable access by all will be provided to ensure use by a broad spectrum of the public and to avoid further traffic-related problems.

11.3 Objectives of the SPD

There are a number of objectives for the SPD:

1) To ensure that a consistent approach is taken towards the provision of recreation open space;

2) To ensure recreation open space is integrated into, or in close proximity to, residential areas.
11.4 Outline of Options

The broad options that have been considered so far are:

- To ‘do-nothing’; or
- To increase the commuted sum sought to help manage and improve recreation open space.

11.5 Considerations for the SA Framework

The most relevant SA objectives will be numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12. As a result, the key issues that will need to be explored and assessed in detail will relate to improving the health of the population, improving accessibility, conserving biodiversity and avoiding adverse traffic-related effects due to inappropriate siting.
12. Alterations and Extensions SPD

12.1 Planning Background and Context

The document will aid clarity on a number of policies in the Local Plan Review 2005, particularly Policy EN1 on the Control of Development. It will include guidance on amenity and design issues. Key Sustainability Issues

12.1.1 Economic:

The built environment plays a key role in the economic success of the Borough by making it an attractive place to live, work and visit.

12.1.2 Social:

Housing need in the Borough is changing. The SPD will need to allow dwellings to adapt to changing needs.

12.1.3 Environment:

The SPD will promote quality and sustainable design and conservation. Adaptation of the existing dwelling stock may protect the countryside including the green belt.

12.2 Objectives of the SPD

There are a number of objectives for the SPD:

1. To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the local environment and maintain local distinctiveness;

2. To encourage design quality which minimises impact on the environment, particularly in sensitive areas;

3. To facilitate the best use of land;

4. To encourage sustainable construction practices;

5. To protect residential amenity of neighbouring properties; and

6. To maintain a safe and secure environment.

12.3 Outline of Options

Options cannot be outlined until further information has been obtained from data gathering and consultation. Options for the SPD will be developed and assessed in the next stage of the SA process.
12.4 Considerations for the SA Framework

It is too early in the process to ascertain the implications for the SA Framework. However, on-going evidence gathering and consultation will assist in this. It is likely that SA objective numbers 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 16 will be of most importance in developing the most sustainable option to take forward.
13. ROYAL VICTORIA PLACE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF SPD

13.1 PLANNING BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The SPD will set out the planning principles for the expansion of the Royal Victoria Place Shopping Centre and the policy framework for bringing forward a planning application for the development of the site. Policies in the Local Plan Review that are relevant to the area to be covered by the SPD, and which will be saved following adoption of the Plan in 2006, are set out below:

Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan Review – Second Deposit Copy:

- Policy CR5 (a) – Mixed Use Allocation, Royal Victoria Place
- Policy TP1 – Large Scale Non-residential Development
- Policy TP4 – Access to the Road Network
- Policy TP7 – Tunbridge Wells Central Parking Zone (Commercial)
- Policy CS6 – Retention of Community Buildings
- Policy EN1 – Design and Other Development Control Criteria
- Policy EN4 – Demolition in Conservation Areas
- Policy EN5 – Development in Conservation Areas

The Royal Victoria Place shopping centre opened in 1992 and is situated in the northern part of the Primary Shopping Area, in the town of Royal Tunbridge Wells. Shops are situated on two floors, together with a food-court at basement level. Expansion of the shopping centre, as envisaged by Local Plan Review Policy CR5 (a), is likely to involve the redevelopment of existing buildings at the corner of Calverley Precinct and Camden Road and at Ely Court. Also, the Market Square, within which a small open market operates on two days of the week, is likely to be redeveloped. There may also be scope to rationalise or redevelop the existing Community Centre and Church at the north-eastern end of the centre.

According to the Shopping Study Update of 2003, Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre contains approximately 100,225 square metres of retail floorspace. 82% of this comprises premises providing ‘comparison goods’; 18%, comprises food i.e. ‘convenience goods’. Within ‘comparison goods’, the centre contains a diverse retail sector.

13.2 KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

13.2.1 Economic

The range, scale and quality of retail, leisure, cultural and tourist facilities provided at Royal Tunbridge Wells makes it an important sub-regional centre and destination. A substantial need for additional comparison retail floorspace exists within Royal Tunbridge Borough, which should be located in Royal Tunbridge Wells, to protect the town’s position as a sub regional shopping centre for the community, and
to ensure the continued success of the local economy. New development should be located within the town centre in preference to edge of centre or out-of-centre locations.

Royal Victoria Place opened during the economic recession of the early 1990s. It contributed to the initial fall, and the subsequent stabilisation, of rent levels in Royal Tunbridge Wells. The centre is one of the main locations for non-food related i.e. ‘comparison goods’ shopping. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has identified scope for new retail floorspace in the vicinity of Royal Victoria Place, as well as in other parts of Royal Tunbridge Wells, including land on, or in the vicinity of, Mount Pleasant Road.

13.2.2 Social
The town centre acts as a social focal point for a wide area. In order to ensure that it continues to fulfil this role, it is necessary for needs to be identified and, where possible, shortfalls in facilities to be addressed.

As well as retail and ancillary uses, there is a community centre and church within the area covered by the Local Plan Review mixed use allocation. These facilities contribute to the social function of the town centre.

13.2.3 Environmental
Road congestion is a key issue in Royal Tunbridge Wells. This has implications on the environment including the reduction of air quality. TWBC has proposed an Air Quality Management Area along the A26. This will need to be taken into consideration in the SPD as expansion/ development of Royal Victoria Place should avoid contributing to this problem through traffic generation.

Development of the shopping centre will also need to consider the Royal Tunbridge Wells Conservation Area. It is important that any expansion does not adversely impact upon the character of the Conservation Area.

13.3 Objectives of the SPD

There are a number of objectives for the SPD:

1) Ensure that significant and appropriately configured retail floorspace is provided, within a mixed-use development, to enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, thereby retaining its role as a sub-regional centre and reducing pressure for out of centre development;

2) Provide an alternative location for the outdoor market and either retain the existing community buildings or secure alternative provision at a suitable location;

3) Integrate the development with the surrounding townscape, through appropriate scale, massing, design, materials and pedestrian movement;

4) Secure a high quality of design, befitting the Royal Tunbridge Wells Conservation Area, and encouraging sustainable design and construction methods; and

5) Ensure safe and sustainable transport provision is made to serve the site.

13.4 Outline of Options

Acceptable development of this allocation may take various forms – there will not be a single design solution. In order to avoid being over-prescriptive, the purpose of the Development Brief will be to interpret the planning policy background to assist achievement of the broad planning objectives.
Broad options have been identified for a number of key issues as follows:

- **Amount of retail floorspace** – options are:
  1) To secure the minimum requirement of 13,000 sq m (as envisaged would be provided in the Local Plan Review) but no more than this;
  2) To exceed this marginally; or
  3) To exceed this significantly (but not by more than total provision required from town centre sites to meet Borough wide need of 23,500 sq. m – i.e. this figure minus out of town commitments).

- **Amount of on-site non-operational parking** – options are:
  1) No on-site parking but provision for off-site parking and improved links to other transport modes;
  2) Some on-site parking and provision for off-site parking and improved links to other transport modes; or
  3) On-site parking to meet all requirements of the new development.

- **Scale and massing** – options are:
  1) A tight building envelope, which does not exceed height/depth of existing buildings on this site;
  2) A medium building envelope which allows some increase in height/depth over existing built form; or
  3) A loose building envelope, which allows significant increase in height/depth over existing, built form.

- **Community Centre and Church** – options are:
  1) Retainment in-situ;
  2) Relocation within RVP development envelope; or
  3) Relocation outside the allocation.

- **‘Do Nothing’ option** – please note: the Development Brief is about the delivery of an allocation in a soon-to-be-adopted Local Plan and therefore is not perceived as a ‘practical’ alternative.

### 13.5 Considerations for the SA Framework

Due to the scale, proposed location and objectives of the development brief, it will be important to assess the options carefully against the SA Framework. In particular, SA objective numbers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. The scope of the SA is widened with the Royal Victoria Place SPD due to numerous economic and social issues that need to be assessed along with town centre environmental constraints such as traffic, the conservation area and setting.
14. **AFFORDABLE / KEY WORKER HOUSING SPD**

14.1 **PLANNING BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

This SPD will provide guidance on requirements for affordable housing on general market sites throughout the Borough and guidance on bringing forward rural exceptions housing schemes adjacent to the small rural towns and villages in the Borough.

Affordable housing is defined as low cost market and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenures, ownership or financial arrangements) that will be available to local people who cannot afford to meet their housing needs on the open market.

The SPD is intended to supplement Policies H3 and H9 in the Local Plan Review.

14.2 **BASELINE INFORMATION**

Baseline information is available on local affordable housing need from the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Housing Needs Survey (2000) on the extent, general location and type of household in need. This survey is being updated and will be available from September 2005 to inform the SPD. The Borough wide survey will be supplemented by local Parish based needs surveys, where the provision of a rural exceptions scheme is being considered.

14.3 **KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES**

14.3.1 **Social**

The deficiency of affordable housing in the Borough, would, if allowed to continue, mean that a significant proportion of local people would not be able to access a decent and affordable home to meet their needs. Insufficient affordable housing could lead to communities becoming unbalanced, as younger people are forced to move away in search of accommodation. Villages in particular would be likely to become homogenous commuter or retirement settlements, lacking in vitality and variety of social activity. Key workers needed to perform essential jobs such as in teaching, healthcare and other public services would not be attracted to the area.

14.3.2 **Economic**

The high cost of housing in the Borough is a problem for the recruitment and retention of key workers in public services. However, other local employers also have problems recruiting staff. Since their presence is central to the health and well being and future prosperity of the community, provision of affordable housing is essential to prevent future skills shortages.

14.3.3 **Environment**

Provision of an element of affordable housing on market sites is unlikely to have any additional environmental consequences over and above general housing development.

An adequate supply of affordable housing for those in local employment will reduce the need for workers to undertake long commuting journeys, with resulting benefits in reducing congestion on roads and public transport; air quality and sustainable development patterns. In the case of rural exceptions housing, there may be some impact on landscape, biodiversity and habitats, but this offers the possibility of reduced
travel for those employed locally. Affordable housing can be used as examples of good practice in good quality and sustainable design and construction.

14.4 **Objectives of the SPD**

There are a number of specific additional objectives for the SPD:

1. To encourage provision of affordable housing for local people and key workers on rural exception sites; and
2. To provide advice to developers and affordable housing providers on how affordable housing will be negotiated and provided on eligible sites.

14.5 **Outline of Options**

There are a number of options for the SPD:

- To do nothing;
- To provide SPD as a guide to procedures and facilitate the provision of affordable housing; or
- To provide guidance on preferred mix of tenure types and types of affordable dwelling to be achieved on all eligible sites and which best reflect needs identified in the current local housing needs assessment.

14.6 **Considerations for the SA Framework**

The provision of affordable/ key worker housing is essential from a sustainable development perspective. The options above that will be tested will need to demonstrate that they need to perform well in achieving SA objective numbers 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.
15. **SA Report Structure**

A provisional SA Report structure has been developed and is outlined in Table 4, below.

**Table 4: Provisional SA Report Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of SA Report</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summary and Outcomes                             | • Non-Technical Summary  
• How to comment on the report                     |
| Appraisal Methodology                            | • SA approach  
• When the SA was carried out and by whom  
• List of who was consulted and how they were approached |
| Background                                       | • Rationale behind the SA  
• The purpose of the SA Report  
• Report contents  
• Compliance with the SEA Directive/ Regulations |
| Sustainability objectives, baseline description and context | • Links to other plans, programmes and strategies and sustainability objectives  
• Baseline context  
• Difficulties and limitations in obtaining baseline data  
• The SA Framework including objectives, targets and indicators  
• Key economic, social and environmental issues identified through the review of relevant documents and baseline information |
| DPD / SPD issues and options / Plan policies     | • Main strategic options considered and how they were identified;  
• Comparison of the social, environmental and economic effects of the options;  
• How social, environmental and economic issues were considered in choosing the preferred options;  
• Other options considered, and why these were rejected;  
• Significant social, environmental and economic effects of the preferred policies  
• Proposed mitigation measures |
| Implementation - Proposals for monitoring        | • Links to other level plans and programmes and the implications at the project level (including Environmental Impact Assessment)  
• Proposals for monitoring. |
GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

For the purpose of this report the following terms and definitions apply:

Affordable Housing: Housing that is available to those whose housing needs are not met through the normal operation of the housing market by reason of cost. It may include housing for sale or rent.

AONB: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act (1949), and along with National Parks they represent the finest examples of countryside in England and Wales.

AQMA: Air Quality Management Area - An area identified by Local Authorities where statutory UK air quality standards are being, or are expected to be breached up to the end of 2005.

Aquifer: A below ground, water bearing layer of soil or rock. Major aquifers tend to yield large quantities of water and are often used for public water supplies. Minor aquifers yield relatively high quantities of water which can be used for local and industrial supplies. Non-aquifers do not yield significant quantities of water and are rarely used for water supply.

BRE: Building Research Establishment.

Brownfield Site: A piece of previously developed land or buildings that is abandoned or underused and often environmentally contaminated, especially one considered as a potential site for redevelopment. Such redevelopment reduces pressure for the development of green field sites.

BVPI: Best Value Performance Indicator – a national measure of performance set by Central Government.

CLR: Culture, leisure, recreation.

Conservation Area: An area designated under the Planning (Listed Buildings And Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as being of special architectural or historic interest, the character and interest of which it is desirable to preserve and enhance.


DETR: Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions.

DPD: Development Plan Document – A Local Development Document which forms part of the statutory development plan, including the Core Strategy, Proposals Map and Area Action Plans.

DTI: Department of Trade and Industry.

Green Belt: Green Belt is undeveloped land which has been specifically designated for long-term protection. It is a nationally important designation. Green Belt land exists to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land free from development.

LDD: Local Development Document – comprising two types, Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents, which together form the Local Development Framework.

LDF: Local Development Framework – the portfolio of Local Development Documents which sets out the planning policy framework for the district.

LDS: Local Development Scheme - a three year project plan setting out the Council's programme for the preparation of Local Development Documents, reviewed annually in the light of the Annual Monitoring Report.

Listed Building: A building included on a list of buildings of architectural or historic interest, compiled by the Secretary of State, under the Planning (Listed Buildings And Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

LSC: Learning and Skills Council.

LTP: Local Transport Plan.

ODPM: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

PCC: Per capita consumption (of water).

PPG: Planning Policy Guidance - Guidance documents which set out national planning policy.

PPS: Planning Policy Statement – Guidance documents which set out national planning policy. They are being reviewed and updated and are replacing PPGs.
### Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPG</td>
<td>Regional Planning Guidance – Guidance prepared by the Government Office for the South East in March 2001. This will be replaced by the Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategies – Guidance documents which set out regional planning policy. They are being reviewed and updated and are replacing RPGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal – A process by which the economic, social and environmental impacts of a project, strategy or plan are assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Ancient Monument</td>
<td>A nationally important archaeological site included in the Schedule of Ancient Monuments maintained by the Secretary of State for the Environment under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement – sets out the Council’s vision and strategy for the standards to be achieved in involving the community and stakeholders in the preparation of all Local development Documents and in decisions on planning applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Strategic Environmental Assessment - systematic method of considering the likely effects on the environment of policies, plans and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document – a Local Development Document which is part of the Local development Framework but does not form part of the statutory development plan. SPDs elaborate upon policies and proposals in a Development Plan Document or ‘saved’ policies and include development briefs and guidance documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Guidance – guidance which elaborates upon policies and proposals in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNCI</td>
<td>Sites of Nature Conservation Interest are small and isolated pockets of undisturbed habitat, which can link fragmented Sites of Special Scientific Interest – see below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSI</td>
<td>Site of Special Scientific Interest - The best sites for wildlife and geological features in England as designated under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWBC</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A  PLANNING POLICY REVIEW

International Policy

The following international documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- EU Habitats Directive 92/43/EC;
- Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change;
- The Convention on Biological Diversity (1992);
- Directive 2000/60/EC Establishing a Framework for the Community Action in the Field of Water Policy (The Water Framework Directive);
- Directive 96/62/EC on Ambient Air Quality and Management;
- The Johannesburg Declaration of Sustainable Development (2002);
- European Spatial Development Perspective (1999);
- Waste Framework Directive (91/156/EEC);
- Environment 2010 Our Future Our Choice (EU Sixth Environment Action Programme);
- European Sustainable Development Strategy; and
- European Biodiversity Strategy.

