

Milton Keynes Council

**Sustainability
Appraisal of Waste
Development Plan
Document**

Sustainability Appraisal Report

July 2006

Entec UK Limited

Report for

Rebecca Trowse
Senior Planning Officer
Planning and Transport Department
PO Box 125
Civic Offices
1 Saxon Gate East
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 3JZ

Main Contributors

James Gleave
Kate Proctor
Tim Perkins

Issued by

.....
James Gleave

Approved by

.....
Brian Hamilton

Entec UK Limited

Atlantic House
Imperial Way
Reading RG2 0TD
England
Tel: +44 (0) 1189 036061
Fax: +44 (0) 1189 036261

h:\projects\lea-210\17000-17999\17554-sa of mkc wdpd\17554-12a.doc

Milton Keynes Council

Sustainability Appraisal of Waste Development Plan Document

Sustainability Appraisal Report

July 2006

Entec UK Limited



Certificate No. EMS 69090



Certificate No. FS 13881

In accordance with an environmentally responsible approach, this document is printed on recycled paper produced from 100% post-consumer waste, or on ECF (elemental chlorine free) paper

Document Revisions

No	Details	Date
----	---------	------

.

Contents

Non-Technical Summary	i
Appraisal of Strategic Options	v
Summary of Policy Appraisal	vi
Policy Recommendations	vi
Summary of Site Selection Appraisal	vii
Glossary	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of this Report	1
1.2 The Emerging Waste Development Plan Document	1
1.3 Background to the SA Process	2
1.4 Key Outputs	2
1.4.1 Difficulties Associated with the Appraisal	3
2. The Scoping Report	5
2.1 Background	5
2.2 Review of Plans and Programmes	5
2.3 Baseline information	5
2.3.1 Key Sustainability Issues	8
2.3.2 Consultation of Scoping Report	8
3. Appraisal of the Strategic Options	9
3.1 Methodology for Appraisal	9
3.2 Developing the Strategic Options	9
3.3 Methodology for Appraisal	10
3.4 Results of the Appraisal	11
3.4.1 Overall Performance of the Strategic Options	11
3.4.2 Recommendations	12
4. WDPD Preferred Options	13
4.1 Background	13
4.1.1 Guidance on Development of Preferred Options	13

4.2	Preferred Vision and Guiding Principles	13
4.3	Preferred Policies in the WDPPO	14
4.4	Preferred Site Options	15
4.4.1	Site Selection Process	15
5.	Appraisal of Development Plan Policies	17
5.1	Introduction	17
5.2	Appraisal Methodology	17
5.3	General Comments on the Appraisal Process	17
5.3.1	Clarity of Preferred Policies	18
5.3.2	Clarity of Objectives	18
5.3.3	Lack of Appropriate Indicators	18
6.	Results of Policy Appraisal	19
6.1	Introduction	19
6.2	Appraisal of Guiding Principles and Vision	19
6.3	Key Findings of the Policy Appraisal	19
6.3.1	Preferred Policy Option 1- Sustainable Waste Management	19
6.3.2	Preferred Policy Option 2 – Working With Neighbours	20
6.3.3	Preferred Policy 3 – Development Control Criteria	20
6.3.4	Preferred Policy 4 – Environmental Objectives	20
6.3.5	Preferred Policy 5 – Transport	21
6.3.6	Preferred Policy 6 – Restoration	21
6.3.7	Preferred Policy 7 – Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery	21
7.	Appraisal of Site Selection Process	23
7.1	Waste Introduction	23
7.1.1	Is the process for selecting sites robust and does it reflect the sustainability priorities in PPS10?	23
7.1.2	Do the site selection criteria reflect all the relevant SA objectives?	24
7.1.3	Is the methodology sufficiently justified?	26
7.1.4	What are the significant effects resulting from the site based policies and have what mitigation measures could be adopted?	26
8.	Monitoring and Evaluation	27
8.1	Monitoring Requirements	27

8.2	Developing Monitoring Indicators	27
9.	Conclusions	29
9.1	Summary of Policy Appraisal	29
9.2	Policy Recommendations	29
9.3	Summary of Site Selection Appraisal	30
	Table 2.1: Summary of Baseline for Appraisal Objectives	6
	Table 3.1 Summary of Options	9
	Table 7.1: Summary of relationship between SA objectives and site selection criteria	24
	Table 9.1: Summary of Appraisal Ratings	29
	Appendix A Interim Report: Appraisal of Strategic Options	
	Appendix B Relevant Plans and Programmes	
	Appendix C Schedule of Baseline Information	
	Appendix D Draft SA/SEA Framework Objectives	
	Appendix E Compatibility Matrix: Comparison of Appraisal Objectives and WDPPO Guiding Principles	
	Appendix F Appraisal Matrix for the WDPPO Preferred Policies	

Non Technical Summary

On 27th January 2006 Entec UK Ltd (Entec) was commissioned by Milton Keynes Council (MKC) to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD). The methodology for this followed that recommended in government guidance on sustainability contained in Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and LDF's. The work followed on from the production of a Scoping Report by Atkins consultants. This report defined the current social, economic and environmental conditions in Milton Keynes and also set out the criteria that would be used to assess the WDPD.

Appraisal of Strategic Options

The first stage of the appraisal process took place between February and May 2006 and involved an appraisal of the strategic spatial options that could form the basis of the WDPD. A report setting out the relative performance of these options in sustainability terms was issued to MKC by Entec in May 2006. The results of Entec's appraisal of the strategic options is summarised in the following table:

Assessment Criteria	Status Quo	Dispersed location of pre and final treatment	One site pre treatment	One site pre and final treatment	Out of MK final treatment	Dispersed location of pre treatment and one site for final treatment
--	4	0	4	3	2	0
-	8	0	6	0	4	0
~	4	2	2	2	3	2
?	3	8	5	8	7	7
+	1	9	3	6	4	7
++	0	1	0	1	0	4
Comment	This option performed worst against the appraisal criteria. The only area where positive results were obtained related to energy efficiency.	Represents the second best performing option. Performs slightly less well than option 6 against air quality and employment criteria.	Option performs badly against social criteria relating to human health, crime and social exclusion.	Third best performing option. Performed less well against crime, social exclusion and accessibility criteria.	Option performs badly against economic and crime criteria.	This option performs best against the appraisal criteria. Uncertainty where options relate to site specific issues.

The first round of appraisal identified that option 6 performed best in sustainability terms. This option was taken forward by the Council as a basis for the Waste Development Plan Preferred

Options (WDPPO), which was issued to Entec in June 2006. Entec has now completed a second round or iteration of appraisal on the policies and proposed sites for waste management facilities contained in the WDPPO. This report appraises the preferred policies and the site selection methodology that was adopted by the Council to select waste management sites. Where appropriate, recommendations are made on how these aspects of the WDPPO document could be improved.

Summary of Policy Appraisal

The following table summarises the performance of the preferred policies in the WDPPO against the appraisal objectives:

Rating	Occurrences of ratings for each policy							Totals
	Policy 1	Policy 2	Policy 3	Policy 4	Policy 5	Policy 6	Policy 7	
++	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
+	12	7	12	0	8	0	13	52
~	3	11	5	0	10	0	13	42
?	0	1	3	20	2	20	2	60
-	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 5.1 shows that the proposed policies met a high proportion of the appraisal objectives, although few performed very well against them. Very few policies received negative appraisal ratings and none received double negative scores (performed very badly against the appraisal objectives). A high proportion of the objectives were either not relevant to the proposed policies or the effect of the policies on those objectives was uncertain. This was largely due to the fact that the wording for the proposed policies was not included in the WDPPO, although it is understood that details of the wording will be available at the submission stage. It was not possible to appraise policies 4 and 6 against any of the appraisal objectives.

Policy Recommendations

Following the completion of the appraisal of the preferred policies Entec has made a number of recommendations on how to improve their performance in sustainability terms. These recommendations relate to the general format, provisions and presentation of policies and also to the specific wording of policies.

- **General Recommendations** - It is considered that the plan should provide more information on how policies have been selected and developed. This would allow stakeholders to understand how and why the suite of policies has been selected by

the Council. Entec suggests there is a need to develop and consult on the draft wording of the proposed policies as soon as possible.

- **Preferred Policy 1 - Sustainable Waste Management:** This policy performs particularly well against air quality and noise pollution objectives, however it does not meet other criteria including land quality and water resources. It is considered that the policy should provide a broader description of what is meant by sustainable waste management and what it involves. The need to reconcile social, economic and environmental concerns and issues could be referred to in the policy.
- **Preferred Policy 2 - Working with Neighbours:** It is considered that working with neighbouring authorities could improve the overall sustainability of waste management across the wider region. Entec considered that it would be useful for the policy to clarify that this will not result in a lack of waste management facilities for the residents of Milton Keynes.
- **Preferred Policy 3 - Development Control Criteria:** This policy contained a comprehensive list of development control criteria. Entec considered that there was a further opportunity to include criteria to address landscape and water resource issues.
- **Preferred Policy 4 - Environmental Objectives:** Further clarity is required on the nature of the Environmental Objectives in order to assess this policy.
- **Preferred Policy 5 - Transport:** The issue of transporting waste relates to the need to ensure that waste management facilities are located in close proximity to sources of waste. It is considered that Transport Assessments would only be required where facilities are considered to have a significant impact on the surrounding road network.
- **Preferred Policy 6 - Restoration:** Further clarity is required on the principal aims of and objectives for restoration in order to assess this policy.
- **Preferred Policy 7 - Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery:** It is considered that this policy could be more specific about the design standards that waste management facilities will be expected to meet. Appropriate SPGs/SPDs could be referenced in the supporting text to this policy.

Summary of Site Selection Appraisal

Entec makes the following recommendations on the basis of the appraisal of the site selection methodology contained in the WDPPO:

- Review the basis for initial site selection and provide an explanation of how this relates to key sustainability factors in PPS10.
- Review the site selection criteria to ensure that all the SA objectives are adequately reflected in the process.
- Review the scoring system with a view to considering the need for weighting. Provide an explanation of the basis for the scoring approach adopted.

- Add appropriate references in the policies relating to the strategic sites which highlight the key sustainability effects and any broad measures which should be adopted as mitigation.

Glossary

AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
DRWMS	Draft Regional Waste Management Strategy
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
LDD	Local Development Document
LDF	Local Development Framework
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LTP	Local Transport Plan
MKC	Milton Keynes Council
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
RSDF	Regional Sustainable Development Framework
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
WDPD	Waste Development Plan Document
WDPPPO	Waste Development Plan Preferred Policy Options

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

On 27th January 2006 Entec UK Ltd (Entec) was commissioned by Milton Keynes Council (MKC) to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document (WDPD). The first stage of Entec's work followed on from the production of a Scoping Report by Atkins and took place between February and May 2006. This involved an appraisal of the strategic spatial options that could form the basis of the WDPD. An interim report setting the relative performance of these options in sustainability terms was issued to MKC in May 2006 and is attached as Appendix A.

The Council used the results of this appraisal process to develop a draft Waste Development Plan Preferred Options document (WDPPPO), which was issued to Entec in draft in June 2006. Entec has now completed a second round or iteration of appraisal on the preferred policies and proposed sites for waste management facilities contained in the WDPPPO. This report will set out the performance of these aspects of the WDPPPO in sustainability terms and constitutes the culmination of the Sustainability Appraisal process and Entec's work for MKC. In particular, the report will:

- Provide a summary of the methodology of the appraisal process and the results of the strategic options for the WDPPPO. A detailed summary can be found in the Interim Report, which is contained in Appendix A of this report;
- How the key provisions of the government guidance for SA contained in Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents has been taken into account;
- A summary of the policies and allocated sites within the WDPPPO;
- The methodology for and results of the appraisal process; and
- Recommendations on how the policies could be amended to improve their contribution to sustainable development in Milton Keynes.

1.2 The Emerging Waste Development Plan Document

The existing Waste Local Plan relating to Milton Keynes is the Adopted Waste Local Plan for Buckinghamshire 1994-2006. The document is being replaced by the emerging Waste Development Plan Document for which an Issues and Options Paper was published in September 2005. The Issues and Options Paper was the first step in the production of the revised WDPD. The document sought to consult on a series of questions relating to the treatment of waste and the siting of waste management facilities in Milton Keynes.

The responses to the Issues and Options Paper were taken forward to the next stage of the WDPD production process, which involved the development of a series of strategic options for the broad framework of the WDPD. These Strategic Options were subject to a first round or

iteration of Sustainability Appraisal in April 2006. The results of this process are outlined in **Section 2** of this document.

The results of the appraisal process were taken into account in the selection of a preferred option by MKC, which was developed into the WDPPO document containing preferred policies and site allocations for waste management facilities. The policies and site allocations contained in the draft document have been subject to a second round of appraisal by Entec.