National Planning Policy

The following national planning documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- Securing the Future: The Government’s Sustainable Development Strategy (2005);
- PPS 1 – Creating Sustainable Communities;
- PPG 2 – Green Belts;
- PPG 3 – Housing;
- PPG 4 – Industrial, commercial development and small firms;
- PPS 6 – Town Centres and Retail Developments;
- PPS 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas;
- PPG8 – Telecommunications;
- PPS 9 (Draft) – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation;
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- PPS 12 – Local Development Frameworks;
- PPG 13 – Transport;
- PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment;
- PPG 16 – Archaeology and Planning;
- PPG 17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport, and Recreation;
- PPG 21 – Tourism;
- PPS 22 – Renewable Energy;
- PPS 23 – Planning and Pollution Control;
- PPG 24 – Planning and Noise;
- PPG 25 – Development and Flood Risk;
- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended);
- Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW);
- England Forestry Strategy (Forestry Commission, 1999);
- ‘Working with the Grain of Nature’: A Biodiversity Strategy for England (2002);
- Our Energy Future – Creating a Low Carbon Economy (2003);
- Climate Change: The UK Programme (2001);
- Air Quality Strategy: Working Together for Clean Air (2000);
- The Historic Environment: A Force for Our Future (2001); and

Regional Planning Policy

The following regional planning documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- Regional Planning Guidance, RPG 9 (2001);
- Regional Spatial Strategy, The South East Plan (2005);
- Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Consultation Draft of the South East Plan (2005);
- Integrated Regional Framework, A better quality of life in the south east (2005);
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- A Better Quality of Life in the South East – Regional Sustainable Development Framework (2001);
- Regional Transport Strategy (2003);
- Sustainable Communities in the South East (2003);
- South East Regional Housing Strategy (2004);
- Regional Economic Strategy for South East England (2002);
- State of the Environment Report, South East (2003);
- Seeing the Wood for the Trees, the Forestry and Woodlands Framework for the South East (2004); and
- The Cultural Agenda (2002).

County Documents

The following local planning documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- Kent Structure Plan (1996);
- Kent Local Transport Plan (2001);
- Kent Design A Guide to Sustainable Development (2005);
- The Strategic Framework for Sport in Kent 2003-2008;
- Kent Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (2005);
- The Deposit Kent and Medway Structure Plan (Local Economic Development Strategy) 2003;
- Education Development Plan (2002/7);
- Community Strategy, Vision for Kent (2002);
- Kent Countryside 2000 Report;
- Kent Environmental Strategy; and
- Kent Biodiversity Action Plan.

Sub-County Documents

The following local planning documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- West Kent Area Investment Framework; and
High Weald AONB Management Plan 2004 – A 20 year strategy.

Local Documents

The following local planning documents were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- Tunbridge Wells Local Plan (1996);
- Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy (2002);
- Tunbridge Wells Local Development Scheme (2005);
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Transport Strategy (2003);
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Summary Crime Audit and Community Safety Strategy (2005 – 2008);
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Community Plan 2003-2011;
- Environmental Strategy 2005 – Tunbridge Wells Borough Council;
- Heath Plan for the Borough of Tunbridge Wells; and
## INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

### EU Habitats Directive 92/43/EC (European Union, 1992)

**Why it is relevant**

The EC Habitats Directive requires Member States to maintain or restore natural habitats of European importance at a ‘favourable conservation status’ so as to preserve biodiversity.

**Key objectives and targets**

Maintain or restore in a favourable condition designated natural habitat types and habitats of designated species listed in Annexes I and II respectively of the Directive. If a project compromising one of these habitats must proceed in spite of negative conservation impacts due to it being in the public interest, compensatory measures must be provided for.

Linear structures such as rivers/streams, hedgerows, field boundaries, ponds, etc., that enable movement and migration of species should be preserved.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Accept the primacy of nature conservation objectives, and clearly take note of these designations in setting SA objectives and defining options in the LDF.

### Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change (United Nations, 1997)

**Why it is relevant**

The Protocol strengthens obligations of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It presents a legally binding commitment for industrialised countries to collectively reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by at least 5% (of 1990 levels) by 2008-2012.

**Key objectives and targets**

Achieve a reduction in anthropogenic CO₂ levels to at least 5% below 1990 levels by 2012. Consider afforestation and reforestation as carbon sinks.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Ensure all reasonable opportunities are taken forward to encourage development which is energy efficient and reduces reliance on private cars.

### The EC Directive on the Conservation of Wild Birds 79/409/EEC (European Community, 1979)

**Why it is relevant**

The Directive outlines a framework for the conservation and management of European wild birds. Member States determine the legal mechanisms through which to implement this. In the UK, this is achieved through several statutory and non-statutory methods including the UK Biodiversity Action Plan, and wild bird monitoring programmes.

**Key objectives and targets**

Imposes duty on Member States to sustain populations of naturally occurring wild birds by sustaining areas of habitats in order to maintain populations at ecologically and scientifically sound levels.
## Implications for the LDF and SA

The SA should consider the effects of local developments on European protected bird species.

### The Convention on Biological Diversity, Rio de Janeiro (United Nations, 1992)

#### Why it is relevant

The Convention outlines three main goals for the conservation, protection and enhancement of biological diversity; the conservation of biological diversity, its sustainable use, and the equitable sharing of benefits associated with genetic resources. National strategies and action plans must be implemented by Contracting Parties to achieve these goals.

#### Key objectives and targets

Article 6a requires each Contracting Party to develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

SA should consider biodiversity impacts within its objectives. It should take a holistic view of ecosystems rather than a focusing on ‘islands’ of protected species.


#### Why it is relevant

The Directive establishes a framework for the protection of inland surface waters (rivers and lakes), transitional waters (estuaries), coastal waters and groundwater. Its purpose is to ensure all aquatic ecosystems and terrestrial ecosystems and wetlands reach ‘good status’ by 2015.

#### Key objectives and targets

Requires all Member States to achieve ‘good ecological status’ of inland water bodies by 2015, and limits the quantity of groundwater abstraction to that portion of overall recharge not needed by ecology.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Surface water run off from paved surfaces and built up areas can cumulatively pollute watercourses. SA should include objective on water quality/quantity.

SA should consider the capacity of groundwater areas to support new development without harming connected ecological systems.

### Directive 96/62/EC on Ambient Air Quality and Management (European Union, 1996)

#### Why it is relevant

The Directive provides a framework for producing daughter-directives and limit values for a range of pollutants, assessing the concentrations of these and for the management of air quality to prevent exceedances.

#### Key objectives and targets

Establishes mandatory standards for air quality and sets limits and guides values for sulphur and nitrogen dioxide, suspended particulates and lead in air.
### Implications for the LDF and SA

The location of new developments should take into account any emissions caused by new transport links (and new ‘need’ to travel), along with emissions from new industry. SA will include objectives for air quality.

### The Johannesburg Declaration of Sustainable Development (World Summit on Sustainable Development, 2002)

#### Why it is relevant

The Johannesburg plan of implementation includes a political declaration by Heads of State and sets new targets and timetables for action. A partnership agreement between governments, the private sector and the civil society was also achieved.

#### Key objectives and targets

Undertake to strengthen and improve governance at all levels, for the effective implementation of Agenda 21.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

None

### European Spatial Development Perspective (European Union Ministers for Spatial Planning, 1999)

#### Why it is relevant

The Perspective sets out principles for sustainable spatial development in Member States.

#### Key objectives and targets

European cultural landscapes, cities and towns, as well as a variety of natural and historic monuments are all part of the European Heritage. Its fostering should be an important part of modern architecture, urban and landscape planning in all regions of the EU.

A big challenge for spatial development policy is to contribute to the objectives, announced by the EU during international conferences concerning the environment and climate, of reducing emissions into the global ecological system.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF could influence the historic environment in several ways, including the ambience of historic structures and features.

The SA should include objectives for Conservation Areas and reducing Carbon Dioxide emissions.


#### Why it is relevant

### Key objectives and targets

Article 4.
Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that waste is recovered or disposed of without endangering human health and without using processes or methods which could harm the environment, and in particular:
- Without risk to water, air, soil and plants and animals.
- Without causing a nuisance through noise or odours.
- Without adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

LDF should consider these impacts when deciding on locations for waste disposal or processing.
This would feed into SA objectives for noise, air, landscape, and biodiversity.

### Environment 2010: Our Future, Our Choice - EU Sixth Environment Action Programme (European Union, 2001)

**Why it is relevant**
The Programme outlines priority environmental issues to be addressed by Member States.

**Key objectives and targets**
Recognises that land use planning and management decisions in the Member States can have a major influence on the environment, leading to fragmentation of the countryside and pressures in urban areas and the coast. Also includes objectives on stabilising greenhouse gases, halting biodiversity loss, reducing pollution and resource use.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**
SA should include objectives on minimising production of greenhouse gases, halting biodiversity loss, reducing pollution and resource use.

### European Sustainable Development Strategy (European Union, 2001)

**Why it is relevant**
Completing and building on the Lisbon strategy, the ESDS focuses on a small number of problems which pose severe or irreversible threats to the future well-being of European society.

**Key objectives and targets**
Strategy states that decoupling environmental degradation and resource consumption from economic and social development requires a major reorientation of public and private investment towards new, environmentally-friendly technologies.
Intention is to provide catalyst for policy-makers and public opinion for the future as a driving force for institutional reform, changes in corporate and consumer behaviour. Clear, stable, long-term objectives.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**
LDF/AAP should reflect European and national desire to decouple environmental impacts and social issues from economic growth.
SA objectives should consider issues identified at the European level which may be particularly relevant to Tunbridge Wells Borough.
## European Biodiversity Strategy COM (98)42 (European Commission, 1998)

### Why it is relevant
The Directive addresses biodiversity loss and the role of spatial planning in conserving this natural resource within Member States.

### Key objectives and targets
Intended to reverse present trends in biodiversity reduction or losses and to place species and ecosystems, including agro-ecosystems, at a satisfactory conservation status, both within and beyond the territory of the European Union (EU). Strategy aims to anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of significant reduction or loss of biodiversity at source through the integration of environmental policies into key policy areas at the regional level and through spatial planning.

### Implications for the LDF and SA
- LDF should emphasise desire to halt biodiversity losses and to seek enhancement where possible.
- SA should include objectives on maintaining and enhancing biodiversity through the preservation of existing designated sites (particularly when in conflict with allocated development areas) and general criteria based policy.

## NATIONAL POLICY


### Why it is relevant
This is a review of the original sustainable development strategy of 1999. It contains principles, priorities and indicators relating to sustainable development in the UK.

### Key objectives and targets
The new objectives included within the strategy are:
- Living within environmental limits;
- Ensuring a strong healthy and just society
- Achieving a sustainable economy
- Promoting good governance

Using sound science responsibly.

### Implications for the LDF and SA
The aim of the plans should reflect the first three objectives of the strategy and these should form the basis for the SA objectives for the plan.

### PPS 1 – Creating Sustainable Communities (ODPM, 2005 – Government Policy document)

### Why it is relevant
The document sets out the key policies and principles and the Government’s vision for planning. It includes high-level objectives and sets out the framework for specific policies further developed in the thematic Planning Policy Statements which will substitute the current PPG documents.
### Key objectives and targets

Sustainable development is the purpose of planning. Communities need to be actively involved in the planning process, which is not simply regulations and control but must become a proactive management of development.

These overarching objectives inform specific objectives such as promotion of urban and rural regeneration, of local economies, of inclusive, healthy and safe communities.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Local Authorities should consider how their plans are addressing the four pillars of sustainable development by including relevant sustainability objectives both for the plan and the SA. The four core aims of sustainable development are:

1. Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;
2. Effective protection of the environment;
3. Prudent use of natural resources; and
4. Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth.


**Why it is relevant**

PPG 2 outlines Government policy on green belt land and will have an effect on the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans.

**Key objectives and targets**

There should be a general presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This includes the construction of new buildings unless exempted under para. 3.4 of the guidance note.

When any large scale development or redevelopment occurs within the Green Belt, it should contribute towards the objectives provided in para. 1.6 of the guidance note.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Objectives pertaining to the openness of landscape in greenbelt and the protection of biodiversity (habitat connectivity implications) will be included within the SA.

The LDF should include policies to protect the greenbelt limiting exceptions and windfall sites.


**Why it is relevant**

PPG 3 outlines Government policy on housing and will have an effect on the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans.

**Key objectives and targets**

Plan to meet the housing needs of the whole community, consider mixed used developments and prioritise redevelopment of brownfield sites. Place the needs of the people before ease of traffic movement.

Additional housing should be well designed and should be focused in towns and cities.
### Implications for the LDF and SA

| SA should recognise and include objectives tackling social exclusion. |
| The SA objective for townscape should emphasize the presumption towards brownfield developments. |
| The LDF must help to implement PPG3 and could, for example, include a policy seeking affordable housing in appropriate developments. |


| Why it is relevant |
| PPG 4 outlines Government policy on industrial/commercial development and will have an effect on the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans. |

| Key objectives and targets |
| Guidance on the provision in planning for economic development married to respect for the environment. |
| Industrial and commercial developments are vital for the wealth of an area but need to be carefully placed so to minimise dependency of businesses and customers from road transport and integration with existing and planned transport and housing developments and plans. |
| Encourage new developments in locations which minimise the length and number of trips, especially by motor vehicles. |
| Encourage new development in locations that can be served by more energy efficient modes of transport. |
| Discourage new development where it would be likely to add unacceptably to congestion. |
| Locate development requiring access mainly to local roads away from trunk roads, to avoid unnecessary congestion on roads designed for longer distance movement. |

### Implications for the LDF and SA

| The LDF should seek to make beneficial use of previous industrial areas which are currently under-used or vacant. |
| The LDF should seek to separate polluting activities from sensitive areas such as housing, hospitals or schools. |

### PPS 6 – Town Centres and Retail Developments (ODPM, 2005 – Government Policy document)

| Why it is relevant |
| PPS 6 outlines Government policy on development within towns and out of town locations. It will influence the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans. |

| Key objectives and targets |
| Adopt a town centre first sequential approach to development. |
| To promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment. |
| Encouraging town centre development will promote their vitality and viability, and will enhance consumer choice with a wide provision of shopping, leisure and local services to meet the needs of the whole community; |
| To ensure development is accessible by a range of means of transport, and to encourage a cleaner, safer, greener town centre environment; |
| To promote social inclusion by encouraging investment in disadvantaged areas to provide improved services and more employment opportunities; |
| To promote high quality and inclusive design and make efficient use of land in town centres to deliver more sustainable development. |
### Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF should promote the vitality of town and village centres whilst increasing accessibility and reducing social exclusion.

### PPS 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (ODPM, 2004 – Government Policy document)

**Why it is relevant**

PPS 7 outlines Government policy on sustainable development in rural locations and will therefore effect the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development documents.

**Key objectives and targets**

Requires that development within existing villages should be permitted where it meets local economic and community needs, where it maintains or enhances the environment and does not conflict with other policies.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Ensure the LDF is coordinated with rural transport service plans.

SA Objective to include ‘local needs met locally’.


**Why it is relevant**

PPG 8 outlines Government policy and will influence the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans with regard to telecommunications.

**Key objectives and targets**

The Government's policy is to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. The Government also has responsibility for protecting public health.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The plan needs to ensure that is includes the right mix of policies to balance the competing demands of industry, health concerns and the environment.

The LDF should include policies which restrict the positioning of telecommunications masts near locations which are sensitive in terms of human health. Policies should ensure adequate screening to avoid adverse visual impacts.


**Why it is relevant**

PPS 9 outlines Government policy relating to biodiversity and geological conservation and will have an effect on the content of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council’s development plans.
**Key objectives and targets**

Plan policies and planning decisions should be based upon up-to-date information about the environmental characteristics of their areas and seek to maintain, or enhance, or add to biodiversity and geological conservation interests.

Plan policies on the form and location of development should take a strategic approach to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geology, and recognise the contributions that individual sites and areas make to conserving these resources within the wider environment.

Local planning authorities should consider whether proposed developments can be accommodated without causing harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests. Where there may be significant harmful effects, local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that any reasonable alternative sites that would result in less or no harm have been fully considered.

The draft replacement to PPG 9 notes that proposals maps within the LDF should make clear distinctions between the hierarchy of international, national, regional, and locally designated sites when identifying designated sites of importance for biodiversity and geodiversity.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The LDF should include policies to protect and enhance biodiversity. Create new areas of habitats and make Local Nature Reserve designations as appropriate.

The SA should include an objective to protect and enhance biodiversity.

---


**Why it is relevant**

PPS 12 outlines Government policy on the process of preparing local development documents.

**Key objectives and targets**

Outlines a new style of land use planning, streamlining programme for policy agreement and ensuring community engagement throughout the process.

No relevant objectives, targets and indicators.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The LDF should accord with national guidance in terms of process. No particular policy considerations.

---


**Why it is relevant**

This PPG outlines Government policy on the integration of transport and planning at the national, regional and strategic levels.

**Key objectives and targets**

Actively manage the pattern of urban growth and the location of major travel generating development to make the fullest use of public transport, and to encourage walking and cycling.

Land use planning should facilitate a shift in transport of freight from road to rail and water. Attention should be paid to the value of disused transport sites and effort made to prevent their loss to different land uses.
### Implications for the LDF and SA

This objective is fundamental in encouraging public transport use and establishing a viable patronage base, as well as cycling and walking. In doing so, the LDF would be contributing to the air quality, human health, climate change and social inclusion objectives of its SA.

The Borough has good rail links and nodes and the LDF should seek to maximise commercial opportunities in close proximity to these i.e. Paddock Wood.

### PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment (1994 – Central Government Policy document)

**Why it is relevant**

PPG 15 relates to the role of the planning system in the conservation and identification of built heritage.

**Key objectives and targets**

Objectives are for effective protection for all aspects of the historic environment. It complements PPG 16 on Archaeology and Planning.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The historic environment can be affected by changing land uses in a number of ways, including inappropriate development, vibration/noise impacts, and visual intrusion. The SA should include objectives for the conservation of the historic environment.

The LDF should recognise that the historic environment, tourism and economic prosperity are linked.

### PPG 16 – Archaeology and Planning (1990 – Central Government Policy document)

**Why it is relevant**

This PPG sets out policy on archaeology and advises on the handling of remains including on the level of consideration that should be afforded in planning decisions and planning conditions.

**Key objectives and targets**

Development plans should reconcile the need for development with the interests of conservation including archaeology. Detailed development plans (ie local plans) should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Archaeological sites can be potentially damaged through construction of new build. Archaeological and cultural objectives should be included within the SA.

### PPG 17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport, and Recreation (2002 – Central Government Policy document)

**Why it is relevant**

PPG 17 sets out Government policy on the role of local authorities in the provision of open spaces and sports and recreation facilities.
### Key objectives and targets

The recreational quality of open spaces can be eroded by insensitive development or incremental loss of the site. In considering planning applications - either within or adjoining open space - local authorities should weigh any benefits being offered to the community against the loss of open space that will occur.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Ensure policy proposals take account of the impact of developments on all open space.

There will be an opportunity within the LDF to increase the provision and quality of recreation facilities and open space.

Recognise and protect open space and recreation areas which are highly valued by the community.


#### Why it is relevant

This PPG addresses the importance of tourism for the economy. It also outlines the environmental impact of tourism and its relevance in land-use planning. PPG 21 explains how the needs of tourism should be addressed in development plans and in development control.

#### Key objectives and targets

Ensure land use is distributed and managed in such a way that it supports the qualities that underpin the tourism industry.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

Promoting tourism would increase prosperity and employment, however it is important to recognise the potential conflicts between tourist developments and other environmental objectives.


#### Why it is relevant

The policies set out in PPS 22, on renewable energy, will need to be incorporated into the Local Development Documents for the Borough.

#### Key objectives and targets

Regional spatial strategies and local development documents should contain policies designed to promote and encourage, rather than restrict, the development of renewable energy resources. Except where these developments are likely to have an adverse effect on designated conservation sites (historic and natural), or designated landscapes.

Targets should be expressed as the minimum amount of installed capacity for renewable energy in the region, expressed in megawatts, and may also be expressed in terms of the percentage of electricity consumed or supplied. Targets will be set in the revised RSS for achievement by 2010 and by 2020.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

Prioritise policies that protect designated sites in relation to renewable energy developments.

The LDF should include policies to ensure that, where appropriate, a percentage of energy to be used in new developments is sourced from on-site renewable energy sources.
**PPS 23 - Planning and Pollution Control (2004 – Central Government Policy document)**

**Why it is relevant**

Local authorities are required to take the policies outlined in PPS 23 and its Annexes into consideration when preparing Local Development Documents.

**Key objectives and targets**

Any consideration of the quality of land, air or water and potential impacts arising from development, possibly leading to impacts on health, is capable of being a material planning consideration, in so far as it arises or may arise from or may affect any land use;

The planning system plays a key role in determining the location of development which may give rise to pollution, either directly or indirectly, and in ensuring that other uses and developments are not, as far as possible, affected by major existing or potential sources of pollution.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Policies should be developed that assist in determining the location of potentially polluting development.

Policies should be developed that require remediation of contaminated sites.

---


**Why it is relevant**

This PPG provides guidance on noise and the role of local authorities in minimising adverse impacts.

**Key objectives and targets**

Noise-sensitive developments should be located away from existing sources of significant noise (or programmed development such as new roads) and that potentially noisy developments are located in areas where noise will not be such an important consideration or where its impact can be minimised.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Ensure that SA includes a noise objective.

---


**Why it is relevant**

PPG 25 provides guidance on the consideration of flood risk in relation to development. It sets out the importance of management and flood-risk reduction in land-use planning.

**Key objectives and targets**

Consider the information available on the nature of flood risk and its potential consequences and accord it appropriate weight in the preparation of development plans and in determining applications for planning permission and attaching conditions where permission is granted.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

LDF should avoid unnecessary development in the floodplains that might decrease storage/increase runoff, and compromise human safety. LDF should also encourage development of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Act is the principle mechanism for the legislative protection of wildlife in Great Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key objectives and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses the problem of species protection and habitat loss by setting out the protection that is afforded to wild animals and plants in Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the LDF and SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant interaction between wildlife and different types of land use. The SA should consider the affects of land use on biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Act creates new access rights to the countryside of England and Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key objectives and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasises the public’s right of access to open country and common land, and gives additional protection to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the LDF and SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain land uses and development might hinder accessibility to open country and common land. The LDF should consider these issues which have relevance to SA objectives on human health, population, and severance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK Biodiversity Action Plan (1994 – Central Government Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Action Plan is the Government’s response to the Convention on Biodiversity. It is the primary framework for wildlife conservation in the UK. The Plan recognises the role of local authorities in implementing the Plan on a local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key objectives and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK BAP was published in response to the requirements of the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992). It highlights a number of priority habitats and species with associated action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for the LDF and SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF should take account of priority habitats and species in the Borough, and integrate their plan objectives within it, whenever possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>England Forestry Strategy 1999 (Forestry Commission, 1999 – Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy sets out strategic priorities and programmes for forestry in England.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key objectives and targets

Continued steady expansion of woodland area to provide more benefit for society and the environment.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

LDF should seize upon opportunities to expand existing woodland or create new woodland areas.


#### Why it is relevant

The Strategy sets out a five year work programme for biodiversity. It seeks the greater integration of biodiversity issues in policy. It complements and builds on the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.

#### Key objectives and targets

Ensures biodiversity considerations are embedded in all main sectors of economic activity. (It is the principal means by which the government will comply with duties under section 74 of the CRoW Act).

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

The SA aims to integrate biodiversity into LDF activity by highlighting interaction between land use and wildlife.


#### Why it is relevant

The document sets out policies for a low-carbon future and addresses energy use and climate change in the UK.

#### Key objectives and targets

Stimulate new, more efficient sources of power generation, and cut emissions from the transport and agricultural sector.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

LDF should encourage development of renewable energy facilities and attempt to reduce the need for long distance car travel.

### Climate Change: The UK Programme (2000 – Central Government Non-statutory document)

#### Why it is relevant

The programme outlines how the UK plans to meet its Kyoto target to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5%, and achieve its domestic goal to cut carbon dioxide emissions by 20% below 1990 levels by 2010.

#### Key objectives and targets

Cutting UK Carbon Dioxide emissions 60% by 2050.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

The SA should contain objectives for reducing Carbon Dioxide emissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy describes the current and likely future air quality of the UK. It provides a framework for action which includes objectives to improve and protect the UK’s air quality in the long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets objectives for eight main air pollutants to protect health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the LDF and SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF should consider the location of any Air Quality Management Areas, and the objectives for the eight main air pollutants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The document outlines an agenda to achieve more attractive towns and cities; a prosperous and sustainable countryside; world-class tourist attractions; new jobs; and learning, vibrant and self-confident communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The historic environment should be protected and sustained for the benefit of our own and future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the LDF and SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LDF could influence the historic environment in several ways, including the ambience of historic structures and features. The SA should include objectives for Conservation Areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strategy outlines the Government’s vision that no person should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live. It includes two long-term goals; lower worklessness and crime, and improved health, skills, housing and environment in order to reduce the gap between deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The national vision for neighbourhood renewal, the plan aims:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have lower worklessness; less crime; better health; better skills; and better housing and physical environment in all the poorest neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To narrow the gap on these measures between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the LDF and SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These objectives are essential in reducing social exclusion and should be considered broadly within the LDF and SA. The LDF should look to regenerate the most deprived wards in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REGIONAL POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Regional Planning Guidance, RPG 9</strong> (South East England Regional Assembly, 2001 - Statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPG 9 is the Regional framework for preparation of local authority development plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with four key objectives of Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Effective protection of the environment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prudent use of natural resources; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 12 Key Development Principles are set out in paragraph 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate development in places well served by public transport, especially town centres, within urban areas and on previously developed sites, before considering the option of developing on greenfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity principle extends to sustainable communities and the need to reduce reliance on the private car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should be designed to make sustainable use of the regions natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the LDF and SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF must be in conformity with RPG9 whilst the South East Plan is Adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives of the Core Strategy and DPDs / SPDs should be based on principles of sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Regional Spatial Strategy, Consultation Draft South East Plan</strong> (South East England Regional Assembly, 2005 – Statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strategy is the new statutory framework for development in the Region (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). Consultation on 1st Draft has recently closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS should provide the spatial framework that forms the context within which Local Development Documents, Local Transport Plans will be prepared, as well as other regional and sub-regional strategies and programmes that have a bearing on land use activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft Plan’s vision takes as its theme ‘A Healthy Region’ and sets the challenge that there will be a sustained improvement in quality of life in the South East by 2026, measured in terms of social well-being, the economy, environment and the management of the region’s natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional objectives and indicators based on 4 national sustainability objectives taken directly from the Integrated Regional Framework, 2004:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Borough level housing targets omitted from consultation draft; to be included in Stage 2 consultation later in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough will have to respond to the Regional Spatial Strategy allocation for housing while minimising environmental impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for the LDF and SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider objectives and targets from the RSS and IRF when developing LDF. Utilise the targets and indicators in the SA where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing targets / options will need to be reviewed on release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LDF must be consistent with the South East Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report on the Consultation Draft of the South East Plan (South East England Regional Assembly, 2005 - Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The document is the independent Sustainability Appraisal of the consultation draft of the South East Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key objectives and targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Draft SA identifies that the IRF provides the ideal set of core objectives for the region. In addition to the regional objectives and indicators based on 4 national sustainability objectives taken directly from the Integrated Regional Framework, 2004, the SA identifies further existing and potential targets in Table 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where appropriate, use baseline information and the SA Framework which has been widely consulted on and used to assess the Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications for the LDF and SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider additional targets from the Regional SA when developing LDF. Utilise the targets and indicators in the SA where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Regional Framework, A better quality of life in the south east (South East England Regional Assembly 2005 - Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why it is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IRF for the South East of England establishes a shared regional vision of sustainable development, and a set of objectives, indicators and targets that map out how the region should deliver economic development that benefits people and protects and improves the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key objectives and targets

The following key issues are identified for the south east:

- ensuring that there is an adequate supply of affordable housing
- reducing social exclusion and poverty and spreading economic benefits more widely
- tackling the growth in car traffic by reducing the need to travel and improving alternative choices for travelling around the region, especially better public transport
- using natural resources (such as water, wood and fossil fuels) more prudently, while at the same time achieving economic growth
- reducing pollution and waste
- enhancing the region’s biodiversity
- managing and mitigating the likely impacts of climate change such as increases in flooding
- improving overall levels of health of people living in the region
- maintaining and improving the overall quality of the environment, including biodiversity and important landscapes
- adapting to the needs of an ageing population
- improving educational attainment and skills levels
- achieving high and stable levels of employment.

IRF objectives reflect the four key objectives of Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK.

Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone, 9 objectives, 27 indicators:

1. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent, sustainably constructed and affordable home.
2. To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public wellbeing, the economy and the environment.
3. To improve the health and well-being of the population & reduce inequalities in health.
4. To reduce poverty and social exclusion and close the gap between the most deprived areas in the South East and the rest of the region.
5. To raise educational achievement levels across the region and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in work.
6. To reduce crime and the fear of crime.
7. To create and sustain vibrant communities.
8. To improve accessibility to all services and facilities.
9. To encourage increased engagement in cultural activity across all sections.
   - Effective protection of the environment, 6 objectives, 15 indicators:
10. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings, including re-use of materials from buildings, and encourage urban renaissance.
11. To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve.
12. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and ensure that the South East is prepared for its impacts.
13. To conserve and enhance the region’s Biodiversity.
14. To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the region’s countryside and historic environment.
15. To reduce road congestion and pollution levels by improving travel choice, and reducing the need for travel by car/lorry.
   - Prudent use of natural resources, 4 objectives, 10 indicators:
16. To reduce the global, social and environmental impact of consumption of resources by using sustainably produced and local products.

17. To reduce waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste

18. To maintain and improve the water quality of the region’s rivers and coasts, and to achieve sustainable water resources management.

19. To increase energy efficiency, and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources in the region.
   • Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth, 6 objectives, 16 indicators.

20. To ensure high and stable levels of employment so everyone can benefit from the economic growth of the region.

21. To sustain economic growth and competitiveness across the region.

22. To stimulate economic revival in priority regeneration areas.

23. To develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities.

24. To encourage the development of a buoyant, sustainable tourism sector.

25. To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The document sets out a Framework for sustainable development in the South East, which all regional strategies and polices should adhere to.

Links between economic growth, resource depletion and environmental damage should be broken. ‘Cleaner growth’ is key to achieving sustainable development in the region.

Where it is difficult to balance social, economic and environmental factors, the decision made should be explicit and transparent. The document provides a Framework for decision-making.

Implications for the LDF and SA

IRF objectives and targets should be considered integral to the baseline assessment and in the identification of issues and SA objectives.

A Better Quality of Life in the South East – Regional Sustainable Development Framework (South East England Regional Assembly, 2001 - Non-statutory document)

Why it is relevant

This Framework sets out a vision for the Region, and proposes regionally derived objectives, indicators and targets for the South East which contain all of the themes of sustainable development.