1.3 Background to the SA Process

Government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is contained in Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents – Guidance for Regional Planning Bodies and Local Planning Authorities, produced by the ODPM in November 2005 (ODPM SA Guidance). This document incorporates the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive and states that sustainable development is central to the reformed planning system. The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal is to ensure the integration of social, environmental and economic considerations into the preparation of local development documents. This broad objective is reflected in the statutory requirement to undertake Sustainability Appraisal for new or revised development plan documents.

The approach to undertaking this Sustainability Appraisal reflects the provisions of the government guidance as follows:

- Establishing the Baseline and defining the Scope of the SA process – this work was undertaken by Atkins consultants;
- Developing and refining the Strategic Options for the WDPD (undertaken by MKC);
- Development of appraisal criteria and appraising the Strategic Options (appraisal criteria developed by Atkins in the Scoping Report);
- Developing a WDPPO Document;
- Appraisal of the WDPPO; and
- Production of final Sustainability Appraisal Report.

1.4 Key Outputs

The key outputs of the Sustainability Appraisal process involved firstly the production of a report on the appraisal of strategic options which could form the basis of the WDPD. This was issued to MKC in May 2006. This Sustainability Appraisal Report contains the results of the appraisal of the WDPPO, which were developed by MKC from the strategic options. It constitutes the final output of the appraisal process and covers the requirements of the Environmental Report defined in the SEA Directive and contains the following:

- An appraisal of the likely significant effects of the plan on the environment, including issues such as bio-diversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural

and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors.

- An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with; and
- Recommendations to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programmes.

1.4.1 Difficulties Associated with the Appraisal

Government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal and the SEA Directive emphasises the need to document the difficulties encountered whilst undertaking the appraisal process. The particular issues faced by Entec are highlighted at relevant stages in this report.

The WDPPO document has been prepared by MKC in accordance with the guidance contained in PPS 12, to set the spatial strategy for waste management activities in Milton Keynes. At this early stage the document is particularly strategic and the wording of the preferred policies has not yet been developed. It has therefore been particularly challenging to relate the appraisal objectives to the preferred policies. A similar issue was encountered when undertaking the appraisal of strategic options. The high level nature of the options required a number of subjective judgements to be made when applying the appraisal criteria.

The Scoping Report prepared by Atkins provides a clear description of the sources of information examined to determine the appraisal objectives and is a useful source of baseline data. The appraisal objectives were developed to appraise three separate documents and at times, some did not relate particularly well to the WDPPO. The appraisal of the strategic options took place at a workshop on 30th March 2006. Whilst this event was well attended by representatives from the Council, the majority of external consultees were unable to attend. It is considered that the attendance of these organisations would have greatly enhanced the appraisal process.

2. The Scoping Report

2.1 Background

In September 2005 Atkins consultants produced a joint Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal of the Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the emerging Local Transport Plan (LTP) and the Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Although SA and SEA are distinct requirements, government guidance for SA of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks incorporates the requirements of the SEA Directive. The Council therefore decided to combine the early stages of the SA/SEA process for all three plans in a Scoping Report which:

- Aimed to identify common cross cutting environmental/sustainability themes and sources of data; and
- Developed an integrated appraisal framework which may be applied to each plan.

The Scoping Report contained the following sections which were common to all of the documents to be appraised:

2.2 Review of Plans and Programmes

Relevant international, national and local plans and programmes that might influence or be influenced by one or more of the plans to be appraised are identified in the Scoping Report. These other plans were analysed to derive a set of key environmental /sustainability themes relevant to the national, regional and local context. This analysis was presented in a table as the first stage of the draft SA/SEA framework.

At the regional level the key documents analysed in the Scoping Report were the Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG 9, March 2001). Further key documents identified are the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS 8) and Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands (RPG 11), the Draft Regional Waste Management Strategy (DRWMS), as well as the Regional Sustainable Development Framework. The full list of relevant plans contained in the Scoping Report can be found in Appendix B of this document. It should be noted that this schedule relates to the appraisal of the Local Transport Plan, the Municipal Waste Management Strategy as well as the emerging WDPD.

2.3 Baseline information

The baseline information provides a basis for assessing the impact of the options on the current state of the environment. Government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal emphasises that the collection of baseline data and the development of the SA Framework should inform each other. The review and analysis of relevant plans and programmes will also influence data collection.

The baseline information contained within the Scoping Report was gathered from a range of sources, including government agency websites, census data and the South East of England

intelligence network. No primary research was conducted and the information for all three plans covered by the Scoping Report was covered in a baseline schedule attached as an appendix to the document. A full summary of the baseline information gathered by Atkins as part of the production of the Scoping Report can be found in Appendix C. The following table has been reproduced from the Scoping Report and summarises the baseline information gathered for each of the appraisal objectives:

Table 2.1: Summary of Baseline for Appraisal Objectives

SEA Objective as defined in Scoping Report	Summary of Baseline
Improve health and well being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	The proportion of people deemed to have health that is not good is below average (7.11 % of the borough compared to 9.22% in England and Wales) and the number of people with a limiting long term illness / the number of households with one or more persons with a limiting long term illness is at 14 and 28 respectively, compared to 18 and 34 for England and Wales. However, life expectancy of females and Standard Mortality ratios are higher than average.
Reduce Crime and fear of crime	Crime statistics show that the overall rate of crime has increased in MK in the last couple of years, with violent crime and general crime increasing since 2002/03. In contrast, the rate of burglary and automotive crime has decreased since 2002/03.
Reduce Social Exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	Despite MK's striking economic success and prosperity, localised deprivation and disadvantage still persists. The ODPM Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 shows that a number of wards in Milton Keynes fall within the most 10% of deprived wards in the UK.
Improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas.	More than any other city in the UK, Milton Keynes was designed around a grid road system with wide and well designed route roads. But these are beginning to show signs of congestion. Most of the population (about 77%) uses private cars to commute to work. In deprived parts of MK accessibility to jobs and services is poor. Policies aimed to facilitate modal shift to more sustainable modes to integrate deprived parts of MK with its more prosperous parts and to provide the community with access to jobs, essential services and recreational facilities should be encouraged.
Reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve	Improvements in air quality were observed in the borough in the past year. The authority is meeting the national objectives in all air pollutants with the exception of nitrogen dioxide where exceedances are experienced at some locations adjacent to the M1 motorway. However, as there are no sensitive receptors at these locations there is no requirement for designation of AQMAs.
To reduce noise pollution	Traffic forecasts suggest that in 20 years time traffic in the UK will be between 22 – 46% higher than it is now. For MK, forecasts predict an increase of between 47% and 73% over the same period. Predicted growth in the borough's traffic would accentuate noise hotspots. The total number of noise complaints to the Council decreased from 1969 in 2000-2001 to 1392 in 2004 -2005.
Reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes.	Traffic congestion is worst during peak periods and is mainly caused by commuter traffic. Since most employment is and will continue to be within the city, particularly the city centre, congestion and pollution problems will continue to be concentrated in this area. Past trends for modal split have been for the proportion of journeys to work to be made by car to increase the proportion of foot, bicycle and by public transport to fall.
Improve efficiency in land use through the reuse of previously developed and existing land and	The amount of housing built on previously developed land in Milton Keynes (19%) is low in comparison to trends for the south east region (81%) and has even recently decreased in the past year. Government estimated levels of

SEA Objective as defined in Scoping Report	Summary of Baseline
buildings	housing growth show that by 2016, MK will grow by an additional 35,100 homes.
Reduce waste arisings and increase reuse , recovery and recycling	Household waste arisings have shown a considerable increase in recent years. Domestic waste production has increased from 0.44 to 0.50 tonnes per person in the period 1996 – 2002. The MK household waste arisings have grown by an average annual increase of 1.9 % from 2001/02 to 2004/05, while the population annual increase made up 0.6% in the same period. Milton Keynes relies heavily on the disposal of waste to landfill with 73.2% of household waste landfilled in 2004. The percentage dropped 76% in 2003, however further progress needs to be made to achieve the target of 70 % in 2005/06 and 68% in 2007/08. No waste in Milton Keynes is currently used for energy recovery.
Protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and ground water	Of the five sites monitored in Milton Keynes by the Environment Agency, three were considered to have very good biological water quality, while chemical water quality was somewhat worse with two sites scoring fairly well and one poor.
Reduce the risk of flooding	There are currently no flood warnings in force in the borough. Wetland habitats are found around the river Ouse, its tributaries and floodplains. Plans for restoration of an 80 hectare site in the Ouse Valley Park will provide ecologically valuable habitat and an additional 460,00m3 of floodplain storage capacity.
Address the causes of climatic change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG)	Authorities such as MK achieving around 12 %improvements in domestic energy efficiency are anticipated to meet the 30 % target by 2010 – i.e. the correct national timescale.
Increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources	BVPI target 63 assesses energy efficiency of the housing stock using the standard assessment procedure (SAP). Results range from 1 (highly efficient) to 100 (highly inefficient). The 2003/04 score for Milton Keynes was 57.0, which was slightly lower than the regional average of 60.1.
Protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats	Local designations include the MK Wildlife sites (MKWS) and Wildlife corridors, which are given the same protection as MKWS and consist of wetlands, woodland and railway corridors.
Protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings	The heritage of the area of Milton Keynes is good, stretching from the prehistoric monuments through to archaeology of World War 2. There are currently 25 conservation areas and over 1000 listed buildings in the borough. Transport infrastructure should be respectful of the character and appearance of historical areas and buildings and increase access to them without detrimental effect.
Protect, manage and restore soil resources.	Only 1% of the region's workforce is currently employed in the agricultural sector. A total of 365 ha of new woodland have been granted in Milton Keynes new town since 1971.
To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character	MK landscape character study 1999 identifies seven landscape character areas within the borough; Yardley Ridge, Ouse Valley, River Tove, Lowlands, Shenley Lowlands Chichley/Crawley Claylands , Clayland Fringes and Brickhills Redge
Improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance	MK was designated as a new town on 23/01/1967 and is the largest new town in England. The Borough's population age profile is younger than that for England as a whole, with half aged under 35. MK is one of 235 towns taking part in the Countryside Agency's Market Towns Initiative and Wolverton is one of 18 towns in England to have gained Beacon Town status.
Maintain a strong local economy	Compared with regional and national statistics, Milton Keynes scores relatively high in new firm registrations, or VAT registrations (50.2 new firms' registration per 10,000 adult population) compared with England's 41.8. The %age of new registrations in the Borough in (11.8%) is higher than the regional 10.6%. Deregistration in the Borough (9.6%) is lower by 0.1 % than the region. A wide range of industrial sectors are represented in MK, including Electronics, Food and Beverages, Chemicals, Plastics and General

SEA Objective as defined in Scoping Report	Summary of Baseline
Maintain high and stable levels of employment	<p data-bbox="616 331 735 365">Engineering.</p> <p data-bbox="616 383 1345 490">MK is one of the main sources of employment in the sub region. When the new town was designated there were 21,350 jobs. Complete development of all designated employment land within the original city boundary will provide approximately 135,000 jobs.</p>

2.3.1 Key Sustainability Issues

The ODPM SA Guidance indicates that identifying sustainability issues (including environmental problems required by the SEA Directive) provides an opportunity to define key issues for the WDPD. These issues were identified in the Scoping Report through a review of existing data and included the social issues of rapid population growth in Milton Keynes the resulting production of waste, deprivation experienced by those living in disadvantaged areas and recent rises in crime levels. Environmental issues included problems associated with air quality declining numbers of certain species and flood risk issues. Economic issues relate to a lack of employment diversity in the city and the high reliance on service sector jobs.

2.3.2 Consultation of Scoping Report

The Combined Scoping Report was issued for consultation in September 2005. The most significant comments on the section relating to the emerging WDPD came from Buckinghamshire County Council. The objective to reduce residual waste to zero was questioned, as was MKs leading role in relation to waste recycling. Buckinghamshire encouraged MKC to treat waste within its own borders and questioned the statement that no waste in Milton Keynes is used for energy recovery. A number of other queries were raised in relation to the objective of self sufficiency and a particular query was raised on MKCs policy for all forms of thermal treatment.

These issues were considered by Entec to relate more to the content and direction of the emerging WDPD rather than the Sustainability Appraisal. As such, they did not have a significant bearing on the appraisal objectives developed by Atkins and used by Entec to appraise the emerging document.

3. Appraisal of the Strategic Options

3.1 Methodology for Appraisal

Entec used a series of sustainability criteria to assess the strategic options. These criteria, which are referred to in the SA process as objectives and indicators, were developed by Atkins as part of the Scoping Report. These are generic in that they were used to assess the Local Transport Plan and the Waste Strategy, as well as the WDPD. The SEA Directive does not specifically require the use of objectives, but they are a recognised way of analysing and comparing the environmental effects of each option.