Key objectives and targets

This document was the precursor to the Integrated Regional Framework and was superseded by it. The document provides key inputs into the LDF Sustainability Appraisal Framework.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

N/A

Implications for the LDF and SA

N/A
SA Scoping Report, Tunbridge Wells Borough LDF - Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transport Strategy – Chapter 9 of RPG9 (South East England Regional Assembly, 2003 - Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Why it is relevant

The Regional Transport Strategy (RTS), published in July 2004, lays out the South East’s transport policies. It also provides the context for the preparation of Local Development and Transport Plans by local authorities.

### Key objectives and targets

**Key aims / objectives include:**
- Promote good management and investment in the transport system
- Offering value for money by fully utilising existing transport capacity
- Improve the structure of the transport system in favour of more sustainable means of transport
- Support the South East spatial strategy, particularly fostering links with other regions and supporting urban regeneration.

There are some targets listed which are applicable to the preparation of Local Transport Plans but not specifically relevant to the LDF.

The most relevant indicators used to monitor the RTS are as follows:
- Mode of travel to work;
- Mode of travel to school;
- Km travelled per person per year by mode;
- Number of people killed or seriously injured;
- Growth rate of road traffic volume;
- Improvements in rural transport;
- Improved access to jobs and services; and
- Improved public transport.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Relevant regional strategies, development plans and Local Transport Plans should ensure that their management proposals achieve a rebalancing of the transport system in favour of non-car modes as a means of access to services and facilities. Development should be located and designed so as to reduce average journey lengths.

Investment in upgrading the transport system should be prioritised to support delivery of the spatial strategy by developing the network of regional hubs and spokes (M20).

Development plans and Local Transport Plans should in combination adopt restraint-based maximum levels of parking provision for non-residential developments, linked to an integrated programme of public transport and accessibility improvements.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF should be consistent with the transport policies included within the RTS.

Policy T10 – Mobility Management, sets out key areas where both Development and Local Transport Plans can address key transport problems associated with both the region as a whole and relevant to Tunbridge Wells Borough.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Communities in the South East (Government Office for the South East, 2003 - Non-statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a regional version of the Government’s national programme to create sustainable communities for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major concerns identified by a poll of the people were housing supply, affordability of housing and transport. The following key objectives have been identified:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote smart growth and sustainable patterns of development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the largest and fastest growing regional economy in Britain;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote the location as the gateway to continental Europe;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the diverse nature and character of the South East and high quality of its countryside; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackle disparities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure a strategic approach to key worker and social housing across the wider South East of England, the Housing Corporation and English Partnerships will manage the allocation for affordable housing from the three regional pots as a single fund. The South East will share in the £4.736bn being provided for housing investment in the three South-Eastern regions over the next three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local policies should be underpinned by robust housing needs assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in opportunity, economic success, environmental quality and health in different parts of the region should be tackled. There are pockets of deprivation and poverty throughout the region, but particularly in eastern and coastal parts. To tackle the wide disparity between rich and poor communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide for the region's growing population. To turn around the trend in house completions. Completions are too low; they dropped to 22,900 per annum dwellings by 2000, 18% below the figure indicated by Regional Planning Guidance. More homes need to be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the match between housing needs and provision. There is a substantial mismatch between housing needs and the type of housing being built. Home ownership should be more affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implications for the LDF and SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be an SA Objective to provide a suitable standard of housing for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LDF should include policies to increase affordable housing, support improved public transport and protect the character and quality of the Borough's countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South East Regional Housing Strategy (South East England Regional Housing Board, 2004 - Statutory document)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why it is relevant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Regional Housing Strategy sets out the framework for how housing will be provided and funded across the South East with the vision that ‘everyone has the right to a decent home’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key objectives and targets</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The strategy supports five key themes:

- Housing supply;
- Affordability (including the need for inexpensive housing for key workers);
- Regeneration and neighbourhood renewal;
- Homelessness and supported housing; and
- Quality and sustainability.

The strategy suggests a number of key housing indicators which can inform the baseline and monitoring scheme:

- Progress against decent homes standards
- Number of new homes completed
- Number of affordable and key worker housing completions
- Progress against ending use of bed and breakfast accommodation for families

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Local Authorities need to be active in making sure their communities get the houses they need. This includes making provision through plans for at least 10 years’ potential supply of housing. Local authorities have a strategic role in ensuring affordable housing supply meets need, that special needs groups are catered for and that the quality of the housing stock – private and public - is high. Local Authorities may use the SEEDA and Building Research Establishment checklist to inform the planning process and to guide and assess the relevant performance of different developers.

The South East region needs at least 28,000 new homes each year from 2001 and probably more in future years. Recently, housing completions in the South East have fallen well short of these targets.

It is important that the region’s scarce supply of Greenfield land is protected by making maximum use of available brownfield land. The National Land Use Database shows that there is some 3,300 ha of brownfield land with development potential in the South East. About a third of this land is suitable for housing.

Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF should make provision for at least ten years’ potential supply of housing

The LDF should address housing density (and aim to achieve densities in excess of 30 p/ha)

Advocate the use of the SEEDA / BRE sustainability checklist for new housing

The SA should recognise and address social objectives identified in the Regional Housing Strategy


Why it is relevant

RES sets a 10-year framework for delivering the economic aspirations of the broader sustainable development vision defined by the 2001 Regional Sustainable Development Framework (now replaced by the 2004, Integrated Regional Framework).

Key objectives and targets
5 objectives are given:

- Competitive business
- Successful people
- Vibrant communities
- Effective infrastructure
- Sustainable use of natural resources.

‘Framework of Indicators Objectives, Indicators and Targets’ p80-84 provide a number of useful data sources and identify existing trends.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

The South East will contribute to the national brownfield land remediation target of 1,300 ha per annum by securing from 2002 onwards a minimum annual total of 75ha of derelict land and buildings reclaimed annually for employment, housing, community and environmental purposes. The main areas for attention will be the priority regeneration areas of the Kent and Sussex coasts, Southern Hampshire, the Isle of Wight and the former East Kent Coalfield.

Local policy needs to concentrate on funding to enable the delivery of affordable housing.

GDP growth in Kent lags significantly behind the regional average.

The issue of water supply is becoming a development constraint in some parts of the region.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Develop LDF objectives and DPD policies to reflect these objectives.

RES objectives and targets should be considered integral to the baseline assessment and in the identification of issues and SA objectives.

Evaluate objectives, sub-objectives and indicators against IRF objectives in formulating SA Framework.


**Why it is relevant**

The Report is the outcome of an on-going Environment Agency initiative to report on the state of the environment identifying key areas where further work is needed to deliver environmental improvements.

**Key objectives and targets**

The Environment Agency’s vision for the environment and a sustainable future is: A healthy, rich and diverse environment in England and Wales, for present and future generations. The fundamental goals we want to help achieve:

- A better quality of life.
- An enhanced environment for wildlife
- Cleaner air for everyone.
- Improved and protected inland and coastal water.
- Restored, protected land with healthier soils.
- A ‘greener’ business world.
- Wiser, sustainable use of natural resources.
- Limiting and adapting to climate change.
- Reducing flood risk.

The SoE Report reviews a number of data sources for indicators and identifies priorities in relation to:

- Improving Air Quality
- Protecting and Enhancing Water Quality
- Managing Waste
- Managing Water Resources
- Managing Flood Risk
### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Around two-thirds of the land farmed and 40% of the region as a whole, is protected by some form of conservation designation.

Waste is one of the major environmental challenges facing the South East. Industry, business and the public need to reduce the amount of waste produced and waste will need to be put to more productive use.

Unless steps are taken to reduce demand and increase supply, parts of the South East face the prospects of water shortages in future. The region consumes more water per person than most of the country, but receives one of the lowest amounts of rainfall.

The South East has 235,000 properties at risk from flooding. With significant development pressures in the South East, it is vital that flood risks are fully considered in building proposals.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Develop LDF objectives and DPD policies to reflect the goals, outcomes, changes and precautions in the Report. Consider how the DPDs can contribute towards the broad targets and enhance the environment.

Consider 4 indicators used in Report for baseline assessment.

Consider issues identified through report in formulating SA objectives and Framework.

### Seeing the Wood for the Trees, the Forestry and Woodlands Framework for the South East (Forestry and Woodlands Framework Steering Group, 2004 - Non-statutory document)

**Why it is relevant**

The document sets out a framework for the future development of woodlands and forestry in the South East.

**Key objectives and targets**

Each of the four interrelated and interdependent themes of the framework is developed into a number of aims for the region. These are:

- Better places for people to live.
- Enhanced environment and biodiversity.
- A stronger contribution.
- A secure future for our woodland resources.

The document includes 12 targets (outcomes) that are set out in the report under the headings of the main objectives.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

Themes and associated outcomes included in the document could be incorporated into the LDF as follows:

- More people’s health and well-being improved through visiting woodlands.
- The economic value of woodland products to the region being increased.
- Woodlands playing a greater role in attracting tourism, inward investment and other economic activity.
- Integrated, strategic planning of woodland management.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

These indicators should inform the DPDs and SPDs, in particular the Recreation and Open Space SPD.
### The Cultural Agenda (South East England Cultural Consortium, 2002 - Non-statutory document)

#### Why it is relevant

The Agenda is the main document which sets out regional priorities for culture in the South East.

#### Key objectives and targets

Culture South East has defined 14 objectives which encompass the following aims:

- Integrated strategies for the cultural sector in the Region.
- Ensure culture is involved in urban renaissance.
- Promote culture in sustainable development.
- Develop cultural activities to combat social exclusion.
- Ensure all communities have access to cultural provision.
- Promote excellence in new building design.
- Increase resources spent on cultural and creative industries.

**Key aims are to:**

- Promote the role of culture;
- Promote joint working with other local authorities;
- Ensure that Area Investment Frameworks address culture;
- Secure investment in new economic uses for historic buildings;
- Promote development of sustainable tourism, leisure and sport;
- Ensure adequate cultural provision in new developments;
- Ensure adequate provision of services and transport to rural areas.

#### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Advocate the incorporation of effective policies into development plans and other planning documents that, having regard to the new Planning Policy Guidance 17, protect and provide for the open space and sporting and recreational needs and facilities of the Region.

Promote the need throughout the cultural sector to reclaim and use brownfield land to support sustainable cohesive communities in line with Planning Policy Guidance 3.

Promote adequate provision of cultural facilities in new developments, and ensure appropriate facilities design and planning guidance is available.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider objectives within the DPDs and SPDs where possible and appropriate.

### COUNTY DOCUMENTS

#### Kent Structure Plan (Kent County Council, 1996 - Statutory document)

#### Why it is relevant

The Plan sets out the relationship between the environment, development and transport, ensuring that the management of land and resources is consistent with national and regional policy.

#### Key objectives and targets
No specific indicators or targets set within the structure plan. However, a number of policies are listed relating to:

- Protecting and enhancing the environment
- The efficient use of natural resources including a reduction in consumption
- Protecting the Green Belt and developing within designated areas, particularly on previously developed land
- Developing existing business
- Protection of high quality agricultural land
- Improving and encouraging use of the public transport infrastructure
- Increase the amount of affordable housing

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

Any change to the physical environment, including that necessary to stimulate the economy, should contribute positively to the quality of Kent’s environment.

Vacant or damaged land should be brought forward to meet identified development needs in preference to the use of Greenfield sites.

Given increasing public aspirations for better standards of development and environmental protection, those involved in development planning and control will need to ensure that change, where it occurs, is of high quality. These considerations include concern for the standard of housing and employment provision and spring from an expectation of a vigorous local economy.

It will be important in striking the appropriate balance for local authorities to seek to improve the environment and move towards the principles of sustainable development where applicable to land use planning.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Consider how to meet broad objectives within the DPDs and SPDs as appropriate.

---

**Kent Local Transport Plan (Kent County Council, 2001 - Statutory document)**

---

**Why it is relevant**

The Plan sets out the longer term picture for transport in the County.

---

**Key objectives and targets**

8 objectives for transport policy ensure that transport systems will support these wider aspirations for the County; reflect the priorities which people put forward during public consultation; and comply with the policies of the Kent Structure Plan, European and Regional strategies and with Government guidance on Local Transport Plans:

- LTP1 UK Gateway
- LTP2 Environment & Heritage
- LTP3 Accessibility & Choice
- LTP4 Economy
- LTP5 Safety
- LTP6 Integration
- LTP7 Demand Management
- LTP8 Health

---

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

The County is the United Kingdom’s Gateway to Europe; Kent provides the major cross Channel links – the Channel ports and the tunnel - and they act as the principal arteries for the nation’s trade and tourism. Consequently public policy must ensure that international traffic travels through Kent with maximum efficiency, with minimum environmental damage and disruption and that it also provides the opportunity for economic growth and regeneration.

However, the Garden of England must not be turned into the nation’s bottleneck and its unique identity, heritage, countryside and towns need protection from the problems of excessive traffic and the pressures caused by a transport infrastructure inadequate to meet the demands upon it. Traffic in Kent has doubled since 1980 and significantly exceeds the national average.

Kent’s principal concerns are for improved international links and links to London, both to stimulate employment and to support London as a world centre of business.
### Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF should acknowledge the long-term sustainability issues associated with the LTP and look to address the indirect effects such as noise and air pollution through sensitive land-use planning. In addition, it should look to support public transport and increase overall accessibility and choice of travel modes. Furthermore, the LDF should promote sustainable transport patterns through land-use allocation (i.e. type and amounts) in relation to sensitive areas, in particular, sections of the A26, which has recently been declared as an Air Quality Management Area. The SA will include an objective relating to reducing congestion and the reliance on the private car.

### Kent Design – A Guide to Sustainable Development (Kent County Council, 2005 - Supplementary Planning Guidance document)

#### Why it is relevant

Kent Design aims to achieve environmental excellence for all new developments by providing advice on the process and design of development proposals.

#### Key objectives and targets

The aim of Kent Design is to encourage development that:

- creates memorable quality places
- contributes to Kent’s distinctive character
- creates attractive, safe and friendly neighbourhoods
- respects Kent’s rich built heritage and landscape
- is innovative where appropriate
- draws on up-to-date best practice
- creates sustainable communities
- reduces the need to travel
- reduces energy use
- makes best use of land
- concentrates development in urban areas
- promotes mixed use.

There are no specific targets.

#### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

We must build new neighbourhoods with a heart, clustered around new and existing community facilities and commercial centres, close to public transport and with a distinctive Kentish identity.

By taking the initiative in planning, a local authority can save time that might be wasted at a later stage in negotiations on ill-conceived planning applications, and in appeals that might have been avoided.

Kent has a rich and varied heritage of architecture and landscape that differs from other counties. The design of new developments should evolve from this special local character.

The layout of a new development should be ‘permeable’ to encourage walking and cycling with good connections between new and existing developments providing a choice of routes. Developments should be designed so that walkers, cyclists, children and the disabled have priority over vehicles except on main roads.

Layout design has a crucial role to play in preventing crime and alleviating the fear of crime. Safe, secure and neighbourly environments are those that provide a human scale and intimacy and are sociable and comfortable.

New developments on ‘brownfield’ or recycled land rather than on ‘greenfield’ sites.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Ensure the SA includes objectives relating to land use, noise, disabled access and designing out crime. Also the SA should include objectives relating to sustainable resource management in new or converted developments (i.e. energy efficiency, waste water, recycling facilities, reduction of car use and use of sustainable materials in construction).
**Community Strategy, Vision for Kent (Kent Partnership, 2002 - Statutory document)**

**Why it is relevant**

The Strategy is a multi-partner vision for Kent intended to bring about improvements to the economic, environmental and social wellbeing of the county of Kent over the next 20 years.

**Key objectives and targets**

The key objectives are for a county:

- of strong cohesive communities, where local people, agencies and groups work together in partnership and individuals from all backgrounds can join in community life,
- displaying excellence in learning opportunities and in skills development,
- which is a centre of excellence for high quality leisure and tourism,
- where people enjoy healthy lives and have high standards of health and social care,
- where people are helped to be more independent and become less dependent,
- which is safe and where people live free from the fear of crime,
- where business growth builds on existing strengths and grasps the new opportunities arising from Kent's position as the Gateway to Europe,
- where the countryside and coast, heritage and environment are safeguarded and enhanced for everyone's enjoyment, now and in the future, and
- where the difficulties of traffic and transport are tackled for the benefit of all.

Each theme within the document contains a number of targets from existing plans and strategies.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

Kent people are fairly healthy and many have an above average life expectancy. The things that make a difference to maintaining good health are co-ordinated economic, environmental, housing and social policies that positively set out to be of benefit to all.

We need to encourage all types of physical activity (walking or cycling to work, access to the countryside and sports facilities) so that taking exercise becomes routine.

Sevenoaks, Tunbridge Wells and Tonbridge have a challenge to maintain successful business growth and offer new housing inside the current urban area.

Overdevelopment is a threat in some parts of the County.

Standards of educational achievement up to school leaving age range from excellent to poor. More young people need to achieve academic and vocational qualifications to support business development and attract successful businesses into Kent.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The LDF objectives should be informed by the objectives of this strategy.


**Why it is relevant**

The management plan sets in place clear policies and actions for the conservation management and enhancement of the AONB for a five year period and sets a longer term vision.
Key objectives and targets

- Conserving and enhancing landscape character and diversity
- Conserving and enhancing biodiversity
- Farming as custodian of the landscape
- Managing woodland and trees
- Conserving the ancient landscape
- Sustaining natural resources
- Supporting communities
- Retain and restore prominent views
- Protect, conserve and enhance the components of natural beauty and landscape character of the Kent Downs AONB
- Increasing the managed area of ancient, semi-natural and coppiced woodland
- Restoration of woodland
- Recreation of heathland
- Develop local services, facilities and employment
- Improve public transport opportunities.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Local authorities, government agencies, statutory undertakers and public bodies, who all have new statutory duties to safeguard the AONB. Sec 85, Part IV of the CRoW Act requires all public bodies and relevant authorities to demonstrate that they have taken account of the purposes of the AONB in their decision making.

The impact of infrastructure surrounding the AONB has been considerable. There are new pressures in the form of urban expansion along parts of the northern and southern boundaries of the AONB and the future funding and policy regime for farming, the major AONB land use, is uncertain.

The Kent Downs AONB, perhaps more than any other of Britain’s protected landscapes has faced severe pressure from the development of transportation infrastructure, communications and housing, as well as the pressures of intensive agriculture and forestry.

The Kent Downs is the fifth largest AONB in England and Wales, and administratively is one of the most complex falling within twelve local authorities and lying partly or wholly within 137 parish council boundaries.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider how the DPDs can contribute to achieving these objectives. Ensure that the policies take adequate consideration of the landscape and biodiversity of the Kent Downs.


Why it is relevant

The Report summarises the key social, economic and environmental issues in the rural parts of the County.

Key objectives and targets

The following issues have been identified:
- Provision of services in rural areas;
- Lack of affordable housing;
- Lack of skills and low educational attainment in rural areas;
- Road safety;
- Management of visitors.

No specific targets identified.
### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

In general, levels of unemployment are low among rural residents, although lack of skills and low educational attainment is an issue for some.

While homelessness and poor housing conditions are generally worse in urban wards in Kent, a significant number of people living in rural wards experience such housing difficulties.

Dependence on the car in rural Kent is generally high. Bus and rail services do exist in rural areas but they are often limited, particularly at weekends. Rural road safety is a growing concern.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider how the DPDs and SPDs will contribute to achieving these objectives and meeting the targets.

Ensure SA objectives facilitate the increased use of walking as a highly sustainable means of transport.

---


#### Why it is relevant

The Framework, produced by Kent County Council's Sports Development Unit, seeks to provide direction for sport within the county for forthcoming years.

#### Key objectives and targets

The framework contains a number of non-specific Required Outcomes which may prove useful subject to monitoring and audit.

#### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

There are 15,000 sports clubs in Kent.

Sport is increasingly being seen as a tool to address deprivation, health, community safety and community cohesion.

Many of the local authority services in sport are first class, although individual staff are stretched.

There is increasing anecdotal evidence that the number of volunteers in sport is dwindling and there is a trend towards litigation, which will require appropriate insurance, waivers and health and safety responses to be put in place.

#### Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider the vision statement in formulating LDF objectives and DPDs and SPDs (particularly within the Recreation and Open Space SPD)

---

**Kent Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (Kent County Council, 2005 - Statutory document)**

#### Why it is relevant

It is a Statutory Development Scheme prepared by Kent County Council.

#### Key objectives and targets

No specific objectives are given.
# Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

No specific opportunities are outlined. Constraints relate to resourcing.

## Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF to be in conformity with MWDS. The SA Framework to reflect objectives of evolving and existing DPDs.

## The Deposit Kent and Medway Structure Plan - Local Economic Development Strategy (Kent County Council, 2003 - Statutory document)

### Why it is relevant

The draft Structure Plan endorses the objectives from the Kent Partnership's "Vision for Kent" (2002) which sets out a vision of Kent.

### Key objectives and targets

Under the monitoring proposals, the plan contains an extensive number of headline targets and performance indicators which support the core principles.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

New development should provide for a better balance of homes, jobs and services in places where they can be easily reached. It should support the role of town and district centres as focal points for local communities and make more effective use of urban land.

Developers, local authorities and public service providers should seek to improve the way that suburban areas function and to enhance their environment and traffic management.

Local Development Documents should also establish a pattern of mixed use which protects and improves residential amenity and public safety.

Rural service centres have an important role to play because they provide community facilities as well as jobs and hence reduce the need to travel to urban areas.

Existing non-conforming industrial or service uses can make it more difficult to use land effectively or to plan for mixed use development in inner urban areas.

The Metropolitan Green Belt in Kent has a major role to play in restraining expansion between and around Tunbridge Wells, Southborough and Tonbridge.

## Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider how the LDF can contribute to achieving the broad objectives and also how to meet the specific targets.

## Education Development Plan 2002/7 (Kent County Council, 2002 - Statutory document)

### Why it is relevant

The Plan outlines key issues for education in the County. It set out targets to raise educational attainment across Kent.
### Key objectives and targets

The Government targets are represented through:

- Raising Attainment in the Early Years and in Primary Education
- Raising Attainment in Key Stage 3 - Raising Attainment in Key Stage 4
- Narrowing the Attainment Gap - Tackling Underachievement (Of Particular Groups)
- Support for Schools Causing Concern

Locally concerns are:

- Recruitment, Retention and Development of Teachers for Kent Schools
- Leadership of Learning in Kent Schools
- Building Partnerships and Improving Effectiveness across the Education System in Kent.

Targets generally relate to key stage performance.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Room for improvement exists in:

- Recruitment, Retention and Development of Teachers for Kent Schools.
- Improving Leadership and Management in Kent Schools.
- Building Partnerships and Improving Effectiveness.

The needs of children and their parents are best met through local partnerships and activities, which promote self-managing schools. Schools are therefore grouped into 22 Clusters with devolved autonomy to identify and respond to local needs.

The Development Plan identifies strategies and targets and deploys people resources and budgets to support schools in their central task of improving standards of pupil attainment and achievement.

There is scope for an improvement in standards of attainment at each stage in schooling.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

The SA Framework should include objectives related to improvement in educational skills.

### Kent Environmental Strategy (Kent Partnership, 2003 - Non-statutory document)

**Why it is relevant**

The Strategy identifies 98 areas for action and objectives to ensure a sustainable environment in the County.
Key objectives and targets

The environmental strategy identifies the following issues:

- Climate change; a changing rural economy.
- Global markets.
- Transport and traffic.
- Development pressures.
- Environmental pollution.

There are a number of targets for local authorities, including:

- Encouraging reduction in car use;
- Reducing noise pollution;
- Increasing sustainable transport;
- Including biodiversity objectives are included in development plans;
- Developing partnerships between countryside access and recreation Providers;
- Supporting the development of Green Tourism in rural areas;
- Encouraging developments to achieve an energy rating equivalent to 10 on the NHER scale.
- Supporting Heritage Economic Regeneration Schemes;
- Establish further heritage tourism opportunities;
- Ensuring new retail, leisure and cultural developments are located in town and rural centres;
- Improving traffic management in Kent’s town and rural centres;
- Increasing our use of buses by implementing the Kent Bus Strategy.
- Providing appropriate recycling facilities in all new developments.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Issues of traffic growth, air quality, carbon emissions, water consumption, and waste generation are proving the most difficult to tackle.

The opportunities offered by education, within and beyond schools, to promote environmental awareness as a fundamental building block of a more sustainable future should be taken advantage of.

Balancing the long-term protection and enhancement of the environment alongside other aspirations is a major challenge.

A more equitable approach to economic, social and environmental decision making needs to be adopted.

Implications for the LDF and SA

These targets should inform the policies and should be considered within the DPDs and SPDs.

Kent Biodiversity Action Plan (Kent Biodiversity Action Plan Steering Group, 1997 – Non-statutory document)

Why it is relevant

The document identifies methods by which to conserve, enhance and restore biodiversity in Kent and contributes to the targets set out in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.
### Key objectives and targets

To maintain and enhance:

- The populations and natural ranges of native species;
- The quality and range of wildlife habitats and ecosystems;
- Internationally and nationally important and threatened species, habitats and ecosystems;
- Species, habitats and natural and managed ecosystems that are characteristic of Kent;
- The biodiversity of natural and semi-natural habitats, where this has diminished over 3 recent decades;
- To increase public awareness of, and involvement in, conserving biodiversity.
- Continue to comply with PPGs, RPGs and legislation relating to nature conservation in preparing development plans and determining planning applications. Address deficiencies where these exist;
- Incorporate site protection policies for SNCIs in all development plans;
- Protect remaining semi-natural habitats, whether designated or not, through policies, strategies and development plans;
- Develop Nature Conservation Strategies or local Biodiversity Action Plans.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The good condition of species-rich hedgerows should be ensured for the future of the wildlife in Kent.

The demand for new homes in the South East of England is growing. Careful design and landscaping of new development will be required so that biodiversity is recognised and opportunities for wildlife are maximised.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Protect and enhance Kent’s Biodiversity through Core Strategy policies

---

**SUB-COUNTY DOCUMENTS**

**West Kent Area Investment Framework (West Kent Economic Steering Group, 2003 - Non-statutory document)**

**Why it is relevant**

The framework is a comprehensive study of the local economy which seeks to highlight economic issues and outlines actions to ensure future competitiveness and growth is maintained.

**Key objectives and targets**

- Maximise opportunities for individuals to enhance their skills
- Strengthen the competitive performance of local businesses
- Enhance tourism’s contribution to the local economy
- Create a strong local infrastructure that is responsive to business needs
- Reduce disparity between deprived and affluent areas
- Equal the South East rate of numbers of people with no or low skills (NVQ Level 1) in 2007;
- Maintain the recent level of increase in the number of jobs, i.e. 8,160 more jobs by 2007;
- Equal the South East rate of % of people employed in knowledge based activities and high value-added manufacturing in 2007;
- Maintain current levels of increase in the number of new businesses: c.300 new businesses (net) by 2007.
Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Business start-up activity is relatively high in West Kent, particularly in Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells. West Kent’s economy is the strongest of the County's sub-regions, but it does not compare as well with the more dynamic sub-regions in the south east. There are many strengths to the West Kent economy, including high levels of inward investment, full employment, a highly skilled resident workforce, high performing educational establishments, growing businesses and a buoyant tourism sector.

However, compared with other parts of the south east there are significant underlying economic weaknesses in the area, including recruitment and retention of staff, with skills shortages in key sectors. In part these are caused by high levels of out-commuting to London draining the local economy of knowledge and skills.

Although the area appears successful and many residents have a high standard of living, there are significant problems and several pockets of severe deprivation.

Future competitiveness and growth is threatened by these problems and, if action is not taken, the economy may stagnate and decline.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Ensure that these objectives inform the DPDs and that provision is made to meet targets


Why it is relevant

The Plan sets out local authority policy for the AONB and will be used to assess how public bodies, statutory undertakers and holders of public office fulfil their duty to have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the High Weald.

Key objectives and targets

To provide environmental, social, and economic developments in the High Weald that supports the primary purpose of designation: the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty.

- To maintain the capacity of natural systems; minimizing resource consumption; and protecting and improving environmental quality.
- Restore natural function of river catchments
- Maintain and protect sandstone outcrops of the AONB
- Pilot rural community renewable energy schemes in operation
- Protect the historic pattern of settlement
- Enhance the architectural quality of the High Weald
- Retain historic street furniture
- Enhance the ecological function of routeways
- Maintain the undeveloped nature of rural lanes
- Increase protection for archaeological monuments
- Secure agriculturally productive use for the fields of the High Weald AONB
- 100% retention of unimproved grassland
- 100% retention of key heathland sites
- Increase opportunities for education and celebration of the character of the AONB.
- Improve maintenance of Rights of Way network - 100% of network in these zones meeting basic RoW standards.
Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The environment of the High Weald is what makes the area outstanding. It comprises physiographic and geological features, water systems, climate, flora, fauna, landcover, buildings, transport infrastructure, boundaries, and archaeological monuments.

The AONB management plan will inform future development plan policy, and will assist in the implementation of existing policies.

There is a need to develop an appropriate mechanism to allow different communities of interest to identify what additional features they value in their local countryside and to participate effectively in setting priorities for their management.

The population surrounding the AONB is high: 873,000 people live in wards wholly or partly within 5km of the AONB. This context highlights the pressures (including those of development) on the AONB as well as its benefits to the surrounding urban areas (such as providing open-air recreation, potable water supply, local produce, and an environment that is attractive to businesses and their workers).

Implications for the LDF and SA

The DPDs should consider how to meet these targets. The LDF should be informed by these objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Local Plan (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 1996 – Statutory document)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why it is relevant**

The Plan sets out policies for the control of development in the Borough, makes proposals for development and the use of land to allocate land for specific purposes and highlights local planning issues.

**Key objectives and targets**

Due to the stage of the Local Plan Review, it is considered that the principles and targets included in the Adopted Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 1996 have been superseded. See Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy, below.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

See Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy, below.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

LDF objectives and DPD policies will need to address the main principles of the Plan.

| Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review, Second Deposit Copy (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2002 - Statutory document) |

**Why it is relevant**

The Plan sets out policies for the control of development in the Borough and makes proposals for development and the use of land to allocate land for specific purposes. It is the Review of the 1996 Local Plan.
Key objectives and targets

The overall aim of the Local Plan Review is to promote sustainable development through three strategic objectives:

- To protect the unique, high-quality environmental character of the area and to promote enhancement by encouraging excellence in the quality of all development;
- To conserve finite, non-renewable resources such as land, energy, water, soil and air quality; and
- To retain and provide an appropriate level and distribution of development to meet identified housing, economic and community needs.

Targets for each main objective are defined:

- There will be no loss of Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Sites of Special Scientific Interest designated of national importance
- No development within the Metropolitan Green Belt will be permitted other than that which is in accordance with PPG2 and the Local Plan
- 90% of new dwellings will be developed on previously-developed land
- 75% of housing development built on sites allocated in the Plan will be within the Royal Tunbridge Wells Central Access Zone or within 400 metres of the defined Primary Shopping Areas of Southborough, Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst
- 25% of housing development built on sites allocated in the Plan will be within 400 metres of a defined Neighbourhood Centre in Royal Tunbridge Wells/Southborough
- 35% of new economic development floorspace will be constructed on previously-developed land or through converted buildings
- Densities of 30-50 dwellings per hectare or greater will be achieved on all housing allocations
- Travel plans will be secured for appropriate development schemes
- No development which would adversely effect the quality of groundwater or surface water
- No development in flood risk areas at high risk from flooding
- 2,900 additional dwellings will be built;
- 2001 – 2003 funding and sites identified for 209 affordable dwellings. During the remainder of the Plan period, a further 177 dwellings are expected to be met;
- Up to 70,000 square metres of new business floorspace (B1, B2 and B8 Uses) and 20,000 square metres retail floorspace (A1 Use Class) will be permitted.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The high quality environment (of the Borough) is a constant consideration.