A draft framework of 20 broad objectives was initially developed from the review of plans and programmes outlined in Section 1 of this report. A series of sub criteria known as indicators were also developed to support the objectives and ensure that they were interpreted in the same way for the assessment of each strategic option. The objectives and indicators are set out in Table 6.1 of the Scoping Report, which is attached as Appendix D of this report.

3.2 Developing the Strategic Options

The Strategic Options for the Waste Development Plan Document were developed by the Council and reflect the broad alternatives for the dispersal of waste disposal facilities around Milton Keynes. The options were kept deliberately strategic and non site specific to reflect the strategic nature of the SA assessment objectives. The key characteristics of the strategic options assessed by the SA process are set in Table 3.1 below:

Table 3.1 Summary of Options

Option	Key Characteristics
Status Quo	<p>Around 70 % of waste to landfill</p> <p>Around 30 % recycling (includes composting)</p> <p>No final treatment facilities provided</p>
Dispersed Location of Pre and Final Treatment	<p>Reduced amount of waste sent to landfill to meet LATS targets</p> <p>Increased recycling to meet government targets</p> <p>Final treatment facilities located within MKC area</p>
One Site Pre Treatment	<p>Reduced amount of landfill to status quo but does not meet LATS targets</p> <p>Maximise recycling at existing MRF</p> <p>No final treatment facilities included</p>
One Site Pre and Final Treatment	<p>Reduced amount of waste sent to landfill to meet LATS targets</p>

Option	Key Characteristics
	Increased recycling to meet government targets Final treatment facilities located within MKC area Integrated Waste Management Facility to treat waste
Out of MK Final Treatment	Reduce amount of waste sent to landfill to meet LATS targets Maximise recycling at existing MRF Final treatment provided outside MKC area to neighbouring facility
Dispersed location of pre treatment and one site for final treatment	Reduced amount of waste sent to landfill to meet LATS target Increased recycling to meet government target Final treatment facility located within MKC area

The exact nature of the pre and final treatment facilities was not defined at the time of the strategic options report. At this stage the assessment was only seeking to determine if these facilities would be provided and whether an integrated or dispersed approach would be adopted for their distribution.

3.3 Methodology for Appraisal

The appraisal of the strategic options took place at a workshop session on 30 March 2006. Prior to the workshop Entec assessed each option against the appraisal objectives. The purpose of the workshop session was to discuss the assessments made by Entec and amend them according to the views of the appraisal group. The workshop was facilitated by Entec and attended by the following Council officers and statutory consultees:

- Rebecca Trowse Milton Keynes Council, Waste Planning
- Sue Mason Milton Keynes Council, Waste Management
- Mark Harris Milton Keynes Council, Development Plans
- Diane Taylor Milton Keynes Council, Community and Economic Development
- Adam Ireland The Environment Agency
- Tim Perkins Entec UK Ltd, Principal Consultant
- Kate Proctor Entec UK Ltd, Assistant Consultant
- James Gleave Entec UK Ltd, Principal Consultant

Whilst the Scoping Report contained the appraisal objectives and indicators it did not propose a means of assessing the performance of the strategic options against the appraisal objectives. As such, Entec developed the following criteria for this purpose:

- ++ Performs very well against the objective
- + Meets the objective

- ~ No Impact
- ? Uncertain of the Impact
- Does not meet the objective
- Performs very badly against the objective

The performance of each option against the appraisal criteria was recorded in a matrix at the workshop session which was also developed by Entec. As well as recording the relative score of each option the matrix contained a section for comments to justify the allocated score.

3.4 Results of the Appraisal

The Strategic Options Report commented on the performance of the options against each objective and looked at the short, medium and long term implications of implementing each option. In addition, the spatial implications of each option were investigated, as were the secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of implementing each option and the likelihood of those effects occurring. Finally, recommendations were made on the measures that could be implemented to mitigate against negative effects that would occur if the options were to be implemented. A description of how each option performed against these criteria can be found in the Interim Report on the performance of Strategic Options, contained in Appendix A.

3.4.1 Overall Performance of the Strategic Options

The appraisal considered the six strategic options for waste facilities in Milton Keynes put forward by council officers. The table below summarises their performance against the 20 sustainability objectives.

Table 3.2: Summary of Performance against Assessment Criteria

Assessment Criteria	Status Quo	Dispersed location of pre and final treatment	One site pre treatment	One site pre and final treatment	Out of MK final treatment	Dispersed location of pre treatment and one site for final treatment
--	4	0	4	3	2	0
-	8	0	6	0	4	0
~	4	2	2	2	3	2
?	3	8	5	8	7	7
+	1	9	3	6	4	7
++	0	1	0	1	0	4

Comment	This option performed worst against the appraisal criteria. The only area where positive results were obtained related to energy efficiency.	Represents the second best performing option. Performs slightly less well than option 6 against air quality and employment criteria.	Option performs badly against social criteria relating to human health, crime and social exclusion.	Third best performing option. Performed less well against crime, social exclusion and accessibility criteria.	Option performs badly against economic and crime criteria.	This option performs best against the appraisal criteria. Uncertainty where options relate to site specific issues.
----------------	--	--	---	---	--	---

Of the options considered Options 1 and 3, which had a significant reliance on landfill sites, performed poorly against the sustainability objectives on the basis of the negative effects of landfill. Both options failed to meet government targets for diversion away from landfill and the range of negative effects associated with greenhouse gases, air pollution, transport and local economy. All other options not based around landfill offered positive effects associated with the recycling and/or recovery of waste. The option that performs best is Option 6, based on dispersed pre-treatment and a single site for final treatment. As well as the benefits of reduced reliance on landfill, the option offered social benefits associated with a number of pre-treatment facilities across Milton Keynes, enabling better accessibility.

In all cases (other than option 1) the effects of new strategies were considered to only take effect in the medium to long term, as there will be a lead in time for the development of new facilities.

3.4.2 Recommendations

Entec's report on the performance of the strategic options made a number of recommendations. In broad terms these referred to how each option performed against the appraisal criteria. A summary of the performance of the options is as follows:

1. On the basis of its performance against sustainability objectives, Option 1 should be removed from further consideration except as a short term option, pending development of more sustainable waste management facilities.
2. Option 3 also performs poorly against the sustainability objectives and should be removed from further consideration.
3. In all other cases a robust site selection process, based on the sustainability objectives, should be used to help develop the preferred option and hence allow the effects on the environment, local economy and community to be fully appraised.
4. All remaining options should be retained for further consideration, although option 6 and to a lesser extent option 5 perform best against the sustainability objectives.
5. Option 5, based on an out of MKC option has a number of both positive and negative effects. Although this option performs less well than others it is considered that its performance could be enhanced if the facility was located close to Milton Keynes.

4. WDPD Preferred Options

4.1 Background

Following the production of Entec's Report on the Strategic Options, MKC developed the Waste Development Plan Document Preferred Options (WDPPPO). This document concurred with the results of the initial appraisal that Strategic Option 6 – Dispersed location of pre treatment and one site final treatment was the most sustainable. The WDPPPO interprets this option as meaning that pre treatment management facilities would be dispersed around Milton Keynes and a final treatment facility for residual waste would be located at one site in the City. This option has been taken forward and developed into a series of preferred policies and preferred sites for waste management facilities.

4.1.1 Guidance on Development of Preferred Options

Planning Policy Statement 12 provides guidance on the Preferred Options stage. It states that the aim of formal public participation on preferred options is to give people the opportunity to comment on how the local planning authority is approaching the preparation of the particular development plan document and to ensure that the local planning authority is aware of all possible options before they prepare the submission of the development plan document. The local authority should provide sufficient information where appropriate at the preferred options stage to ensure that people can understand the implications of their preferred options.

This message is reinforced in the Companion Guide that accompanies PPS 12. In particular, this stresses that the Preferred Options document should set out an authorities policy direction together with relevant issues, proposals and alternatives approaches where appropriate.

4.2 Preferred Vision and Guiding Principles

The principle aims for the Waste Development Plan Document were identified at the Issues and Options stage. These are also defined in Section 7 of the WDPPPO as follows:

- To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy;
- To implement and be consistent with the National Waste Strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the Milton Keynes Municipal Waste Management Strategy
- To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency;
- To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type in the right place and at the right time;
- To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents, avoiding risks to human health;

- To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development; and
- To ensure the layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management.

These principles were assessed against the appraisal objectives to determine areas of potential conflict. The matrix showing areas of potential conflict is contained in Appendix E of this report.

4.3 Preferred Policies in the WDPPO

The WDPPO contains seven preferred policies which have been appraised in this report. These policies provide a description of what the main provisions of the policy will be. It is understood that the exact wording of the policy will be developed when the draft WDPD is submitted to the Government Office for consultation. At this stage the policy options are as follows:

Preferred Policy Option 1 – Sustainable Waste Management

The WDPD will include a policy that is consistent with the proximity principle, self sufficiency and the waste hierarchy. The Council is required by national and regional policy to adopt underlying principles to support sustainable waste management.

Preferred Policy Option 2 – Working with Neighbours

A policy that sets out working with others to ensure appropriate waste management solutions are joined up. This includes working and joining up facilities to provide the best economies of scale and all waste sectors working together.

Preferred Policy Option 3 - Development Control Criteria

A policy that sets out development control criteria for new and extensions to waste management facilities. The criteria that the policy will contain are set out in Preferred Policy 3; these include amenity criteria, environmental impacts and design/visual impact.

Preferred Policy Option 4 – Environmental Objectives

A policy that sets out environmental objectives for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities, including climate change and energy recovery.

Preferred Policy Option 5 – Transport

A policy that considers the vehicle movements in and out of a waste management facility. The sites need to be located near the strategic road network and to make sure that traffic queues can be accommodated safely. The policy will consider reducing reliance on road transport and will require a transport assessment to be carried out.

Preferred Policy Option 6 – Restoration

A policy that sets out key principle aims and objectives for restoration of waste management sites, whether these are for landfill or temporary waste operations such as green composting sites. This will include meeting Biodiversity Action Plan targets.

Preferred Policy Option 7 – Sustainable design, construction and demolition and resource recovery

Policies that will set out objectives for sustainable design, construction including encouraging recycling, waste minimisation and resource recovery. The large scale development proposed in Milton Keynes presents a major opportunity to put into practice and demonstrate best practice in waste minimisation and integration of recycling into development. Development is also a significant contributor to waste production, for example construction and demolition waste currently forms half of the total waste stream. This will be in line with Policy D4 of the Milton Keynes Local Plan. Policies will encourage facilities for resource recovery. They will also consider the movement of soils to and from development sites.

4.4 Preferred Site Options

The WDPPO notes that in order to meet the proximity principle, waste management facilities will need to be located close to the sources of waste. The Council has put forward one site for a Strategic Waste Facility at Colts Holm Road and a Reserve Site at Garamonde Drive, Wymbush. Existing sites at Bletchley Landfill and the Materials Recycling Facility at Colts Holm Road will be safeguarded under the provisions of Preferred Site 4. Preferred Site 3 related to other waste facilities and states that a criteria based policy will assess other waste management facilities.

These sites were selected using a site suitability exercise which is detailed in Annex 1 of the WDPPO. Rather than appraise the sites themselves it has been agreed that this appraisal should look at the site selection methodology that has been developed by the Council. The site selection process undertaken by Milton Keynes is summarised in **Section 3.3** below.

4.4.1 Site Selection Process

Entec understand from the WDPPO that the site identification process was initiated by the WDPD Issues and Options paper in August/September 2005. This document asked several questions about suitable locations for waste management sites. The Council also wrote to waste operators, consultants and agents in February 2006 to request that any proposals for facilities in Milton Keynes be put forward to the Council for consideration.

It is understood that this process identified a list of thirteen sites, four of which were larger sites put forward by a land owner, waste operators and the waste department of the Council. A further site was identified by the Waste Planning Authority in the Western Expansion Area to meet the views expressed from the consultation of the Issues and the Options stage that a site should be found before housing is developed around it.

The thirteen sites were assessed using a range of site selection criteria contained in Annex 1 of the WDPPO. The assessment process had many similarities with the Sustainability Appraisal Process. A number of evaluation criteria using environmental, social and economic indicators were identified at a workshop on 21st April 2006. This was attended by MKC officers from Waste, Planning Policy, Environmental Health, Countryside and Landscape, Archaeology and Conservation and Development Control departments.

Sites were scored between 1 (lowest score) and 5 (highest). It was identified that in order to accommodate the strategic waste facility a site of approximately 4 hectares was required. Only 6 sites met this size criteria and were ranked according to their performance against the suitability

criteria. The Colts Holm Road site performed best against the appraisal criteria and was therefore taken forward to the WDPPO as the preferred site.

5. Appraisal of Development Plan Policies

5.1 Introduction

This section of the Sustainability Appraisal Report sets out the methodology for the appraisal of the policies in the WDPPO, the results of the appraisal process and Entec's recommendations to improve the performance of the policies in sustainability terms. As noted in **Section 3.3** the WDPPO contains a description of the purpose and key principles of the policies, rather than the actual proposed policy wording. On this basis Entec has assessed the strategic direction of the policy, which may have influenced the results of the appraisal process.

5.2 Appraisal Methodology

The basic process for assessing the policies in the WDPPO was similar to that used for the appraisal of the strategic options. The assessment criteria for the policies are set out in the Scoping Report for the SA prepared by Atkins. These objectives were used to appraise the strategic options and covered the broad spectrum of social, economic and environmental considerations. As such, it was agreed with MKC that these should be carried forward to appraise the preferred policies in the plan.

Rather than holding a workshop session, Entec appraised the policies against the objectives and then distributed the results to MKC for comment. The means of assessing the performance of policies against the appraisal criteria was the same as that used to appraise the strategic options. This is as follows:

- ++ Performs very well against the objective
- + Performs well against the objective
- ~ No impact
- ? Uncertain of the impact
- Does not meet the objective
- performs very badly against the objective

The performance of preferred policies against the appraisal objectives was recorded in the matrix contained in Appendix F. As well as recording the relative score of each option the matrix also contained a section for comments to justify the allocated score.

5.3 General Comments on the Appraisal Process

The completed appraisal matrix for preferred policy options is contained in Appendix F. This shows how each policy performed against the 20 sustainability objectives. This section provides some general comments on the uncertainties associated with the appraisal process, a summary

of the key findings of the assessment and recommendations for mitigation measures where appropriate.

5.3.1 Clarity of Preferred Policies

Entec understands that the preferred policies were developed by MKC in accordance with the guidance on preferred options contained in Planning Policy Statement 12. Since the exact wording of the preferred policies is not specified in the WDPPO it has been a challenge to determine their performance against some of the appraisal objectives. In particular for Preferred Policy 4, it would have been useful to have additional guidance on the environmental objectives for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities. Rather than make assumptions about the likely wording of the policy it was decided to record its performance as uncertain until further details of the wording are available. A similar view was taken in relation to Policy 6, where further information on the aims and objectives for the restoration of waste management sites would have assisted the appraisal process.

5.3.2 Clarity of Objectives

The Strategic Options report highlighted that in some instances the appraisal team considered there was a lack of clarity with some of the objectives used to assess WDPD strategic options. It was considered that objective 4 identified in the Scoping Report relating to accessibility from residential areas would benefit from further definition and that the primary consideration for this objective should be the accessibility of residents to facilities where they could deposit recyclable waste. This was taken into account in the appraisal of the WDPPO document.

In relation to Objective 18 it was felt that a clearer definition of what is meant by vitality in relation to the proposed options is required. Following the review of the WDPPO document it was decided that this should be removed from the appraisal process.

5.3.3 Lack of Appropriate Indicators

In a number of cases the appraisal team assessing the strategic options felt that the indicators identified in the joint SA/SEA Scoping Report were inappropriate in relation to waste issues. Entec made a recommendation in the Strategic Options report for additional indicators that could be introduced to make them more relevant to the WDPPO.

6. Results of Policy Appraisal

6.1 Introduction

This section of the report sets out the results of the appraisal of preferred policies in the WDPPO. These results are normally expressed in terms of the general performance of the policy and the short, medium and long term effects of its implementation. Since the document is at the preferred options stage and policy wording is not currently available it has not been possible to confidently predict what the short, medium and long term effects will be. Rather than make assumptions about these effects the results of the policy appraisal will concentrate on the general performance of each preferred policy and also the likelihood of positive and negative effects occurring as a result of its implementation. The likelihood of short, medium and long term effects can be predicted as the wording of policies is developed further.

6.2 Appraisal of Guiding Principles and Vision

In general terms there was found there to be no conflict between the guiding principles of the plan and the appraisal objects. When the principles were considered in isolation, some potential areas of conflict were identified by this assessment. These areas related mainly to the need to provide waste management facilities and the objectives seeking to protect social, economic and environmental resources. When the seven objectives were considered as a whole those relating to the provision of waste management facilities were balanced by those seeking to minimise the impact of waste recovery and disposal.

It should be noted that all forms of development have the potential to have an adverse impact on such resources. If the proposed impact is considered to be significant an Environmental Impact Assessment will be required to assess the proposal in more detail and if necessary identify appropriate mitigation.

6.3 Key Findings of the Policy Appraisal

6.3.1 Preferred Policy Option 1- Sustainable Waste Management

This policy seeks to ensure that waste management activities and land uses are developed in a sustainable manner. This objective is at the heart of government planning policy and in general terms the policy performs well against all objectives. In particular it is considered that the policy performed very well against the objectives seeking to reduce air and noise pollution. There were a number of the more detailed objectives which it was considered did not relate directly to the broad sustainability theme of the policy. It is understood that all policies will be consulted when the WDPPO is submitted to the Government Office for consultation.

Likelihood

Overall, it is considered that the inclusion of this policy is likely to bring forward waste management sites and facilities which are more sustainable and have a positive impact on Milton Keynes.

6.3.2 Preferred Policy Option 2 – Working With Neighbours

The inclusion of a policy on Working with Neighbours' scores well against a number of objectives, including climate change, energy efficiency and air pollution. Such a policy is not relevant to many of the specific objectives and it is considered that locating waste management facilities in neighbouring districts could potentially reduce access to waste management facilities for residents of Milton Keynes. There were a number of objectives where the impact of the policy on the objective was uncertain. For example, it was not possible to determine how working with neighbours would influence modal shift to more sustainable means of transport. Overall the proposed policy only met 3 of the objectives.

Likelihood

The positive and negative effects of including this policy are difficult to predict. Overall, it is considered that working with neighbouring authorities to provide a co-ordinated response to waste management issues is likely to have a positive impact on sustainable development. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the provision of waste management facilities in other local authority areas does not result in a negative impact on the residents of Milton Keynes.

6.3.3 Preferred Policy 3 – Development Control Criteria

The WDPPO lists the criteria that this policy will use to determine waste management applications and such it is easier to assess than other policies in the WDPPO. In broad terms, the policy performs well and meets 12 of the 20 objectives. There are a number of objectives that are not directly related to the development control policy and it was unclear how the policy would relate to energy efficiency. The policy appears to contain most of the criteria that would normally be seen in a development control policy.

Likelihood

A policy setting out the development control criteria against which waste management proposals would be judged is considered to be a key component of the WDPD. It is therefore extremely likely that the policy will have a positive impact on sustainable development in Milton Keynes.

6.3.4 Preferred Policy 4 – Environmental Objectives

Entec felt that more information on the proposed environmental objectives would have been useful to appraise this policy. Rather than make assumptions about the provisions of the proposed policy it was decided to score the policy as uncertain against the objectives. It is understood that the wording of this policy has been amended since the appraisal took place, so that it now reads:

“A policy will be included that sets out environmental objectives for new and extensions to existing waste management facilities, including considering climate change and impact on natural resources”

This change does not however influence our initial conclusions as set out above.

6.3.5 Preferred Policy 5 – Transport

Transport is a key issue to take account of when undertaking Sustainability Appraisal and Entec considers it essential that a policy on this subject is included in the WDPD. The policy is only relevant to a limited number of objectives and received relatively few positive appraisal scores. The policy did not receive any negative scores in the appraisal matrix.

Likelihood

It is likely that this policy would help to minimise the transportation impact of waste management facilities on Milton Keynes. As such, it is considered that it would have a positive impact on sustainable waste management in the city.

6.3.6 Preferred Policy 6 – Restoration

Entec felt that more information on the proposed restoration criteria would have been useful to appraise this policy. Rather than make assumptions about the provisions of the proposed policy it was decided to score the policy as uncertain against the objectives.

6.3.7 Preferred Policy 7 – Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery

The preferred policy performed particularly well against the appraisal objectives on the basis that sustainable design, construction and resource recovery was likely to have a positive impact on sustainable development in Milton Keynes. Overall, the proposed policy met a total of 13 of the 20 appraisal criteria. It is considered that sustainable design and construction could potentially address issues such as health and well being, air pollution and energy efficiency of buildings. The policy did not receive any negative score against the objectives, but there were a number of objectives for which there was no relationship.

Likelihood

Whilst the principle of sustainable design is a positive step towards achieving sustainable waste management further information is required on the standards that developers would be required to meet in order to predict the likelihood of a positive outcome. Reference to appropriate design guidance or policies in the local plan would help to provide more clarity on this issue.

7. Appraisal of Site Selection Process

7.1 Waste Introduction

The following section provides a commentary on the site selection process described in the Waste Development Plan Preferred Options Document. (WDPPO) This process has led to the identification of a strategic waste sites and a reserve site in the Document. In assessing the site selection process Entec has sought to reflect the key principles contained in the ODPM SA guidance regarding the evaluation of options (i.e. sites) and predicting and evaluating effects.

Consideration has also been given to how the process relates to the guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Management. The assessment considers whether the site selection process addresses the following key questions.

- a) Is the process for selecting sites robust and does it reflect the sustainability priorities in PPS10?
- b) Do the site selection criteria reflect all the relevant SA objectives?
- c) Is the methodology sufficiently justified?
- d) What are the significant effects resulting from the site based policies and what mitigation measures could be adopted?

7.1.1 Is the process for selecting sites robust and does it reflect the sustainability priorities in PPS10?

The sites appear to have emerged as a result of the Issues and Options consultation and correspondence with waste operators/consultants/agents including sites suggested by the Council's own waste department.

Whilst this is a sound logical approach, it is difficult to see how this links to the broad criteria set out in PPS 10 (unless this is explained elsewhere than in the Plan). PPS10 states that a broad range of locations should be considered including industrial sites and opportunities for co-location with a priority emphasis on brownfield land. It may be that this is implicit in the sites identified for the exercise however; a better audit trail would be helpful. It is suggested that the broad site identification criteria are made clear at the outset e.g. sites identified were based on existing waste management sites with potential for co-location, general industrial areas, other brownfield land.

The sites identified have then be refined on the basis that smaller sites should be dealt with by a criteria based policy which results in a list of 13 potential strategic sites. These were then subject to the site selection process, using a numerical scoring system. The two sites with the highest score were identified in the Plan as a Preferred Strategic Waste Site and a Reserve site.

7.1.2 Do the site selection criteria reflect all the relevant SA objectives?

It is important that the criteria used to assess the sites adequately reflect the Sustainability Appraisal objectives. A summary of how the SA objectives are linked to the site assessment criteria is given in the table below.

Table 7.1: Summary of relationship between SA objectives and site selection criteria

SA Objectives	Relevant Site Selection Criteria
1. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Sensitive Human Receptors
2. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	N/A
3. To reduce social exclusions and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	Objective partially covered by objectives relating to Sensitive Human Receptors and Accessibility for People
4. To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas	Accessibility for people
5. To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve	Not covered, although this issue would be picked up by the Pollution Prevention Control application for the proposed waste management facility.
6. To reduce noise pollution	Sensitive Human Receptors Noise
7. To reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes	Waste transport mode
8. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings	Existing land use
9. To reduce waste arisings and increase reuse, recovery and recycling	Opportunity for co-location
10. To protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and groundwater	Hydrogeology and Groundwater risk
11. To reduce the risk of flooding	Flooding
12. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG)	Waste Transport mode
13. To increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources	Waste Transport mode Opportunity for co-location
14. To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habits	Ecology and Biodiversity
15. To protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings	Archaeology Historic Built Environment
16. To protect, manage and restore soil resources	Partially covered
17. To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character	Areas of attractive landscape Visual Impact

SA Objectives	Relevant Site Selection Criteria
	Landscape Character
18. To improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance	Objective not considered appropriate.
19. To maintain a strong local economy	Objective partially covered by criteria relating to Accessibility for People and opportunity for co-location.
20. To maintain high and stable levels of employment	Objective partially covered by criteria relating to Accessibility for People and opportunity for co-location.

Most of the SA objectives are covered by at least one site selection indicator. The criteria also largely reflect those in Annex E of PPS 10. It would however be helpful if the site selection process demonstrated how the criteria were linked to the SA objectives.

The notable SA objectives which are not fully reflected in the site selection criteria area are:

- Objective 3 – Social Exclusion
- Objective 5 - Air Quality
- Objective 16 – Soil Resources
- Objective 19 – Local Economy
- Objective 20 – Employment

On air quality, consideration should be given as to whether any of the sites would have a significant effect on air quality in the area. It is understood that Milton Keynes has no Air Quality Management Area (AQMAS) therefore air quality may not be a significant issue overall however the site selection process should still demonstrate how this objective has been addressed even if it is concluded that there is no significant difference between the sites.