The urban area of Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough will be the focus for major development.

Edge-of-town development is restricted by the Green Belt, the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and other landscape character areas.

Outward expansion of villages will not occur except on sites required to meet the needs of the local community (for example, primary schools).

Most significant deficiencies in recreation and open space occur in Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough. Opportunities for providing additional sports pitches are limited through topography and the lack of suitable sites in Borough or Town Council ownership.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Develop LDF objectives and DPD policies to reflect the main strategic objectives.

Consider key targets within the DPDs and address housing issues within the Affordable/Key Worker Housing SPD.

SA objectives should recognise quality of life objectives in the plan.
**Tunbridge Wells Local Development Scheme (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2005 - Statutory document)**

**Why it is relevant**

The Scheme sets out the Council's intended approach to producing a new Local Development Framework for the Borough to replace the Local Plan, identifies which documents are going to be produced and sets out a programme for their preparation.

**Key objectives and targets**

The LDS has two key objectives:

- It is the starting point for the community and stakeholders to find out about what local planning policies relate to Tunbridge Wells Borough and what status the policies will have; and
- Sets out the programme for the preparation of the Local Development Framework over a three-year rolling period.

Key delivery targets in plan making.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

It is important that the local community is actively involved in preparing the Local Development Framework for the Borough.

Unforeseen circumstances may trigger a need to amend the LDS in advance of the next scheduled Annual Monitoring Report.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

LDF timetable to be monitored annually to ensure delivery.

SA Framework will need to conform to LDS.

---

**Tunbridge Wells Borough Transport Strategy (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2003 – Non-statutory document)**

**Why it is relevant**

The aim of the Strategy is to address the transport needs of the Borough. It forms an important and integral part of Kent County Council’s Local Transport Plan.

**Key objectives and targets**

The following key objectives arise from the Strategy:

- Support appropriate strategic highway proposals that would reduce traffic congestion, improve road safety and support the local economy,
- Support appropriate strategic rail proposals,
- Facilitate the provision and enhancement of long-distance walking and cycling,
- Encourage traffic, particularly HGVs, to use appropriate roads and to discourage inappropriate traffic speeds and volumes in sensitive areas.

The 12 Transport Strategy Targets relate directly to those in the LTP.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

Considerable congestion is experienced on the A21 between Tonbridge and Royal Tunbridge Wells at peak periods.

The Borough has a substantial network of Public Rights of Way, including strategic long distance cycle routes, footpaths and bridleways.
The ongoing vitality of the local economy indicates that, without intervention, the rate of growth in traffic volumes is likely to continue in the future. A detrimental impact will be experienced if substantial road building is undertaken in the borough.

To sustain economic growth and vitality within the Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre, attractive alternatives need to be provided to manage the demand for trips to the town centre by private car.

In the long term it will not be sufficient for excess demand to be satisfied by new buses, walking and cycling. A measure of restraint will be needed to avoid the town centre becoming congested by car traffic.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

Develop LDF objectives and DPD policies to reflect the main strategic objectives. Consider strategy targets within the DPDs and address provision, traffic reduction and safety targets in site-specific SPDs where appropriate.

Fundamental implications for encouraging public transport use, thereby contributing to air quality, human health, climate change and social inclusion objectives of the SA.


**Why it is relevant**

The Strategy promotes the cultural well-being of the Borough. The purpose of the document is to ensure that a strategic approach is adopted to culture.

**Key objectives and targets**

The Strategy aims to improve the cultural life of the Borough by:

- Encouraging active communities
- Improving access and maximising opportunities for all
- Managing and conserving built and natural assets
- Safeguarding the local community
- Supporting the economy, maintaining lively towns and villages
- Encouraging healthy lifestyles
- Focusing on young people.

A number of implementation targets (largely relating to the implementation of other plans and programmes).

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

The Borough of Tunbridge Wells has a rich legacy of natural and built heritage assets. It is set in a nationally recognised Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

A number of cultural activities are popular in Tunbridge Wells including visiting local restaurants and bars, libraries, parks and open spaces. However, less than 50% of the community participate in a range of other opportunities including sport activities and visiting museums, art galleries and historic properties and gardens. From consultation it is clear that often people felt poorly informed about what was available.

Provision and take-up of cultural activities is uneven within the Borough. Groups least likely to have participated in one or more cultural activities in the previous twelve months include those without access to a car, those aged over 65, people with disabilities, unemployed people and those on low incomes.

For many, lack of disposable income is a major factor that contributes to social exclusion and has a real impact on participation. The Concession Card, available to low income groups, is not well known.

Those without transport of their own find public transport both inadequate and costly and those with cars in rural areas have to travel longer distances to most cultural facilities.

It is particularly important for communities living in urban areas to have access to local outdoor recreation facilities such as parks, recreation grounds and play areas within walking distance of their homes.
### Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider objectives within the DPDs and SPDs where possible and appropriate


**Why it is relevant**

The strategy aims to improve the quality of life for people within Tunbridge Wells with regard to crime and safety.

**Key objectives and targets**

The key aims are:

- to reduce crime and disorder
- to reduce the fear of crime
- to further strengthen partnership working and communication
- to build safer localities for those who live, work or spend leisure time in the borough.

Main targets include:

- 10% reduction in British Crime Survey comparator crimes.
- 10% reduction in fear of crime.
- 10% reduction in numbers of young people who are victims of crime
- 33% reduction in repeat victimisation (domestic abuse) within twelve months
- 10% reduction in alcohol fuelled disorder
- 10% reduction in anti-social behaviour incident reports
- 10% reduction in reported shoplifting.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

There are a number of local schemes, including the Safe Towns Partnership which are working to reduce crime in the Borough.

In approaching anti-social behaviour, there are two clear areas to consider, namely dealing with and tackling individuals, and the ‘street scene’ or environmental crime, such as graffiti, damage, fly tipping and abandoned vehicles.

Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre has the highest levels of recorded crime within the Borough, largely as a consequence of an extensive retail economy and a growing night-time economy.

There remain certain types of behaviour and crimes, such as anti-social behaviour and damage, which continue to undermine attempts to reduce the fear of crime and improve the quality of life for people who live, work or enjoy leisure time within the Borough.

### Implications for the LDF and SA

Consider how the DPDs and SPDs can contribute to meeting these objectives. These should be considered in all area or site specific SPDs

Consider crime reduction objective(s) within the SA framework

### Tunbridge Wells Borough Community Plan 2003-2011 (Tunbridge Wells Borough Community Plan Partnership, 2003 - Statutory document)

**Why it is relevant**

The Plan seeks to provide a positive force for change to improve the quality of life for all who live, work and enjoy leisure time in the Borough.
### Key objectives and targets

**Objectives for 2011 include:**

- An environment which is conserved and enhanced, both for ourselves and for the benefit of future generations
- A prosperous local economy
- A wide range of high quality and enjoyable leisure opportunities
- A reduction in crime and the fear of crime
- Safe, convenient and sustainable travel options to work, school, health and leisure facilities
- Housing which meets the needs of local people of all ages.
- Access to healthy lifestyle choices and the right healthcare facilities to meet the community’s needs
- An opportunity for everyone to lead a fulfilling life.

**Safeguarding our environment:**

- 100% of main rivers rated as good or fair quality by 2011
- 40% of household waste recycled and composted by 2005/06 (20% recycled and 20% composted)
- 90% of new homes built on previously-developed land between 2001 and 2011
- No reduction in the Green Belt by 2011
- No development within the Green Belt or outside settlements situated beyond the Green Belt permitted other than that allowed by the Local Plan
- No loss of Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Sites of Special Scientific Interest designated of national importance by 2011
- No development, the design of which is incongruous within its context, permitted during the period to 2011
- 300 new trees, 1500m of hedgerow and 20 ponds restored in the countryside by 2006
- Reduce domestic energy consumption by 18% by 2011
- At least one new Conservation Area Appraisal and Enhancement Scheme each year to 2011
- Work with 40 landowners by 2006 to enable schemes which will enhance the landscape.

**Maintaining a thriving local economy:**

- Maintain unemployment below national and county rates consistently until 2011
- 74% of 16 year old pupils in local authority schools achieving 5 or more GCSEs at Grades A* - C or equivalent by 2004.

**Enabling people to take part in and enjoy leisure activities:**

- Achieve 600 GP referrals to the Tunbridge Wells Sports and Indoor Tennis Centre and Weald Sports Centre by 2008
- Achieve targets of 240 places in social, recreational and educational activities in priority areas listed in Table 1 (page 46) by 2005
- Achieve 500 hours per year of activities for up to 2,000 young people from 2003 - 2006

**Increasing community safety and reducing the fear of crime:**

- Reduce all crime by 10% between 2002 and 2005
- Reduce vehicle crime by 2.5% between 2002 and 2005
- Reduce burglary dwelling by 5% between 2002 and 2005
- Increase membership of Neighbourhood Watch by 10% between 2002 and 2005
- Ensure less than 33% of all recorded domestic violence incidents involve repeat victims between 2002 and 2003
- Reduce public disorder between 2002 and 2005

**Transport - getting around the Borough:**

- To reduce traffic growth between 1999 and 2005/6 in Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough by 1.8% close to the town centre and 1.2% at the edge of town
- To reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries to pedestrians by 40% by 2010 from the 1994/96 average
- To reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries to cyclists by 40% by 2010 from the 1994/96 average
- To reduce the number of children killed or seriously injured on the road by 50% by 2010 compared with the annual average in the period 1994 - 1998
- 25% of major employers have, or be developing, Travel Plans by 2006/07
- Number of children travelling to primary school and secondary school in their parents’ or own car reduced by 20% from the base year 2003 by 2010
- 98% of street lights functioning correctly at all times
Meeting the need for housing:

- 2,900 additional homes completed by 2011
- 815 new affordable homes achieved by 2011
- Over 50% of new homes to be of small or intermediate size (80 square metres or less) up to 2011
- Provision of 35 key worker homes by 2004
- Complete research into the need for supported accommodation, nursing homes and key worker housing by 2006

Promoting health and improving well-being:

- Reduce the death rate from coronary heart disease and reduce stroke and related diseases in people under 75 by at least 40% by 2010
- Reduce accident death rates by at least 20% and the rate of serious injury from accidents by at least 10% by 2010
- 20 additional intermediate care beds and 1,000 non-residential intermediate care card places, together with increased therapy services in the community, within South West Kent Primary Care Trust area compared with 1999/2000 baseline by 2004
- 70% of all state schools and 70 new catering establishments in the Borough to participate in the Kent Heartbeat Award by 2008
- Achieve the opening of the new District General Hospital by 2007/08
- 2,475 people to cease smoking by 2006 across the South West Kent and Maidstone Weald Primary Care Trust areas
- Reduce the rate of conception amongst 15-17 year olds by 50% by 2010
- Run one Safety in Action event per year in primary schools within the Borough

Encouraging social inclusion by supporting independence:

- Provide family support services
- Provide pre-school education together with out of school activities which encourage focus on 8-12 year olds
- Develop and monitor activities in line with Children’s Fund aims and objectives (Sherwood)
- Increase opportunity for youth participation
- Support community/volunteering activity for all age groups and develop a Compact with the voluntary sector
- Identify and support community leaders in areas of deprivation
- Determine opportunity for development of social enterprises
- Provide suitable learning opportunities such as basic skills
- Support and facilitate the provision of appropriate community buildings
- Improve provision for disabled people including access to public buildings, road crossings and usage of sports facilities

Work with 30 schools and other community groups by 2006 to raise awareness of the countryside.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

With increasing demand for homes, work space and other community needs, land use needs to be very carefully managed and sustainability considered as an integral part of any plan for development.

By targeting ‘brownfield’ (previously developed) sites in preference to undeveloped greenfield sites and encouraging good design practice, we can minimise resource use.

At present, 20% of household waste in Tunbridge Wells Borough is recycled and composted. However, we cannot remain complacent and we must aim to achieve the national target of 30% by 2005/06. 85% of Borough residents believe the provision of recycling facilities in public places and the provision of green boxes for paper/cardboard collection are important.

In Tunbridge Wells Borough, tourism contributes significantly to the local economy. An extension of the tourist season should be pursued to increase income to the area.

The Borough’s rural and urban environments face a number of threats, from predicted changes in the global climate to the local impact of factors such as traffic congestion, new development and the disposal of waste.

Implications for the LDF and SA

The LDF objectives should be significantly informed by the objectives of this strategy which reflect local concerns and issues

These targets should be addressed in the DPDs and SPDs where relevant. For example, housing targets should be met through the Affordable/Key Worker Housing SPD and leisure targets should be addressed within the area specific SPDs and the Recreation Open Space SPD

Targets and data sources should be considered as suitable indicators for SA objectives.
(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2002 - Statutory document)

### Why it is relevant
The Strategy sets out the vision for housing in the Borough until 2006.

### Key objectives and targets
The main aims for housing until the end of this strategy are:
- To Consider the Needs of all Customers
- To Help People Access Homes
- To Improve the Standard of Homes
- To Help People Live in the Community

Further objectives are set out in the report in relation to these aims.

The report identified a number of targets for each objective including extent of Brown Field development.

### Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges
Partnership-working to meet the needs of vulnerable people across West Kent has been a particular success in Tunbridge Wells through a long-standing partnership with Sevenoaks and Tonbridge & Malling.

Tunbridge Wells has a significant number of people aged over 60 compared to other areas. The 60-69 age band in West Kent is expected to increase, so this is a key issue for all agencies.

The Borough is, on the whole, prosperous although this brings its own problems of high land and property values. The housing market in the Borough is very dynamic and as house prices rise, more and more people who would normally be able to purchase their own property are now in need of alternatives to purchase or assistance to get them on to the property ladder.

The challenge for the Council is to meet the demands and aspirations of people within the Borough for all types and sizes of dwellings, from five-bedroom executive homes to one-room flats. 80% of the growth in the total number of households nationally over the next 15 years is expected to be due to an increase in one-person households. This pattern is also expected to apply in Kent and Tunbridge Wells Borough.

The most important issue for the Council's Housing Service is the lack of affordable housing within the Borough.

Important national, regional and local planning objectives relating to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings, urban regeneration and sustainable locations for housing development are key issues for the Local Plan, along with the need for affordable housing.

### Implications for the LDF and SA
Consider Strategy objectives in formulating LDF objectives
Consider these objectives in the Affordable-Key Worker Housing SPD
Consider brown field redevelopment targets in SA.

(Tunbridge Wells Borough Council - Non-statutory document)

### Why it is relevant
The purpose of the Strategy is to contribute to health improvement and help to improve the energy efficiency and overall condition of the housing stock of the Borough.
Key objectives and targets

The Councils’ vision ‘to promote the health and wellbeing of our residents by improving their living conditions and ensuring that all have access to a suitable and decent home’ is to be monitored against four key objectives:

- To maintain and increase the proportion of private housing in decent condition, particularly that occupied by vulnerable people
- To enable vulnerable people (including older people) to live safely and independently in their own homes
- To reduce fuel poverty by increasing access to affordable warmth, make homes more energy efficient and reduce domestic energy consumption
- To monitor the condition and make best use of the existing housing stock.

Targets are identified in relation to each objective including:

- Increase the percentage of the unfit properties made fit as a result of Council action (BVPI target - 2% in 2004/5 – increase to 4% 2005/6);
- Further reduce domestic energy consumption by 16% by 2011;
- Increase the number of unfit and vacant private sector dwellings returned to occupation or demolished annually.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The Council has a central role in private sector renewal through its duty to monitor local housing in relation to both conditions and need. In association with this it can help to ensure that the best use is made of limited housing resources and assist the most vulnerable sections of society to have access to suitable and decent homes.

Traditionally the worst housing conditions are found in the private rented sector.

There is a high demand for low cost private rented accommodation and housing association homes.