Soil resources are covered partially with reference to the existing land use criterion which addresses contamination and best and most versatile land. The existing land use criterion does however address the sustainability objective relating to the efficient use of land (objective 8). It is suggested that MKC should give consideration to separating out elements of this criteria which relate to soil resources and those which relate to the efficient use of land as these two issues are addressed by separate SA objectives.

Economic and social objectives are not fully reflected in the site selection criteria. PPS 10 refers to the need to examine cumulative effects of facilities on local communities, including any effects on environmental quality, social cohesion and economic potential. These are quite difficult factors to assess, however this is a notable omission in the assessment criteria.

Consideration should be given to examining the relationship between the site and economic and social indicators. These could include local unemployment levels, potential for economic development, social deprivation. Even if it is concluded that there is no significant difference between the sites these factors should be addressed in the site selection process.

7.1.3 Is the methodology sufficiently justified?

In the scoring system each indicator is scored from 1 - 5. No explicit weighting is applied to any of the indicators. There is no explanation as to the basis for the lack of weighting applied. Numerical scoring systems, by their very nature imply a level of objectivity to a subjective process. As such the basis for any scoring system and associated weighting should be clearly explained. The lack of such explanation opens the site selection process up to potential criticism.

It is noted however that whilst there is no explicit weighting there are three landscape/visual indicators which in effect give this sustainability objectives a weighting of x3 in the assessment. The basis for this needs to be explained or alternatively the number of criteria reduced. It is also the case that some of the site selection criteria may be easier to mitigate against, for example noise within a designated site. This may effect the way different criteria are weighted.

The weighting for the criteria should be reviewed in light of the sustainability priorities in PPS10. For example PPS 10 gives a clear priority for sites located on previously developed land and it could therefore be argued that this criterion should have a higher weighting in the site selection process.

7.1.4 What are the significant effects resulting from the site based policies and have what mitigation measures could be adopted?

Preferred Site 1- Colts Holm Road is indicated as being suitable for a final treatment facility, which could also include recycling. The site performed best overall in the site selection exercise, although there were a number of moderate scores e.g. landscape, ecology and two lower scores i.e. noise and accessibility for people. In order to improve the performance of the policy against SA objectives it would be beneficial to identify in broad terms potential mitigation which should be put in place to address any significant effects.

PPS10 also refers to the need to consider the cumulative effects of waste disposal activities in an area. As this site involves additional facilities adjacent to an existing site then this factor should be considered as part of the assessment process.

The Preferred Site 2 – Garamond Drive is identified as a reserve site in the event that Colts Holm Road does not come forward. This site performs well against the site selection criteria and is ranked 2nd closely behind Colts Holm Road. Again the site has a number of moderate scores against certain criteria e.g. landscape, ecology, noise and one poor score against opportunities for co-location. It is important that any significant effects are addressed and broad mitigation measures should be put forward within the Plan.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

8.1 Monitoring Requirements

The SEA Directive specifically requires monitoring to identify unforeseen adverse effects and to enable appropriate remedial action to be taken. In addition, Planning Policy Statement 12 states that Local Planning Authorities must develop monitoring systems to assess the effectiveness of local development documents. The annual monitoring report should include an assessment of whether policies and related targets or milestones in local development documents have been met or progress is being made towards meeting them or, where they are not being met or not on track to being achieved, the reasons why:

- what impact the policies are having in respect of national, regional and local policy targets and any other targets identified in local development documents.
- the extent to which any local development order, where adopted, is achieving its purposes;
- whether the policies in the local development document need adjusting or replacing because they are not working as intended;
- whether the policies need changing to reflect changes in national or regional policy; and
- if policies or proposals need changing, the actions needed to achieve this.

8.2 Developing Monitoring Indicators

The Council has indicated that it will work with statutory consultees and other stakeholders to establish the relevant sustainability effects to be monitored. These indicators will be developed further when formulating the precise wording of the policies after the preferred options consultations. The principle aims for these indicators are:

- To reducing landfill per head;
- Increasing recycling percentage;
- No. of facilities coming forward to meet regional targets;
- Strategic site being delivered;
- Number of complaints relating to waste management operations;
- Locations of smaller facilities coming forward;
- Number of facilities minimising road movements; and
- Number of restoration schemes meeting Biodiversity Action Plan Targets

Monitoring arrangements to ensure delivery of sustainability objectives will be built into the Annual Monitoring Report.

9. Conclusions

9.1 Summary of Policy Appraisal

The following table summarises the performance of the preferred policies in the WDPPO against the appraisal objectives

Table 9.1: Summary of Appraisal Ratings

Rating	Occurrences of ratings for each policy							Totals
	Policy 1	Policy 2	Policy 3	Policy 4	Policy 5	Policy 6	Policy 7	
++	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
+	12	7	12	0	8	0	13	52
~	3	11	5	0	10	0	13	42
?	0	1	3	20	2	20	2	60
-	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 5.1 shows that the proposed policies met a high proportion of the appraisal objectives, although few performed very well against them. Very few policies received negative appraisal ratings and none received double negative scores (performed very badly against the objectives). A high proportion of the objectives were either not relevant to the proposed policies or the effect of the policies on those objectives was uncertain. It is considered that this lack of clarity is largely due to the fact that wording for the proposed policies was not included in the WDPPO. For this reason it was decided not to appraise policies 4 and 6 against the appraisal objectives.

9.2 Policy Recommendations

Following the completion of the appraisal of the policies Entec has made a number of recommendations on how to improve their performance in sustainability terms. These recommendations relate to the general format, provisions and presentation of policies and also to the specific wording of policies.

- **General Recommendations:** - It is considered that the plan should provide more information on how policies have been selected and developed. This would allow

stakeholders to understand how and why the suite of policies has been selected by the Council. Entec suggests there is a need to develop and consult on the draft wording of the proposed policies as soon as possible, although it is understood that the Council has developed a programme of consultation.

- **Preferred Policy 1 - Sustainable Waste Management:** This policy performs particularly well against air quality and noise pollution objectives, however it does not meet other criteria including land quality and water resources. It is considered that the policy should provide a broader description of what is meant by sustainable waste management and what it involves. The need to reconcile social, economic and environmental concerns and issues could be referred to in the policy.
- **Preferred Policy 2 - Working with Neighbours:** It is considered that working with neighbouring authorities could improve the overall sustainability of waste management across the wider region. Entec considers that it would be useful for the policy to clarify that this will not result in a lack of waste management facilities for the residents of Milton Keynes.
- **Preferred Policy 3 - Development Control Criteria:** This policy will contain a comprehensive list of development control criteria. Entec considers that there was a further opportunity to include criteria to address landscape and water resource issues.
- **Preferred Policy 4 - Environmental Objectives:** Further clarity is required on the nature of the Environmental Objectives in order to assess this policy.
- **Preferred Policy 5 - Transport:** This issue of transporting waste relates to the need to ensure that waste management facilities are located in close proximity to sources of waste. It is considered that Transport Assessments would only be required where facilities are considered to have a significant impact on the surrounding road network.
- **Preferred Policy 6 - Restoration:** Further clarity is required on the principle aims of and objectives for restoration in order to assess this policy.
- **Preferred Policy 7 - Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery:** It is considered that this policy could be more specific about the design standards that waste management facilities would be expected to meet. Appropriate SPGs/SPDs could be referenced in the policy.

9.3 Summary of Site Selection Appraisal

Entec makes the following recommendations on the basis of the appraisal of the site selection methodology contained in the WDPPPO:

- Review the basis for initial site selection and provide an explanation of how this relates to key sustainability factors in PPS10.
- Review the site selection criteria to ensure that all the SA objectives are adequately reflected in the process.

- Review the scoring system with a view to considering the need for weighting. Provide an explanation of the basis for the scoring approach adopted.
- Add appropriate references in the policies relating to the strategic sites which highlight the key sustainability effects and any broad measures which should be adopted as mitigation.

Appendix A

Interim Report: Appraisal of Strategic Options

Appendix B

Relevant Plans and Programmes

18 Pages

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
International Plans and Programmes		
European Directives	Framework Directive on Waste Disposal (75/442/EEC) amended by 91/156/EEC, 91/692/EEC 96/350EC and 96/59/EC; Hazardous Waste Directive (91/689/EEC), Directive on the Landfill of Waste (1999/31/EC), Directive on Packaging and Packaging Waste (94/62/EC), Directive on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (Directive 2002/96/EC), Animal By-product Regulation 1774/2002/EC; Directive on End of Life Vehicles 2000/532/EC; Waste Incineration Directive 2000/76/EC; Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive 96/61/EC; Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (92/43/EEC), Noise Directive (86/188/EEC), Conservation of Wild Birds Directive (79/409/EEC), Freshwater Fisheries Directive (78/659/EEC), Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (91/271/EEC), Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC); Air Quality Directive (96/62/EC) and their daughter directives.	Waste/Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
EU 6 th Environmental Action Plan, September 2002: Thematic Strategy on Recycling and Prevention of Waste; Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection; Thematic Strategy on the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources.	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/newprg/	Transport/Waste
EU Biodiversity Strategy (covers 4 Action Plans), February 1998	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/docum/9842sm.htm	Transport
EU Sustainable Development Strategy, May 2001	http://europa.eu.int/comm/environment/eusd/	Transport/Waste

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
National Plans and Programmes		
Guidance on Municipal Waste Management Strategies, July 2005	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/localauth/pdf/guidemunwaste-strategy.pdf	
A New Deal for Transport White Paper, July 1998	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_about/documents/page/dft_about_021588.hcsp	Transport
The Future of Transport White Paper, July 2004	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_about/documents/divisionhomepage/031259.hcsp	Transport
Guidance on Full Local Transport Plans, March 2000	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_localtrans/documents/divisionhomepage/032384.hcsp	Transport
Full Guidance on Local Transport Plans, Second Edition, December 2004	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_localtrans/documents/page/dft_localtrans_504005.hcsp	Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Strategic Environmental Assessment Guidance for Transport Plans and Programmes TAG Unit 2.11, December 2004	Department for Transport: http://www.webtag.org.uk/sitepages/consult/pdf/211consult.pdf	Transport
SD Policy Statement, March 2004	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_about/documents/page/dft_about_027569.hcsp	Transport
Transport 10 Year Plan 2000: Delivering better transport – progress report	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_about/documents/page/dft_about_023008.hcsp	Transport
Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_roads/documents/page/dft_roads_504929.hcsp	Transport
Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997: draft guidance to local transport authorities	Department for Transport: http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_roads/documents/page/dft_roads_504929-08.hcsp	Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Securing the Future - UK Government sustainable development strategy, March 2005	Sustainable Development Unit, Defra: http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk	Transport/Waste
The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, January 2000 (as amended)	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/airquality/strategy/index.htm	Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
PPGs and PPSs	PPG1: General Policies and Plans PPG3: Housing PPG4: Industrial Commercial Development and Small Firms PPG6: Town Centres and Rural Development PPG7: Countryside PPG8: Telecommunications PPG9: Nature Conservation PPG13: Transport PPG15: Planning and Historic Environment PPG16: Archaeology and Planning PPG17: Planning for Sport, Open Space and Recreation PPG 21: Tourism PPG22: Renewable Energy PPG23: Planning and Pollution Control PPG24: Planning and Noise PPG25: Planning and the Floodplain Draft PPS1: Creating Sustainable Communities PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas Draft PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management PPS11: Regional Planning PPS12: Local Development Frameworks PPS22: Renewable Energy.	
Environment Agency Policy	http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/aboutus/512398/?version=1&lang=e	Transport/Waste
English Nature Position Statements	http://www.english-nature.gov.uk/news/position.asp	Transport/Waste
Countryside Agency Strategy	http://http://www.countryside.gov.uk/WhoWeAreAndWhatWeDo/strategy.asp	Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
English Heritage Regional Plans	http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1676	Transport
English Heritage Strategy 2005 - 2010	http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.8755	Transport
National Waste Strategy 2000	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/cm4693/	Waste
Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981	http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/index.htm http://www.naturenet.net/law/wca.html	
Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000	http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/cl/	
National Biodiversity Action Plan (UK Biodiversity Action Plan Steering Group 1994)	http://www.ukbap.org.uk/	Transport/Waste
UK Climate Change Programme	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/02.htm#uk	Waste/Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
National Waste Development Framework	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/leg_dir.htm	Waste
Waste Strategy 2000, the UK National Waste Strategy	http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/cm4693/pdf/wastvol1.pdf	Waste
Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards, English Nature	English Nature, 1995: Research Report No. 153, Accessible Natural Greenspace in Towns and Cities - a Review of Appropriate Size and Distance Criteria, Updated info: http://www.english-nature.org.uk/pubs/publication/PDF/526.pdf http://www.english-nature.org.uk/pubs/publication/PDF/Accessgreenspace.pdf	Transport/Waste
Regional Plans and Programmes		
Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy (MKSM SRS)	Government Office for the South East: http://www.go-se.gov.uk/gose/docs/170192/221841/221846/221880	Waste/Transport
Regional Planning Guidance for the South East RPG9 (the spatial strategy for the region)	http://www.go-se.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalPlanning/?a=42496	Transport/Waste

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8), March 2005	http://www.gos.gov.uk/goem/psc/suscom/rss/	Transport/Waste
Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands (RPG11)	http://www.gos.gov.uk/gowm/149642/170408/?a=42496	Transport/Waste
Regional Transport Strategy July 2004	http://www.go-se.gov.uk/gose/docs/171301/RPG9AmendChap9.pdf	Transport
Waste Local Plan for Buckinghamshire 1994 - 2006 (March 1997)	Buckinghamshire County Council	Waste

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Regional Waste Management Strategy and the Regional Mineral Strategy Panel Report (January 2005)	http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalPlanning/wasteMineralsPanelReport/?a=42496	Waste
Proposed Changes to Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG 9) Waste and Minerals August 2005	http://gose.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalplanning/?a=42496	Waste
Draft Regional Waste Management Strategy, 'No Time To Waste', (March 2004)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/strategies/waste_2003.html	Waste
Draft Regional Minerals Strategy (March 2004)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/strategies/minerals.html	Waste

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
SEERA- Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (May 2003)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/strategies/energy.html	Transport/Waste
Regional Spatial Strategy for Tourism (June 2003)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/strategies/tourism.html	Transport
SEERA- Annual Report (2004-05)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/annual_report.html	Waste/Transport
The Regional Sustainable Development Framework (June 2001)- A better quality of life in the South East	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/our_work/planning/sus_dev/framework.html	Waste/Transport
Regional Economic Strategy for South East England: 2002-2012	http://www.mkiobservatory.org.uk/download/5q045w2cijwlyizoavwaw55/496/Regional%20Economic%20Strategy%20for%20SE%20England.pdf	Waste/Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
South East Plan Consultation Draft (January 2005)	http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/plan/view_plan.html	Waste/Transport
State of the Environment; 2004 for South East England	http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/regions/southern/871496/?lang= e	Waste/Transport
State of the Countryside Report for the South East Region	http://www.countryside.gov.uk/Publications/articles/Publication_tcm2-25597.asp	Waste/Transport
Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk in the South East	Institute for Public Policy Research- Commission on Sustainable Development in the South East - http://www.ippr.org.uk/ecommm/files/SE%20water%201.pdf	Waste/Transport
Local Plans and Strategies		
A Waste Strategy For Milton Keynes, October 2002 Update	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/waste/documents/Final_waste_strategy_draft_3_.pdf	Waste

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Milton Keynes Draft Waste Development Plan Document, August 2005	Hard copy	Waste
Milton Keynes Municipal Waste Strategy, Consultation Draft, August 2005	Hard copy	Waste
Milton Keynes Minerals Local Plan 2001 – 2011 Second Deposit Version	Milton Keynes Council: www.mkweb.co.uk/local%5Fplan%5Freview/DisplayArticle.asp?ID=22888	Waste/Transport
Milton Keynes Local Plan 2001 – 2011 Second Deposit Version	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/local%5Fplan%5Freview/DisplayArticle.asp?ID=16914	Waste/Transport
Milton Keynes, Local Development Scheme 2005-2008	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/local_plan_review/documents/Local_Development_Scheme_2005 - 2008_March_2005_.pdf	Waste/Transport
MK Corporate Plan 2005-08	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/best-value/documents/BVPP20058.pdf	Waste/Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
MK Draft Housing Strategy 2005-2008	http://www.miltonkeynes.gov.uk/housing%2Dneeds/DisplayArticle.asp?ID=26162	Transport
MK Local Transport Plan 2001/02 to 2005/06	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/transport/documents/local_transport_plan.pdf	Transport
MK Provisional LTP 2006-07 to 2010-11 (Draft, July 2005)	Hard copy	Transport
MK LA21 Strategy (March 2002)	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/la21/documents/LA21Strategyadopted%2Epdf	Waste/Transport
Sustainable Communities: An Urban Development Area for Milton Keynes, A Consultation Paper	http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_control/documents/contentservertemplate/odpm_index.hcst?n=4508&l=2	Waste/Transport
A Sustainable Integrated Transport Strategy for Milton Keynes, 1999	http://www.mkweb.co.uk/transport/documents/Sustainable_Integrated_Transport_Strategy.pdf	Transport

Plan / programme	Data source	Relevance to Transport / Waste
Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Biodiversity Action Plan 2000-2010	http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/countryside/biodiversity/biodiversity_action_plan/contents.stm	
Milton Keynes Landscape Character Study (October 1999)	Landscape Design Associates	Waste/Transport
The Wildlife Corridors of Milton Keynes 1996	Milton Keynes Council, MK Wildlife Corridors Project	Waste/Transport

Appendix C

Schedule of Baseline Information

20 Pages

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Age structure</i>	Population – 207,057 of which 50% are male (Census 2001) 0-4 years 7% 5-16 years 16% 17-24 years 10% 25-34 years 15% 35-59 years 37% 60+ years 15%	South East England - 8,000,645 of which 49% are male 0-4 6% 5-15 14% 16-19 5% 20-24 6% 25-44 28% 45-60 22% 60+ 19% UK population from 2000 to 2011 is predicted to grow at 2% compared with 23% for Milton Keynes.	Growth to a population of around 255,000 is planned by 2011	0-4 years projected to increase by 26% by 2011 5-16 years projected to increase by 9% by 2011 17-24 years projected to increase by 19% by 2011 25-34 years projected to increase by 19% by 2011 35-59 years projected to increase by 16% by 2011 60+ years projected to increase by 35% by 2011	Milton Keynes is one of the fastest growing districts in the country- Between 1981 and 2001, its population increased by 64.4%, whereas the population of England increased by only 5.0%. It has much higher than average projected growth rates for 0-34 years, and very high growth rates for 60+ years. Current median age is slightly under 35, projected to be rise slightly to 36 due to migration and births from current residents. Still younger than England, which is projected to have a median age of 41 in 2011.	Population	Milton Keynes Population Bulletin 2004/05, Neighbourhood Statistics ONS Regions in Figures

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Working age people</i>	65.8%	South East – 60.9 GB – 61.4				Population	NOMIS and 'midyear population estimates' (2003)
<i>Qualifications of working age population</i>	Milton Keynes – Degree and Higher Degree level qualifications- 21.6% Fewer than 5 GCSEs at grades A-C – 62.6% No qualifications – 12.8%	South East - Degree and Higher Degree level qualifications- 28.5% Fewer than 5 GCSEs at grades A-C – 66.0% No qualifications – 10.8% GB – Degree and Higher Degree level qualifications- 25.2%				Population	NOMIS and 'local area labour force survey' (Mar 2003-Feb 2004), ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
		Fewer than 5 GCSEs at grades A-C – 61.5% No qualifications – 15.1%					
<i>Percentage of school pupils or full-time students aged 16 to 74 years</i>	5% of the resident population were school pupils or full-time students aged 16 to 74 years (Census in April 2001).	5.1% of the population in England and Wales					Neighbourhood Statistics (Census 2001, ONS)
<i>People aged 16-74 with: No qualifications</i>	24.37% (April 2001)	South East – 23.91% England and Wales – 29.08%					

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>People aged 16-74 with: Highest qualification attained level 4 / 5</i>	18.93% (April 2001)	South East – 21.75% England and Wales – 19.76% In South East 80% of 17 year olds continued to participate in post- compulsory education, compared with 78% in England and Wales		Level 4/5 includes First degree; Higher degree; NVQ levels 4 and 5; HNC; HND; Qualified Teacher Status; Qualified Medical Doctor; Qualified Dentist; Qualified Nurse; Midwife; Health Visitor.			

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Pupils achieving 5 or more GCSEs graded A* to C</i>	2003/04 academic year; 48.2% of pupils in MK achieved 5 or more GCSEs graded A* to C	South East – 55.3% England - 53.7%	In 1998 34.6% (49.2% in SE) had higher than 5GCSEs at grades A-C or equivalent this rose by 13.6% to 48.2% (55.3% in SE) by 2004. This is a sharp increased compared to England's (7.4%) and the South East's (6.1), however MK's score remains lower than the national and regional.			Population	Neighbourhood Statistics
<i>Percentage of Working Age based on total population</i>	65.8%	South East – 60.9% GB – 31.4%				Population	midyear population estimates (2003)
<i>Burglary Offences per 1000 households</i>	2003-13.3	South East 12.1 England – 18.6		2000 – 14.0 2001 – 13.9 2002 – 15.8	Although burglary crime rates have remained static over the last couple of years, overall crime rates have risen slightly.	Material Assets	MKi - Milton Keynes Intelligence Observatory, ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Overall Crime Rate</i>	2003- 67.7	South East - 54.2 England – 69.3				Population, Material Assets	ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets
<i>Vehicle Crime per 1000, population</i>	2003- 16.6	South East – 13.0 England – 17.0		1999 – 31.2 2000 – 19.0 2001 – 20.8 2002 – 17.7		Material Assets	MKi - Milton Keynes Intelligence Observatory, ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets
<i>Robberies per 1,000 population</i> <i>National Crime Survey</i>	2003 – 1.3	South East – 0.8 England – 2.0		1999 – 0.8 2000 – 1.0 2001 – 1.4 2002 – 1.0		Material Assets	Home Office, Crime Statistics for England and Wales
<i>Violent offences committed in public places per 1,000 population</i>	12.2 (2003/04)	Regional Average - 9.1		A 4% increase from 2002 to 2003 (11.7)		Population	ODPM-BVPI (BV127b)

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Deprivation</i>	<p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation: Milton Keynes has an overall rank of 204 out of 354 local authorities (a low score indicates greater deprivation).</p> <p>Rank of Income Scale: 89</p> <p>Rank of Employment Scale: 101</p>					Population	ODPM 2004 IMD
<i>Disability Living Allowance and Attendance Allowance</i>	<p>For August 2003:</p> <p><i>Disability Living Allowance</i> 7,335 people (3.8%) in MK received this benefit.</p> <p><i>Attendance Allowance</i> 3,180 people (14.5%) in MK received this allowance.</p>	<p>England and Wales - 5.1%</p> <p>England and Wales - 14.4%</p>			<p>The Disability Living Allowance is a benefit paid to people under 65, who are disabled, and need help with personal care and/or getting around.</p> <p>Attendance Allowance is paid to people aged 65 or over who are disabled, either physically or mentally, and who need supervision or assistance with personal care over a prolonged period of time.</p>	Population	Neighbourhood Statistics - DWP

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>% of households without a car</i>	19.2% of households in Milton Keynes did not have a car or van (2001) 36.3% owned 2+ cars	England and Wales: average of 26.8% with no car or van 29.4% owned 2+ cars				Population, Human Health	ONS Regions in Figures
<i>Car Ownership Rates</i>	2001 – 0.51 cars per resident 2001 – 1.26 cars per household	10-15% higher than the national average, and is a similar rate to affluent and predominantly rural districts.			Car ownership rates are much higher than urban centres with a similar population, highlighting Milton Keynes dependence on the car.	Population, Human Health	ONS Regions in Figures
<i>% of people using their car for journeys to work</i>	82% (based on Census 2001 – LTP1)		Decrease journey to work by car to 62% by 2006 SITS sets an overall target of reducing the proportion of car journeys to work from the current level of 77% to 55% by 2011.	77% - based on Census 1991	Traffic congestion is worst during the peak periods and is mainly caused by commuter traffic. Almost 80% of journeys to work within Milton Keynes were by car - much higher than the regional average of 60% (1991 Census). 50% of local commuters travel less than 3 miles to work (MKC)	Population, Human Health, Air	Milton Keynes Council: A Sustainable Integrated Transport Strategy for Milton Keynes (1999), MK- LTP1

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Number of cars parked in Central Milton Keynes on a weekday at 1000am</i>	2003/04 – 16,342		Decrease journey to work by car to 62% by 2006	2000 – 16,143 cars 2001/02 – 16,105 2002/03 – 16,672		Population, Human Health, Air	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Total number of passenger journeys made annually on all local buses</i>	6,881,066	Regional- 14,075,573		2001/02- 6,667,040 2002/03- 6,512,000 2003/04 – 6,881,000 Over the course of LTP1 there have been steady increases in bus ridership each year. Between 2002/03 and 2003/04, there was a 5% increase.	Traffic forecasts suggest that in 20 years time, traffic in the UK will be between 22% and 46% higher than it is now. For Milton Keynes, traffic forecasts are between 47% and 73% higher than now.	Population, Human Health, Air	ODPM –BVPI (BV102) LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004 Milton Keynes Council: A Sustainable Integrated Transport Strategy for Milton Keynes (1999)