Constraints imposed by the Metropolitan Green Belt and the designation of High Weald as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty mean that there is limited scope for development on Greenfield sites. It is therefore essential to maximise the potential of the existing housing stock to meet housing need while safeguarding the local environment.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Develop LDF objectives and DPD policies to reflect the main strategic objectives.

Targets and data sources should be considered as suitable indicators for SA objectives

Environmental Strategy (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, 2005 – Non-statutory document)

Why it is relevant

This Strategy provides a framework to tackle local environmental issues. It builds on issues outlined in the Community Plan.
Key objectives and targets

A number of objectives relate to the following key issues:

- Countryside;
- Built Historic Environment;
- Your Doorstep;
- Transport, Traffic and Access;
- Waste and Recycling;
- Water Quality and Flood Risk;
- Nuisance, Contaminated Land and Light Pollution;
- Air Quality;
- Resource Use and Climate Change;
- Nature Conservation;
- Corporate Action.

Improve currently congested transport links with alternatives to the car.

Address development pressure, notably for more buildings and transport infrastructure.

Reduce the need for landfill.

Address the pollution of water, noise, land and air.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

The Council has powers to manage many changes that would be detrimental to the built and natural environment through legislation and the Local Plan process.

The Borough’s two museums work to preserve local artefacts and documentary heritage through their conservation programmes and also by increasing awareness and understanding through their education programmes.

The Council works with developers to ensure the provision of sufficient play areas in new housing developments, providing appropriate street lighting and also designing out crime through ‘Safe by Design’.

Road traffic is the main generator of air pollution within the Borough. There are a few areas of higher concentration of pollutants, along the busiest roads and around junctions.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Ensure that broad objectives are met within the DPDs.

Health Plan for the Borough of Tunbridge Wells (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council - Non-statutory document)

Why it is relevant

The Plan addresses the health of the residents of the Borough and outlines objectives through which standards may be improved.
Key objectives and targets

- To increase physical activity
- To improve diet and nutrition
- To address smoking
- To improve housing
- To improve food safety
- To improve air, soil and noise pollution
- To improve road traffic
- To control waste
- To increase physical activity
- To improve diet and nutrition
- To address smoking
- To improve housing
- To improve food safety
- To improve air, soil and noise pollution
- To improve road traffic
- To control waste
- To improve workplace health and safety
- To address health issues relating to children and young adults
- To facilitate community development
- To address health issues relating to older adults
- To reduce falls
- To address domestic violence
- To address social exclusion
- To improve living environments
- To improve working environments
- Improve access and to increase usage of Council owned sports facilities
- Participate in National Bike Week and other initiatives to raise awareness of cycling
- Enforce the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council tobacco smoking policy in civic buildings
- Improve the physical and living conditions of houses in the borough
- Improve food safety and hygiene standards in food premises in the borough
- Continue to review and assess the air quality within the borough
- Develop a local Noise Policy for the borough
- Promote and investigate new and alternative modes of travel
- Introduce traffic calming measures in the borough
- Improve refuse collection and recycling
- Implement a programme of play and recreational enhancement schemes
- Support young homeless people in the borough
- Ensure the housing needs of local people of all ages are met
- Work with families and individuals at risk of social exclusion to address their needs
- Reduce crime and disorder within the community
- Increase community safety
- Improve bus services to rural locations within the borough
- Reduce crime in rural areas by 10% over the next three years.

Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges

Whilst the LDF will not be able to contribute to delivering all of the objectives above such as reducing falls and the improvement of food safety and hygiene standards, it will be able to provide policies related to key issues such as noise and air quality and access to sports facilities and open space.

Implications for the LDF and SA

Ensure that these objectives are addressed by the DPDs and SPDs

**Why it is relevant**

The Strategy outlines specific local economic priorities and actions pertinent to the Borough. It is intended to complement the more strategic economic actions at the West Kent level.

**Key objectives and targets**

The vision is for the Borough of Tunbridge Wells to have an increasingly diverse and thriving economy, with profitable businesses across all sectors providing a wide range of products, services and local employment opportunities whilst nurturing high quality rural and urban environments.

The three key objectives are to:
- Encourage the continued development of a wide range of enterprise in the Borough;
- Enhance the attractiveness of towns and other centres in the Borough as places to work, visit, shop, and establish new, and enhance existing, enterprises.
- Support the sustainable development of the more rural areas and communities.

**Opportunities, synergies, constraints and challenges**

- Promote identified sites through planning briefs to optimise the use of available land and premises.
- Attract new business ventures to the Borough (including technology based and professional service businesses) building on the strengths of the business services sector and locally available skills.
- Undertake a review of options for improving accessibility of Tunbridge Wells for workers, businesses, visitors and shoppers.
- Encourage the development and enhancement of market towns (Cranbrook and Paddock Wood).
- Encourage the development and retention of diverse enterprise within the more rural areas to provide locally based employment and services (including tourism, leisure and recreation activities, business services, retail and other activities, as appropriate).
- Promote the development of employment opportunities (identified in the Local Plan) and vacant sites and premises to provide accommodation for growing local and selected inward investing companies.
- Encourage local businesses and organisations to procure local goods and services.
- Encourage businesses to develop transport plans for their employees to reduce congestion and improve air quality.
- Examine the potential for developing the evening economy in Cranbrook Town Centre to help sustain local businesses.
- Market the Tunbridge Wells area as a tourist destination to draw a low volume of high spending visitors to sustain historic parks, gardens and other visitor attractions, to support businesses serving rural communities and to support the vitality and viability of key centres.
- Ensure the Local Development Framework takes full account of the need for employment floor space, to allow the growth and retention of employment and services in rural areas and settlements.

**Implications for the LDF and SA**

The LDF should address the objectives outlined in the Economic Strategy through policies contained within its DPDs.
Appendix B  BASELINE DATA SOURCES


Colliers CRE on behalf of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Shopping Study Update, Volumes One and Two, May 2003.


Eveleigh, N.G. on behalf of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Residential Development and Recreation Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance, April 1996.

http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk

http://www.magic.gov.uk

Indicative floodplain map http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk


Landscape Character Area Assessment, 2002.


Tunbridge Wells Borough Council/ Air Quality Consultants, Updating and Screening Assessment of Air Quality in the Borough of Tunbridge Wells, May 2003.

www.airquality.co.uk

www.countryside-agency.gov.uk

www.environment-heritage.gov.uk

www.naei.org.uk
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has recently received a consultation document relating to the South East Plan: Employment, housing and infrastructure in Kent.

The consultation is on the planning advice to be given by Kent County Council and Medway Council to the South East England Regional Assembly. Tunbridge Wells is regarded as being in the ‘Rest of Kent’ area. The consultation paper gives two housing options:

**Rest of Kent Housing Options 2006-2026**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potential Land Supply</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These options, subject to consultation, will be taken forward during the preparation of the emerging options for the Core Strategy.
Appendix C  DETAILED BASELINE INFORMATION FOR THE BOROUGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Baseline Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In July 2005, there were 104,000 residents in the Borough. There are below average levels of young adults living in the Borough. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*

According to mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data, there were 104,600 people residing in Tunbridge Wells Borough; of whom 48.3% were male and 51.7% were female. There are more females than males in the Borough in the following age categories: up to 15 years; 16-24 years; 35-44 years; 45-59 years; and 65 and over. There are more males than females in the 25-34 years age category. There are equal number of females and males aged between 60 and 64 years in Tunbridge Wells Borough. *(Mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data)*

Females appear to be living longer than males in the Borough, with significantly more living beyond retirement age. According to mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data, there were 3,000 more females over the age of 65 years than males in the Borough in July 2003. *(Mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data)*

According to mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data, children under five accounted for approximately 6% of the resident population of the Borough. This compares with almost 6% for England and Wales overall. In 2003, the population of the Borough was split by age as follows: up to 15 years – 22,000; 16 – 64 years – 65,600; 65 years and over – 17,000. *(Mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data)*

The resident population of the Borough in 2001 stood at 104,030, of which 48.2% (50,133) were male and 51.8% (53,897) were female. This compared with a resident population in South East of 8,000,645 people, of whom 49% were male and 51% were female. *(2001 Census)*

In 2001, the population density of Tunbridge Wells Borough averaged 313 people per square kilometre, compared with an average of 421, for the region and 380 people per square kilometre for England overall. *(2001 Census)*

In 2001, 20.7% of the resident population were under 16 years of age, 71.3% were aged between 16 and 74, and 8% were over 75 years of age. The average age of the population in Tunbridge Wells Borough was 39.2 years. This compared with an average age for England and Wales of 38.6 years. Relatively few young adults live in the Borough, particularly in rural areas. There is a relative shortfall of people aged 18-29 in comparison with the South East and Britain as a whole. *(2001 Census)*

With regard to ethnicity, in 2001, 97.6% of the Borough’s residents were White; 1% were of mixed origin; 0.7% were Asian; 0.2% were Black; 0.4% were Chinese and 0.3% were classed as belonging to another ethnic group. *(2001 Census)*

In 2001, 55% of residents lived in urban wards and 45% in rural wards *(2001 Census data in Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

In 1991, 99,538 people were living in the Borough; 47.8% of whom were male and 52.8% were female. 98.7% of the Borough’s residents were White. *(1991 Census)*
### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Baseline Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In July 2005, approximately 40,000 people commuted into and out of the Borough for work purposes. One in four jobs were filled by people living outside the Borough. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*

In July 2005, 82% of all employment in the Borough was service-sector based. The largest sectors of employment in the Borough are retail, hotels and restaurants, with 15,400 jobs (which represented 3 in 10 jobs in 2003). The banking and business services sector and the public administration, education and health sector are also large; both employing 12,500 people, each representing just under one quarter of all jobs. Manufacturing provides 4,000 jobs. Transport and Communications businesses, and ‘other services’, each employ 2,500 people. Construction provides 1,700 jobs, and primary industries provide the lowest number of jobs in the Borough, at 1,400. Agricultural employment in the Borough declined by a third between 1995 and 2002. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*

The Borough’s residents have high levels of economic activity. In July 2005, 71% were economically active. More people work full-time and are self-employed (12% of residents) than in the rest of Kent. Self-employment levels are particularly high in the rural parts of the Borough. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005/ Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

A high proportion of the Borough’s residents have very high skill levels; however this masks 38% of the Borough’s population having no or low qualifications. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*

The 2000 survey of economic impact indicated 3,300 jobs in the Borough were associated with the tourism industry, equating to 7% of total employment *(South East England Tourist Board, 2000)*. Of the 3,300 jobs in the industry, over 650 were based within the accommodation sector (including hotels and bed and breakfast facilities), which housed 34% of all staying trips to the Borough. *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

There was a 2.2% decline in employees between 1995 and 2003 in the Manufacturing, Transport & Communications and Public Administration & Health sectors in the Borough. Growth was experienced in the Distribution, Hotels & Restaurants sector and the Banking, Finance & Insurance sector during this period. *(Annual Business Inquiry, 2005)*

In July 2003, 1.1% of people (695) in the Borough were unemployed; in the period January to May 2004, this figure had risen to 1.2% (739). However, this was considerably lower than the unemployment level in 2001, which stood at 1.9%. *(Mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data)*

In July 2003, 18.7% of the Tunbridge Wells Borough resident population were of retirement age (65 and over for males or 60 and over for females), compared with 18.5% in England and Wales. *(Mid-2003 population estimates based on adjusted 2001 Census data)*

In 2001, the proportion of people in the Borough who were employed was 66.5%. *(Local Housing Needs Survey, 2000/ 2001 Census)*

In 2001, 1.9% of the population of the Borough were unemployed (compared to 3.4% national average). Of the people in Tunbridge Wells who were unemployed, 22.14% were aged 50 and over, 4.6% had never worked and 24.26% were long-term unemployed. *(2001 Census)*

In 2000, the average gross household income in the Borough was £24,589 compared to the national average of £20,500. *(Local Housing Needs Survey, 2000)*
### Economic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Baseline Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In July 2005, there were 5726 businesses in the Borough, employing 53,000 people. This figure comprises 45 Primary Industry businesses; 353 manufacturing businesses; 452 construction businesses; 1,861 retail businesses, hotels and restaurants; 82 transport and communications businesses; 1,944 banking and business services establishments; 377 public administration, education and health establishments; and 512 ‘other service’ businesses. *(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*


Within Tunbridge Wells Borough, land available for major commercial development is limited. *(Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)*

In Tunbridge Wells Borough at the start of 2003, there were approximately 5,400 business establishments, of which 4,770 were registered for VAT. These employed 52,600 people in 2002. *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

The Borough is marketed as the ‘Heart of Kent’ in partnership with Ashford, Sevenoaks, Maidstone, Tonbridge and Malling councils. The tourist industry is significant in terms of the investment and employment that it generates. In 2003, tourism contributed £153.9 m to the Borough’s economy. In 2000, the figure stood at 124.8m. Both leisure tourism and business tourism are essential elements of the commercial infrastructure of the Borough. *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004/ Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005/ The Economic Impact of Tourism in Tunbridge Wells in 2003)*

There was a net addition in the Borough of 480 businesses services organisations, 225 wholesale and retail outlets and 60 hotels and restaurants to the business stock (a 15% increase in local business stock) between 1994 and 2003. This figure masks great variation between sectors – the stock of agricultural businesses, for example, reduced by 14% over this period. However, it does suggest that there are few barriers to entrepreneurs setting up businesses in Tunbridge Wells Borough. *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

There were 560 VAT registrations and 455 de-registrations in the Borough in 2002 alone, representing 20% of the business stock. *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

The main Economic Development Areas in the Borough are:

- Longfield Road and High Brooms Estate *(Tunbridge Wells)*;
- Transfesa and Eldon Way *(Paddock Wood)*; and
- Gills Green *(Hawkhurst)* *(Economic Overview of Tunbridge Wells Borough, 2004)*

### Deprivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Baseline Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft 2005/ National Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Details about the Baseline Information for the Borough.*
### Baseline Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In February 2005, there were 2,400 people claiming Income Support in the Borough. <em>(Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ward of Sherwood has been identified as one of the most deprived parts of Tunbridge Wells Borough. In 2004, it was ranked just outside the top 25% most deprived wards in the Country. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the 2004 English Indices of Multiple Deprivation, Tunbridge Wells has an overall rank of 283 out of 354 local authorities. These statistics indicate that the Borough is considerably less deprived than many parts of the country (it is the 283rd least deprived local authority in England). The Borough was ranked 10th least deprived out of 12 local authorities, with regard to average score on the indices of deprivation in the Kent County Council area. The Borough ranked of 233 on the income measure. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between September 1999 and September 2004 the number of young people aged 18 to 24 years who were claiming work related benefits reduced by 40% in Tunbridge Wells Borough, compared to a reduction of 30.7% in Great Britain overall. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In September 2004, only 6% of people claiming work-related benefits in Tunbridge Wells Borough had been doing so for more than 12 months, compared to 17% in September 1999. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In August 2003, there were 4645 people claiming Income Support in Tunbridge Wells Borough; of these 2% were aged under 20. In the Borough, 7% of the population over the age of 16 benefited from Income Support payments. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In August 2003, there were 665 claimants of the Jobseeker's Allowance in Tunbridge Wells Borough. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Borough, in 2000, there were 4600 people claiming income support; in 1998, there were 5200 people claiming income support and in 1997, there were 5000 people claiming Income Support. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In July 2005, 38% of the Borough’s residents had no or low qualifications. <em>(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunbridge Wells is located in the Local Education Authority of Kent, part of the South East region. In the academic year 2003/04, 55.8% of pupils in Kent achieved 5 or more GCSEs graded A* to C, compared to an average for England of 53.7%. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the last five years, in the County, standards in education, as shown by the Standard Assessment Tests (SATs), have also improved in respect of younger students. The proportion of pupils in Kent achieving at least level 4 at Key Stage 2 (KS2) (the anticipated level of attainment for pupils aged 11 in their final year at primary school) has changed from 68% in 1999 to 70% in 2004 for Mathematics, and from 70% to 74% for English. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, 24.3% of the population of the Borough had qualifications at degree level or higher. The national average was 19.8%. In the same year, 22% of people in the Borough had no qualifications; which was lower than the national average of 29.1%. <em>(National Statistics)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, 6% of the resident population were school pupils or full-time students aged 16 to 74 years. The average for England and Wales for the same year was 5.1%. <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Baseline Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the period April 2003 – March 2004, there were 939 Offences for Violence Against the Person recorded by the Police, in Tunbridge Wells Borough. The figure for the same period for the South-East was 113,402 Offences; nationally, it was 902,738 Offences.</strong> (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the same period, there were 42 Robbery Offences recorded in Tunbridge Wells Borough, compared to 6542 in the South-East and 99,915 nationally. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 Burglary in a Dwelling Offences were recorded in the Borough between April 2003 and March 2004; the figure for the South-East was 40,879 for the South-East as a region and 338,431 for England, nationally. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279 Theft of a Motor Vehicle and 558 Theft from a Vehicle, Offences were recorded in Tunbridge Wells Borough. The figures for the South-East were 29,584 and 74,585 respectively. Nationally, there were 274,524 Theft of a Vehicle and 568,704 Theft from a Vehicle Offences recorded. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the period April 2000 to March 2001, there were 570 Violence Against the Person Offences, recorded by the Police in Tunbridge Wells Borough. This was compared to 70,051 in the South-East and 561,676 nationally. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the same period, there were 36 Sexual Offences in the Borough recorded by the Police. In the South-East the figure was 5,077 and nationally it was 35,422 Sexual Offences. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Robbery Offences were recorded by the Tunbridge Wells Borough Police from April 2000 to March 2001. This was compared to 5,639 for the South-East and 94,211 for England as a whole. (National Statistics/ Neighbourhood Statistics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing**