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Bus passenger satisfaction</i>	38% (2003/04)		48% (2003/04)	41% (200/01) 3% decrease since 2000/01	The 3% decrease in bus passenger satisfaction in 2003/04 was unexpected. Investment by the major bus operator and Milton Keynes Council in programmes to improve bus services need to be ongoing to see improvements in bus passenger satisfaction.	Population, Human Health, Air	ODPM – BVPI (BV104u) LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
Modal Split	<p>1991- journeys to work by: car – 77% public transport- 12% cycling – 3% walking – 7% motorcycling – 1%</p> <p>1996- journeys to shopping from a survey of shoppers visiting the Shopping Centre in 1996: car – 68% public transport- 13% walking – 15% other- 4%</p> <p>Vehicle Cordon Studies (MK) 2001 – 23,000 2002 – 23,000 2003 – 23,500 Bus Passenger Studies (MK) 2002 – 1,902 2004 – 2,161</p> <p>Inbound Pedestrians (MK) 2003 – 678 2004 – 724</p> <p>Inbound Cycles (MK) 2003 – 195</p>		<p>2006 – car – 62 public trans.-20 cycling – 10 walking – 7 motorcycling – 1</p> <p>2011 – car – 55 public trans. - 25 cycling – 12 walking – 7 motorcycling – 1</p>	<p>Past trends have been for the proportion of journeys to work made by car to increase and for the proportion made on foot, by cycle, and by public transport to fall.</p> <p>More recent trends have shown increasing numbers of car trips, but at a slower rate than nationally. Bus usage has shown a significant increase in both peak period and throughout the day recently. Walk trips in the peak hour have also increased recently.</p>	<p>More than any other city in the UK, Milton Keynes was designed around the car with wide and well designed roads but these are beginning to show signs of congestion.</p> <p>Traffic congestion is worst during the peak periods and is mainly caused by commuter traffic. Since most employment is, and will continue to be, within the City, particularly the City centre, congestion and pollution problems will continue to be concentrated on this area.</p>	Population, Human Health, Air	Milton Keynes Council: A Sustainable Integrated Transport Strategy for Milton Keynes (1999) LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Number of cycling trips at representative locations</i>	Number of cycles parked at a representative number of counting points 2003 - 266		UK National Target adopted for Milton Keynes – triple cycling by 2010	The number of cycles parked in Central Milton Keynes has increased by 27% since 2000.	Past investments in improving facilities have been shown to have positive effect in increasing cyclist numbers and should be continued into the future.	Population, Human Health, Air	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Number of cyclists on Sustrans route by Milton Keynes Central Rail Station</i>	2003/04 – 219		UK National Target adopted for Milton Keynes – triple cycling by 2010	2001 – 167 2002/03 – 185		Population, Human Health, Air	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Number of people killed or seriously injured on roads in Milton Keynes</i>	2003/04 – 94		2003/04 – 110	From the 1994-98 baseline figures, there has been a reduction in the number of people killed or seriously injured by 30%.	Although there has been a significant reduction in the number of people killed and seriously injured, this number is still deemed to be too high. There is concern that as the figures for 2003/04 showed such a dramatic decrease compared to previous years, this may have been a 'blip' year, and casualties may again be higher.	Population, Human Health	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Number of children killed and seriously injured</i>	2003 – 13		2003 – 16	From the 1994-98 baseline figures, there has been a reduction in the number of children killed or seriously injured by 38%.	As above.	Population, Human Health	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>% of rural households within 800 metres of an hourly or better bus service</i>	2001/02 - 77%		2003/04 - 77%	The percentage of rural households within 800 metres of an hourly or better bus service has remained at a constant level of 77% since 2001/02.	There is an issue of poor accessibility to jobs, shops, and services in some remote rural areas.	Population, Air	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Number of walk trips to work</i>	2003/04 – 6%		1991 Census – 7%	Stabilise journey to work by walking at 7% by 2006	The percentage of walk trips to work has decreased slightly since 1991 and has showed no sign of significantly increasing.	Population, Human Health, Air	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>% of total length of footpaths and other rights of way which were easy to use by the public</i>	2003/04 – 52%		2001/01 – 85% 2002/03 – 39%	Target of 70% by 2006/07	Although there has been a past trend in decreasing ease of use of footpaths and other rights of way, this indicator is now improving. A well maintained footway network is important for safety and to encourage use.	Population, Human Health	ODPM – BVPI (BV 178)

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>% of pedestrian crossings with facilities for people with a disability</i>	2003/04 – 100%		2000/01 – 90%	Target achieved of 100% by 2005/06	There is a need to maintain this level of disabled pedestrian accessibility in the future.	Population, Human Health	ODPM – BVPI (BV 165)
<i>Number of Community Transport Trips</i>	2004/05 – 40,110 trips by MK Special; 48,360 trips by MK Fastchair		New indicator	New indicator no target set	Community Transport can be used to increase accessibility in hard to reach areas.	Population, Human Health	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Number of schools with a school place travel plan</i>	2004/05 – 20		2001/02 – 0 2002/03 – 0 2003/04 - 5	100 Schools by 2005/06		Population, Human Health	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Number of pupils walking and cycling to school</i>	2003/04 – 59%		2001/02 – 60% 2002/03 – 59%	2005/06 – 65% of surveyed schools		Population, Human Health	LTP1 Annual Progress Report 2004
<i>Noise Levels</i>	Noise hotspots are expected to be found at the main road networks and isolated noise generators (airports, railways). Defra is commissioning a noise map which will be produced in the next 12 months.			The EU Noise Abatement Policy may be expected to bring about reductions in ambient noise levels over the long term.	Predicted growth in traffic could accentuate the noise hotspots.	Human Health	Roger Tym & Partners/Halcrow/Three Dragons: Milton Keynes and South Midlands Study

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Stats on Noise Complaints</i>	Complaints per 1,000 pop: 2004-2005: 6.4		The Council standards: - to respond to complaints within 5 working days and; - to resolve 80% of complaints within 4 months.	Complaints per 1,000 pop: 2000-2001: 9.3 2001-2002: 8.3 2002-2003: 8.2 2003-2004: 7.1 The total number of complaints decreased from 1,969 in 2000-2001 to 1,392 in 2004-2005. However, the number of health and safety complaints increased from 99 (2000-2001) to 201 (2004-2005)	The actual number of cases dealt with by MK Community Mediations, shows that 206 cases were closed in 2004, an increase from 190 in the previous year.	Population, Human Health	MK Council website Statistics: Neighbour Complaints and Mediations http://www.mkweb.co.uk/statistics/DisplayArticle.asp?ID=11648

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Life expectancy</i>	Male 76.4 (2002) Female 80.0 (2002)	Males in England 76.2 Males in the South East of England – 75.4 Females in England – 80.7 Females in the South East of England – 80.4		Males 1999 – 75.3 2000 – 75.8 2001 – 76.2 2002 – 76.4 Females 1999 – 80.0 2000 – 79.9 2001 – 80.3	The Milton Keynes Public Health Annual Report 2002 showed that the leading causes of death in Milton Keynes are the same as in the country as a whole: cancer, heart disease and respiratory disease	Human Health	ODPM Neighbourhood Renewal Unit
<i>Standard Mortality Ratio</i>	SMR- 107 (103 for males 110 for females)	South East – 93 (92 for males and 95 for females) England - 100			MK mortality rates are high compared with national rates, and much higher compared to the regional SMR.	Human Health	Population Trends 108 - Report: Death registrations in England and Wales, 2001: area of residence
<i>General Health considered 'good'</i>	73%	South East 72% England and Wales 69%			The Census 2001 showed that Milton Keynes compared favourably with England as a whole in terms of health: - 72.5 % of MK population had Good Health compared to 68.8% in England	Human Health	2001 Census, Office of National Statistics

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>General Health considered 'not good'</i>	7%	South East 7% England and Wales 9%				Human Health	2001 Census, Office of National Statistics
<i>Suicide Mortality Rate</i>	2002 – 6.5	South East – 8.4 England – 8.7		1997 – 9.3 1998 – 8.3 1999 – 9.7 2000 – 7.6 2001 – 8.1	In 1999 suicide rate in MK (9.7) was slightly higher compared to the national (9.6) and regional (8.9) rates, but has been lower for all other years.	Human Health	ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets

Indicator	Quantified data (Milton Keynes Council)	Comparators (Quantified data for the South East of England Region and England and Wales)	Targets	Trends	Issue identified	Associated SEA topics	Source
<i>Road casualty rate (KSI)</i>	Road casualty rate 2003 Overall – 5.6 KSI- 0.5 Child KSI – 0.3	South East – 5.0 England – 5.2 South East – 0.6 England – 0.6 South East – 0.2 England – 0.4		Road casualty rate KSI- 1997 – 0.6 1998 – 0.5 1999 – 0.8 2000 – 0.9 2001 – 0.6 2002 – 0.7		Human Health	ODPM- NRU, Floor Targets

Appendix D SA/SEA Framework Objectives as defined by Atkins' Scoping Report

8 Pages

Key to Data Availability for Indicators

Bold = Known data for Milton Keynes Borough

Italic = Known data for SE Region

Underlined = Data for Borough and SE Region currently unknown

No.	Draft SA Objective	Draft Headline Indicator	Potential Detailed Indicators	SEA Topics
Social				
1	To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Life expectancy	Life expectancy Standard mortality ratios % of people who describe their health as not good % of people who describe their health as good Suicide mortality rate BVPI 99 - Road casualty rate (killed or seriously injured - KSI)	Human health, population
2	To reduce crime and the fear of crime	Overall Crime Rates	Overall Crime Rates <u>Buses fitted with CCTV</u> Violent offences committed in public places per 1,000 pop. Burglary offences per 1,000 households Vehicle Crime per 1000, population Robberies per 1,000 population	Human health, population
3	To reduce social exclusion and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	Indices of deprivation	Indices of Deprivation – overall rank Rank of Income Scale Rank of Employment Scale Disability Living Allowance Attendance Allowance	Human Health, Population
4	To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas.	<u>% of population within 1km of public transport links</u>	<u>% of urban and rural residential population within walking distance of key services</u> <u>% of people of working age, within 30 minutes of work by public transport</u> <u>% of new development within 1km of main employment areas</u>	Human health, population

No.	Draft SA Objective	Draft Headline Indicator	Potential Detailed Indicators	SEA Topics
			<u>% of new residential development within 1km of good public transport links</u> <u>% of new commercial development within 1km of good public transport links</u> <u>Access to services for disabled people</u> BVPI 165 - Pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people <u>Proportion of low floor vehicles in the bus fleet (%)</u> <u>ha of accessible green space per 1000 people (proposed by English Nature)</u>	
Environmental				
5	To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve	Levels of main air pollutants	Levels of main pollutants for national air quality targets Number of days of air pollution <u>Number of PPC installations</u>	Air
6	To reduce noise pollution	<u>Noise levels</u>	<u>Noise levels</u> Statistics re: noise complaints	Noise
7	To reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes	Composition and volume of road traffic Modal split	<u>Road traffic volumes</u> Number of car trips (Census) <u>% change in road traffic volume</u> <u>Change in peak period traffic flows to urban centres (LTP)</u> Annual average flow per 1,000km of principal roads <u>Vehicle kilometres per average weekday</u> <u>Congestion (vehicle delay)</u> Number of passenger journeys made on local buses Travel to work, by mode BVPI 102: Number of passenger bus journeys No. of daily work journeys by bus (LTP) <u>Number of passenger rail journeys</u> % households without a car	Population, Human health, Air, Climatic Factors

No.	Draft SA Objective	Draft Headline Indicator	Potential Detailed Indicators	SEA Topics
8	To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings,	<u>% of new development built on previously developed land</u>	% of new housing built on previously developed land	Cultural Heritage, Landscape
9	To reduce waste arisings and increase reuse, recovery and recycling.	% of municipal waste generated disposed of to landfill	Household and amenity waste generated per year (tonnes)	Soil, Water
			Kg of household waste collected per head	
			% recycled	
			% composted	
			% landfilled	
			Amount of biodegradable municipal waste sent to landfill (tonnes or % of total)	
		<u>% of total waste arisings generated from commercial, construction and demolition waste streams</u>	<u>Commercial and industrial waste generated per year</u>	
			<u>Construction and demolition waste generated per year</u>	
			<u>Mine and quarry waste generated per year</u>	
			<u>Agricultural waste generated per year</u>	
10	To protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and groundwater	Biological & chemical water quality	% of watercourse classified as good or fair biological quality	Soil, Water
			% of watercourse classified as good or fair chemical quality	
			<u>Groundwater quality</u>	
			<u>Number of new developments incorporating SUDS</u>	
			<u>BVPI 217 (introduced 2005/06): % of pollution control improvements to existing installations completed on time</u>	
			Number of sites confirmed contaminated	
			Average domestic water consumption (l/head/day)	
11	To reduce the risk of flooding	<u>Extent of floodplain</u>	<u>No. of planning permissions with sustainable drainage installed</u>	Water, soil
			<u>Extent of floodplain changing due to development</u>	
			<u>No. of development schemes in flood risk areas</u>	
12	To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG).	<u>Emissions of greenhouse gases</u>	<u>GHG emissions by sector and per capita emissions (tonnes per year)</u>	Climatic factors
			<u>Vehicle miles travelled per year</u>	

No.	Draft SA Objective	Draft Headline Indicator	Potential Detailed Indicators	SEA Topics
13	To increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources	<u>Energy consumption per capita</u>	<u>Domestic gas consumption</u> <u>Industrial gas consumption</u> % of Renewable Energy Energy consumption per capita BVPI 63 – Energy efficiency of council housing stock <u>Energy Conservation</u> <u>Proportion of council and bus fleets using alternative fuel technology</u>	Climatic factors
14	To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habitats	<u>Number, area and condition of designated sites</u>	Population of species <u>Type, area and condition of designated sites affected by transport and waste management development proposals</u> <u>Area and condition of local priority habitats affected by transport and waste management development proposals</u> Woodland coverage (%of borough)	Biodiversity, Flora and fauna
15	To protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings	<u>Condition of heritage assets</u>	Area and condition of Conservation Areas <u>No. of Listed Buildings and proportion at risk.</u> Number of known (and unknown) archaeological sites affected by transport and waste management development proposals. <u>% of buildings in Conservation Areas in poor condition</u> <u>% scheduled ancient monuments in poor condition</u> <u>% area of historic parks and gardens in poor condition</u> Local Environmental Quality: BVPI 199 Cleanliness	Cultural heritage and landscape
16	To protect, manage and restore soil resources	<u>Soil quality and condition of geological sites</u>	<u>Proportion of contaminated and cleaned-up land</u> <u>Area of (agricultural) soils lost to development</u> <u>Soil damaged by muddy floods/ loss of soil by water-driven erosion</u> % of new housing on previously developed/clean-up land <u>% of new business development on previously developed land or through conversions of existing buildings</u>	

No.	Draft SA Objective	Draft Headline Indicator	Potential Detailed Indicators	SEA Topics
			Area of grade 1 & 2 agricultural land	
17	To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character	<u>Quality of countryside / landscape</u>	<u>Condition of landscape / countryside area used for recreational purposes</u> <u>Proportion of lost attractive countryside/landscape</u> <u>Number of new rights of access to mountain, moor, heath, down and registered common land</u> <u>Number of new routes (rights of way legislation)</u>	
Economic				
18	To improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance	Town Centre Health Check	Town Centre Health Check <u>Proportion of urban open space</u> New firms registrations <u>Number of business applications granted planning consent</u> <u>No. of businesses financially assisted through the Council</u> <u>Vacant industrial/commercial floorspace</u>	Material Assets
19	To maintain a strong local economy	Total economic output	Productivity Number of VAT registered businesses Survival rates for VAT-registered businesses The % change in the total number of VAT registered businesses New firms: registrations <u>Number of economic sectors represented in the area</u>	
20	To maintain high and stable levels of employment	Unemployment rates	<u>Employment rate per 1,000 population</u> % of population of working age Unemployment (number of claimants) % of unemployed, based on economically active % of population claiming Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) Percentage of population of working age that are economically active Job Density	Population

Appendix E Compatibility Matrix: Comparison of Appraisal Objectives and WDPPO Guiding Principles

8 Pages

Sustainability Appraisal of Milton Keynes Waste Development Plan Document

Appraisal Matrix – Policies

11 July 2006

● Potential Conflict between Vision and Objective ○ No Potential Conflict

Objectives in column/ WDPPO Vision in Rows	To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy	To implement and be consistent with the National waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the MKC MWMS	To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency.	To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.	To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents , avoiding risk to human health	To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development	To ensure layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management
1. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
2. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. To reduce social exclusions and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Objectives in column/ WDPPO Vision in Rows	To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy	To implement and be consistent with the National waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the MKC MWMS	To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency.	To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.	To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents , avoiding risk to human health	To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development	To ensure layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management
4. To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
6. To reduce noise pollution	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
7. To reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes	○	○	●	●	○	○	○

Objectives in column/ WDPPO Vision in Rows	To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy	To implement and be consistent with the National waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the MKC MWMS	To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency.	To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.	To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents , avoiding risk to human health	To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development	To ensure layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management
8. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
9. To reduce waste arisings and increase reuse, recovery and recycling	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
10. To protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and groundwater	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
11. To reduce the risk of flooding	○	○	●	●	○	○	○

Objectives in column/ WDPPO Vision in Rows	To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy	To implement and be consistent with the National waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the MKC MWMS	To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency.	To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.	To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents , avoiding risk to human health	To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development	To ensure layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management
12. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
13. To increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
14. To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habits	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
15. To protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
16. To protect, manage and restore soil resources	○	○	●	●	○	○	○

Objectives in column/ WDPPO Vision in Rows	To deliver sustainable development in accordance with the waste hierarchy	To implement and be consistent with the National waste strategy, the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the MKC MWMS	To ensure waste is disposed of as near as possible to its source in line with the proximity principle and net self sufficiency.	To provide sufficient sites for waste management facilities of the right type, in the right place and at the right time.	To minimise the adverse effects of waste recovery, disposal and transportation on the quality of life of nearby residents , avoiding risk to human health	To protect and to minimise the adverse effects of recovery, disposal and transportation of waste on environmental resources and balance these against the need for development	To ensure layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management
17. To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
18. To improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance	○	○	●	●	○	○	○
19. To maintain a strong local economy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
20. To maintain high and stable levels of employment	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Appendix F Appraisal Matrix for the WDPPO Preferred Policies

5 Pages

Sustainability Objectives	Preferred Policy 1 – Sustainable Waste Management		Preferred Policy 2 – Working with Neighbours		Preferred Policy 3 – Development Control Criteria		Preferred Policy 4 – Environmental Objectives		Preferred Policy 5 – Transport		Preferred Policy 6 - Restoration		Preferred Policy 7 – Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery	
	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)
1. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	+	Sustainable waste management will have a beneficial effect on human health	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on human health	+	Controlling waste management activities will have a beneficial impact on human health	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	The control of vehicle movements will have a beneficial impact on human health	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Sustainable design is likely to improve health and well being across the MKC area
2. To reduce crime and the fear of crime	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to reduce the incidence of fly tipping	~	Policy is unlikely to reduce the fear of crime	~	The control of waste management development is unlikely to have a significant impact on crime	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation policies are unlikely to significantly reduce the fear of crime	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	~	Policy has no relationship to crime and fear of crime
3. To reduce social exclusions and improve equality of opportunity amongst social groups	~	It is not considered that sustainable waste management will reduce social exclusion	~	Working with neighbours is unlikely to reduce social exclusion	+	Waste Needs Statement could potentially include information on access to waste management facilities	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	?	It is unclear how the policy will effect social exclusion	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Sustainable design is likely to encourage sustainable design and construction
4. To improve accessibility and transport links from residential areas to key services and employment areas	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to improve access to waste management facilities	-	Locating waste facilities in neighbouring districts is likely to reduce access to waste management facilities	~	This policy is not directly related to improved access	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	Improved transportation will improve access to waste management facilities	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Sustainable design should encourage accessibility to waste management facilities
5. To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to significantly improve air quality	+	Joint working to address waste management issues is likely to improve air quality across a wider region	+	Effective control over waste management development is likely to benefit air quality	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	Clear and consistent transport policies to control numbers of vehicles will have a beneficial impact on air quality	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Sustainable design and construction should reduce air pollution
6. To reduce noise pollution	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to significantly reduce noise pollution	~	Effective working with neighbours will not significantly effect noise pollution	+	Development control criteria are unlikely to reduce noise pollution	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	The control of transportation movements associated with waste management is likely to reduce	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement.	+	Sustainable construction should reduce noise pollution
7. To reduce road traffic and congestion through a modal shift to more sustainable transport modes	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to reduce road transport	?	Unclear how working with neighbours would influence modal shift	?	Unclear if this policy would have a significant impact on sustainable transport	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	This policy will have a positive impact on road traffic reduction.	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	~	No relationship between road congestion and sustainable construction
8. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings	-		~	Unclear how this policy would relate to efficiency of land use	+	Development control policies would improve efficiency of land use	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	This policy objective is not directly related to efficiency in land use	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Policy should result in efficient land use
9. To reduce waste arisings and increase reuse, recovery and recycling	+	Sustainable waste management will reduce waste arisings and encourage recycling.	+	Joint working with neighbours is likely to reduce waste arisings	+	Effective development control criteria are likely to reduce waste arisings	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation policy is not related to this objective	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Waste arisings should be minimised through sustainable construction

Sustainability Objectives	Preferred Policy 1 – Sustainable Waste Management		Preferred Policy 2 – Working with Neighbours		Preferred Policy 3 – Development Control Criteria		Preferred Policy 4 – Environmental Objectives		Preferred Policy 5 – Transport		Preferred Policy 6 - Restoration		Preferred Policy 7 – Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery	
	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)
10. To protect local water resources and improve the quality of surface and groundwater	-	Policy does not contain reference to water resources	~	Policy is not related to the protection of water resources	+	Policy is likely to minimise impact of waste management on ground water	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation issues are not directly related to ground water protection	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement.	+	Water resources should be protected through sustainable construction
11. To reduce the risk of flooding	~	Flooding is not directly related to sustainable waste management policy	~	Flooding issues not directly related to working with neighbours	?	Policy does not make specific reference to flooding	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	?	Policy does not make direct reference to flooding	~	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Flooding should be reduced through sustainable construction
12. To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG)	+	Clear reference to climate change in policy	+	Joint working to address waste management issues is likely to have a beneficial effect on climate change	~	Development control criteria not directly related to climate change issues	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	Control of waste related transport is likely to have a beneficial effect on climate change	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Energy efficiency of buildings should be increased through sustainable construction. This should help to address causes of climate change
13. To increase energy efficiency and use of renewable energy sources	+	Policy encourages energy efficient use of transport	+	Joint working is likely to increase over all energy efficiency	?	Unclear if development control criteria will result in increased energy efficiency	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	+	A co-ordinated approach to transport is likely to result in improved energy efficiency	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Energy efficiency of buildings should be increased through sustainable construction. This should help to address causes of climate change
14. To protect and enhance biodiversity and important wildlife habits	+	Policy contains specific reference to biodiversity	~	Working with neighbours is unlikely to have a significant beneficial effect on biodiversity	+	Policy contains specific reference to biodiversity	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	~	Sustainable construction is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity
15. To protect, enhance and make accessible heritage assets and their settings	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on cultural heritage	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on biodiversity	+	Development control criteria are likely to protect cultural heritage resources	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on cultural heritage issues	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	~	Sustainable construction is unlikely to have a significant impact on cultural heritage
16. To protect, manage and restore soil resources	+	Policy makes specific reference to the protection of soils	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on protection of soils	+	Development control criteria are likely to protect soil and other resources	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transport policies are not directly related to the protection of soils	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	+	Sustainable construction should help to protect soil from waste management activities
17. To promote the protection and enhancement of the countryside and landscape character	-	Policy does not refer specifically to the protection of countryside or landscape	~	Policy is unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape character	+	Policy makes specific reference to the protection of the historic environment	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation policies are unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape character	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	~	Sustainable construction is unlikely to have a significant impact on landscape character
18. To improve the vitality of towns and local centres and encourage urban renaissance It was decided not to appraise the policies against this objective														

Sustainability Objectives	Preferred Policy 1 – Sustainable Waste Management		Preferred Policy 2 – Working with Neighbours		Preferred Policy 3 – Development Control Criteria		Preferred Policy 4 – Environmental Objectives		Preferred Policy 5 – Transport		Preferred Policy 6 - Restoration		Preferred Policy 7 – Sustainable Design, Construction and Resource Recovery	
	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary/Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)	Performance	Commentary / Explanation (to include cumulative and synergistic effects as well as the differential spatial effects and effects over time)
19. To maintain a strong local economy	+	Sustainable waste management should help to maintain a strong and healthy economy	+	Working with neighbours is likely to be economically beneficial	~	Development control criteria do not relate directly to economy	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation policies do not relate directly to the local economy	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement	?	Unclear to what extent sustainable construction will improve local economy
20. To maintain high and stable levels of employment	+	Sustainable waste management is likely to help to maintain a stable level of employment	+	Working with neighbours is likely to help to maintain high and stable levels of employment	~	Development control criteria are not directly related to economy of employment	?	Further details required on environmental objectives to assess policy	~	Transportation is not directly related to economy or employment.	?	Further information required on nature of restoration policy requirement.	?	Unclear to what extent sustainable construction will maintain high and stable levels of employment

- No Potential Conflict
- Potential Conflict