## Subject | Baseline Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House prices in the Borough are high, relative to average local wages, making affordability problematic. <em>(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 2002 and 2003, average dwelling prices in the South East increased by 7.9%, compared with England, where the average rise was 12.2%. The average increase in price was 11.8% between 1997 and 1998 in the South East, compared with 8.1% increase in England. <em>(Housing Needs Survey, 2000)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Tunbridge Wells Borough there were 42,695 households in 2001. 97% of the resident population lived in households. The remainder of the population lived in communal establishments, including supervised hostels, hotels, large hospitals and prisons. <em>(Neighbourhood Statistics)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, the average size of households in Tunbridge Wells Borough was 2.4 people, which equalled the national average. <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, 28.41% of the resident population of the Borough lived in a detached house or bungalow. 30.87% lived in a semi-detached house or bungalow. 18.66% lived in a terraced property (including end terrace). <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, 21.7% of the Borough’s households were accommodated in flats or maisonettes. 0.3% lived in caravans or other mobile or temporary structures. This compared with 19.2% and 0.4%, respectively for England and Wales on average. <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2001, with regard to housing tenure in the Borough, 30.7% of households were owned outright; 40.4% were owned with a mortgage/loan; 0.61% were rented from the Council; 15.21% were housing association rented or rented from a registered social landlord; 9.58% were rented from a private landlord or letting agency; and 3.06% were rented from another individual/body. <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Borough, 2.5% of identified households in need cannot afford rented accommodation and schemes are in place to enable the purchase of low cost housing or shared ownership. <em>(2001 Census)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nationwide trend of the reduction in the number of people per household is reflected in Tunbridge Wells Borough, where predicted figures for 2011 show a shift away from the number of married couple households, which comprised 58% in 1991, but which are predicted to fall to 46% by 2011. Statistics for the Borough show movement towards single person households, which composed 25% of households in 1991 but which are predicted to increase to 34% by 2011. <em>(Housing Needs Survey, 2000)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites and funding were identified for 30 affordable dwellings between 2001 and 2002 with 65% of the housing need being required within Royal Tunbridge Wells. The split of the percentage shows the need for 58% 1 bed units and 25% 2 bed units. <em>(Housing Needs Survey, 2000)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land for additional housing is limited in the Borough. <em>(Tunbridge Wells Economic Strategy Consultation Draft, 2005)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health | Neighbourhood Statistics
### Baseline Information

In August 2003, 2,570 people between the ages of 16 and 65 in Tunbridge Wells Borough claimed Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disability Allowance because they had been unable to work for at least 28 consecutive weeks because of illness or disability. Of these people, 13% were under the age of 30.

2,375 people in Tunbridge Wells Borough received Disability Living Allowance, in August 2003. This represents 2.7% of all people under the age of 65 living in the area, compared with 5.1% of the population in England and Wales.

In 2001, in Tunbridge Wells Borough, 8.8% of the resident population provided unpaid care compared to 10% in England and Wales. Of the people providing unpaid care, 14.8% gave 50 hours or more per week, this compared with 20.9% in England and Wales.

The proportion of residents in the Borough living with long-term illness was 14.5% in 2001.

6.6% of Tunbridge Wells Borough’s described their general health as ‘not good’ in 2001.

In 2001, 72.9% of residents described their general health as being ‘good’.

There are 19 doctors’ surgeries and 20 dental surgeries within Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough with all parishes being served by at least one doctors’ surgery.

### Cultural Heritage

Within the Borough, there are ten Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM):

- Royal Tunbridge Wells, (2 SAM);
- Cranbrook (2 SAM);
- Benenden (1 SAM);
- Brenchley (1 SAM);
- Capel (1 SAM);
- Horsmonden (1 SAM);
- Lamberhurst (1 SAM); and
- Speldhurst (1 SAM).

There are over 3,000 Listed Buildings in the Borough; so listed for the combination of buildings, spaces and landscape. There are also 25 conservation areas, designated for their urban character and landscape quality. Appraisals have been published for selected conservation areas within the Tunbridge Wells Borough; Cranbrook 1997, Hawkhurst 1999, Pembury 1998, Royal Tunbridge Wells 2000 and Lamberhurst 2002.

English Heritage has compiled a ‘Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England’ which includes 13 or 14 sites within the Borough, and a further 20 listed on the Kent Gardens Compendium.

Bayham Abbey Ancient Monument is located outside the boundary though part of the setting of the Monument is clearly located within the Borough.

### Transport

There are 19 doctors’ surgeries and 20 dental surgeries within Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough with all parishes being served by at least one doctors’ surgery.
### Subject: Baseline Information

| The A21 forms the major north-south road corridor for traffic accessing Royal Tunbridge Wells and considerable congestion is experienced on the A21 between Tonbridge and Royal Tunbridge Wells at peak periods. The A26, A264, and A267 are the primary distributor roads in the Borough. *(Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002)* |
| There are reasonable rail services from Royal Tunbridge Wells to Tonbridge, Sevenoaks and London but in general facilities for cycling and public transport are poor and consequently, there is a comparatively low usage of public transport services. *(Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002)* |
| Three Park and Ride sites were identified in the adopted 1996 Local Plan. These have not yet been implemented. However, planning consent exists for a 580 space car park at Woodsgate Corner (Pembury) and approximately 215 spaces have been constructed. The three sites and an additional fourth site (south of Longfield Road) are in the Local Plan Review. The total capacity of the four sites is estimated to be some 1,530 spaces. *(Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002)* |
| Royal Tunbridge Wells in particular has a high volume of traffic, peak hour congestion and delays. There are limited parking opportunities and occupancy rates for off-street car-parks in Royal Tunbridge Wells have reached approximately 90% of capacity. Continued traffic growth is predicted. The town’s traffic problem is having an adverse impact on the local environment. *(Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002)* |
| In April 2001, 18.7% of households in Tunbridge Wells Borough did not have a car or van, compared to an average of 26.8% in England and Wales. Households with access to two or more cars or vans accounted for 38.2% of all households in Tunbridge Wells Borough, this compared to an England and Wales average of 29.4%. *(Neighbourhood Statistics)* |

| Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna |
| Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002 |
| More than 70% of the Borough is designated as part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which extends across 14 Local Planning Authorities and 550 square miles. |
| There are 10 Sites of Special Scientific Interest within the Borough. Approximately 70% of the Borough being classed as Special Landscaped Area (Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy, 2001). 54.5% of the SSSI’s in the Borough is in favourable condition, 0.5% unfavourable recovering; and 1.09% unfavourable no change (2005). Although the area of designated land (SSSIs) has increased across the country, the percentage of SSSI’s in a favourable condition decreased from 59% in 2000 to 56% in 2002 and to 54% in 2005. |
| There are also 54 Sites of Nature Conservation Interest and 17 Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest. There are four Local Nature Reserves in the Borough. |
| Ancient Woodland covers approximately 12% of the Borough, totalling 3,850 hectares. English Nature’s Inventory of Ancient Woodland (1994) found 77% of this woodland to be ancient (continuously wooded since 1600). *(Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy, 2001)*. |
| The Borough has 410 Tree Preservation Orders including woodlands, trees in large urban developments and individual specimens *(Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy, 2001)*. The Kent Habitat Survey of 2003 identified 19% of the Borough as being broad leaved woodland. |
| The Borough is predominantly rural in character with the Metropolitan Green Belt covering the western extent of the plan area. The Tunbridge Wells Borough Urban Capacity Study (2001) indicated the Borough to be capable of accommodating necessary development without needing to modify the Metropolitan Green Belt boundaries. |
| Six rural fringe areas have been located in close proximity to the urban areas of Royal |
### Subject: Land and Soil

**Baseline Information**

- **Tunbridge Wells and Southborough:** these are Culverden Down, Grange Road Allotments, North Farm Tip, Home Farm, Sherwood Park and Greggs Wood, Speldhurst Road Allotments and Hawkenbury Farm.

- **Southborough:** has the lowest provision of open space at 0.7 hectares per 1000 of the population.

- **Royal Tunbridge Wells:** is also deficient in open space and recreational facilities. This is exhibited in the number of pitches in the area that suffer over-use, along with a number of other indicators. The topography of the area and ownership of land are limiting factors in creating further provision.

- **19 residential areas within Royal Tunbridge Wells** do not have reasonable access to equipped area of play, although a number of suitable sites have been identified for development.

- **Agricultural Land within the Borough:** is predominantly arable and is classed as Grade 3 by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, although few areas of Grades 2 and 3a do exist on intensively cropped land.

### Subject: Landscape

**Baseline Information**

- **Landscape Character Area Assessment 2002**

  The quality of the landscape across the whole Borough is high with much of it very high, and has been identified by residents as one of its main assets. The varying topography and geology of the Borough has produced a varying and interesting landscape that supports a wide range of habitats and wildlife. The landscape of the Borough has been assessed and divided into 19 character areas based on natural characteristics and historical influences. These are contained in the Borough Landscape Character Area Assessment Supplementary Planning Guidance, August 2002.

  **Open space:** Areas of important open space are considered to fall into one of three categories in the Borough: open space of historic importance; open space of local visual amenity value and open space of strategic importance.

  Several varying forms of open space exist within the Borough's areas of historic importance. Each is distinguished by the relationship of buildings to open space. These are: common land; the town park at Calverley Grounds (Royal Tunbridge Wells); the Grove (retained by the 1703 deed); the parkland character of Arcadian developments existing at Camden Park, Calverley Park, Hungershall Park and Nevill Park; and village greens located at Benenden, Goudhurst, Groombridge, The Moor (Hawkhurst), Horsmonden, Langton Green, Matfield, Pembury and Sandhurst. The settings of principal landmarked buildings and within these, plot cartilages, define a historic building line.

  Areas of open space of local visual amenity value includes village greens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; whilst open space of strategic importance is dependent upon location and topography of the area.

  **Areas of landscape importance:** The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designated in 1983 forms a major part of the landscape.

  Landscape of historic importance, neighbourhood edges, landscaped skylines and strategic significance are documented with areas of landscape importance.

  Historic importance recognises how tree groups characterise conservation areas, whether they are as individual trees or dense shrubs and tree cover.

  Separation of the villages is often by dense areas of trees and shrub vegetation acting as a
### DETAILED BASELINE INFORMATION FOR THE BOROUGH

#### Subject: Baseline Information

- **barrier or vegetation (tree belt).**

  Topography of Tunbridge Wells Borough consists of undulating minor ridges and principal ridgelines. As these could potentially take the form of a tree line, they are important in the perception of villages both from within and outside. Vegetated areas also have significance to the wider landscape setting, forming strategic significance to the area.

- **Key components of this landscape were subjected to study, with the landscape divided into six character areas and subsequently sub-divided into 19 areas of distinct characteristics requiring supplementary planning guidance: Fruit Belts; Wooded Farmland; Low Weald Farmland; Forested Plateau; River Valleys; and Open Farmland (Landscape Character Area Assessment, 2001).**

- **Arcadian Areas:** Landscaping forms the dominant visual element within Arcadian areas. Vegetation is often dense and includes specimen trees and exotic species. This dense vegetation provides valuable habitat for many species of mammals and plant.

  Buildings within these areas are often low lying developments set well apart by areas of significantly vegetated open space. The layout of sites is such that corridors of vegetation allow both the facilitation of complex species networks and the colonisation of urban areas via ‘green networks’.

  Royal Tunbridge Wells is characterised by Arcadian developments; a heavily landscaped, low density development set up around Calverley Park in the 1830’s set the initial pattern for subsequent development within Royal Tunbridge Wells. Calverley Park, Camden Park, Hungershall Park, Nevill Park and Broadwater Down all exhibit characteristics of both historic and architectural significance.

#### Ground Contamination

**Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy 2001**

With the Borough’s locality and its extensive rural character, contamination levels are likely to be low. However contamination may be present on a sites such as redundant gas works, petrol stations, railway land and landfill sites. 1100 individual sites have been identified as requiring further investigation.

#### Air Quality

**Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Air Quality Review and Assessment**

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has an Air Quality Management Area along the A26 London Road to Southborough.

Potential exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide air quality objective were identified in 2003, in two other areas; Grosvenor Road and the A264 Mount Ephraim/A26 London Road junction. Consequently, the Council has proposed 2 further AQMA in these locations.

#### Water Resources

**Environment Agency**
### Baseline Information

**About 80% of Kent's public water supply is drawn each year from groundwater. Whilst Kent is self-sufficient in water supply, increases in abstraction have given rise to a progressive depletion in base flows and water tables in the County.**

The Environment Agency monitors two rivers within the Borough of Tunbridge Wells; Barden Mill Stream Tributary and Somerhill Stream.

Barden Mill Stream Tributary was classed as a B class water course (Chemical GQA) 2000-2002 and is therefore of good quality. Somerhill Stream was classed as a grade B class water course (Chemical GQA) 2000-2002 and is also of good quality and an F class water course (Biological GQA) 2002 and therefore of very poor quality.

94% of the watercourses monitored by the Environment Agency in the Borough can be regarded as good or fair quality (Environment Strategy).

### Flooding

**Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002**

The principal areas of high risk flooding within the Borough lie around Paddock Wood, Five Oak Green and Lamberhurst.

### Waste

**Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Review Second Deposit Copy 2002**

There are currently no landfill sites within the Borough, with waste being transported to Essex. The Borough Council's responsibilities for waste disposal extend only as far as domestic refuse collection. The waste management plan was the responsibility of Kent County Council until April 1996 when the Environment Agency took over.

North Farm Household Waste Site, although located in Tunbridge Wells Borough, is run by Kent County Council. The site accepts domestic household waste and also operates the disposal of commercial waste.

With regard to recycling, facilities have been provided at a number of key points within the towns to reduce the amount of waste material to be disposed of to landfill or incineration. The amount of household waste recycled and composted is rising. In 2004/5 the combined total was 32.1% of waste up from 24.5% in 2003/4. 21% of household waste in Tunbridge Wells Borough was recycled or composted in 2002/03.

This exceeds the statutory target set for this Council by Central Government of 20% recycled or composted household waste by 2003/04.

Kent County Council produced their first Waste Local Plan in March 1998 with the only implications for the Borough being improvement and continuation of the waste transfer station at North Farm, Royal Tunbridge Wells (non-toxic industrial wastes and household waste).