

## 8. SOCIO-ECONOMICS

### INTRODUCTION

- 8.1 This chapter, written by Volterra Consulting, considers the effects of the four Development Scenarios upon the local and wider existing socio-economic conditions. This is put in the context of existing national, regional and local planning policies and the existing socio-economic baseline conditions of the three application sites and surrounding local area. The potential effects of the four Development Scenarios are then described and assessed, together with the mitigation measures required to prevent, reduce or offset adverse effects. The resulting residual socio-economic effects, taking into account any mitigation measures, are also described.
- 8.2 This chapter is supported by Technical Appendix 8a, which contains a detailed description of the assessment methodology and additional supporting socio-economic information.

### PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

#### National Planning Policy

##### Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, 2005

- 8.3 Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) (Ref. 8.1) places sustainable development at the heart of Government planning policy. Paragraph 23 deals with the issue of sustainable economic development; noting that Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should:
- Recognise the wider sub-regional, regional and national benefits of economic development. These should be considered alongside any adverse effects to the local area;
  - Ensure that suitable locations are made available for various types of developments so that the economy can prosper;
  - Actively promote and facilitate good quality sustainable developments. They should ensure the provision of sufficient good quality new homes, which should include adequate levels of affordable housing; and
  - Ensure the provision of infrastructure and services that are required to support new and existing economic development and housing.
- 8.4 In addition, Paragraph 27 states that policy should promote mixed used developments in highly accessible locations.

##### Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, 2006

- 8.5 Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) (Ref. 8.2) sets out national planning policy in respect of housing. PPS3 aims to promote a mix of housing including market and affordable housing.
- 8.6 Within paragraph 68 it is stated that, in determining planning applications, LPAs should have regard to:
- Achieving high quality housing;
  - Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular families and older people;
  - The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability; and
  - Using land effectively and efficiently.

- 8.7 Paragraph 16 of PPS3 sets out desirable characteristics for new developments. These include:
- Good connection to facilities and transport links;
  - Efficient use of space, ensuring that it is easily accessible and safe; and
  - Promoting a distinctive character and sense of civic identity.
- 8.8 A key objective of PPS3 is the re-use of previously developed land, where appropriate. In this respect, there is a national target to provide 60% of new homes on previously developed land.

**Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centres, 2005**

- 8.9 Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) (Ref. 8.3) sets out Government's core objectives for planning growth and development in existing town centres. Key points include:
- Improving accessibility and ensuring that existing or new developments offer a wide range of services which are accessible and well-served by a range of transport modes;
  - Enhancing consumer choice in services offered during the day-time and night-time; and
  - Social inclusion and promotion of growth and investment in deprived areas, including the creation of additional employment opportunities.

**Planning Policy Guidance 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation, 2002**

- 8.10 Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) (Ref. 8.4) recognises that open space and opportunities for sport and recreation underpin people's quality of life, and are vital in delivering urban and rural renewal, social inclusion and community coherence, health and wellbeing, and sustainable development.

**Regional Planning Policy**

**The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy of Greater London, 2008 (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004)**

- 8.11 The London Plan (Ref. 8.5) includes the three planning application sites within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ). The CAZ is shown on Figure 8.1 and is defined as containing:
- “a unique cluster of vitally important activities including central government offices, headquarters and embassies, the largest concentration of London's financial and business services sector and the offices of trade, professional bodies, institutions, associations, communications, publishing, advertising and the media. Other key uses and activities, such as those associated with retail, tourism, culture and entertainment, are also concentrated in [the] CAZ”.*
- 8.12 The three application sites, as well as most of the Victoria area, are also identified in the London Plan as an 'Opportunity Area'. Within this 52 hectare (ha) area, the London Plan targets that 8,000 new jobs and 1,000 new homes could be provided within the Victoria Area up to 2026. As such, development opportunities should be sought through higher density redevelopment at key transport nodes with good accessibility and capacity and in town centres.
- 8.13 Specific policies of relevance to the proposed Development Scenarios are summarised as follows:
- Policies 3A.1 and 3A.2 set out a London-wide target for 30,500 additional homes per year, every year until 2016/17, this includes an additional 680 homes per year in Westminster; and
  - Policy 3A.3 supports proposals for large residential schemes in areas of high public transport accessibility, including the provision of suitable non-residential units within such schemes.
  - Policy 3A.3 requires Boroughs to develop residential density policies in line with Table 3A.2 of the London Plan. This indicates that residential developments in Central London locations with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) score of between 4 and 6 are acceptable up to a maximum density of 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare.

### Local Planning Policy

#### Westminster City Council Replacement Unitary Development Plan, 2007

- 8.14 Westminster City Council's (WCC's) Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (Ref. 8.6) contains policies on economic development, shopping and services, housing and sustainability. Those policies that are particularly relevant to the socio-economic aspects of the proposed Development Scenarios are summarised below.

#### ***World Class City Status***

- 8.15 Policy STRA 1 sets out the Council's aim to:

*"...foster Westminster's key 'world class' city roles as a centre for international organisations, headquarters, business services, housing, retailing, medicine, education and other professions, media, arts, culture, entertainment and tourism, and to allow sustainable developments that promote them."*

#### ***Central Activities Zone***

- 8.16 In respect of the CAZ, Policy STRA 3 sets out the Council's aim to:

*"... protect and enhance the strategic role, historic character, social and cultural importance of the central part of Westminster through the designation of a Central Activities Zone and Central Activities Zone Frontages."*

#### ***Regeneration, Economic Development and Offices***

- 8.17 Policy STRA5 aims to support Westminster's economy through the upgrading and regeneration of commercial buildings. Furthermore, Policy COM 1 sets out a general intention to grant planning permission for office proposals in the CAZ. Policy COM 2 (and CENT 3) states that where appropriate and practicable, an equivalent amount of residential accommodation would be required in such developments.

#### ***Shopping and Services***

- 8.18 Policy STRA 10 states that WCC will

*"...enhance the vitality, viability and diversity of Westminster's shopping centres and maintain and increase the number and range of shops in the City."*

#### ***Housing***

- 8.19 Policy STRA14 aims to increase the number of homes in Westminster by at least 19,480 between 1997 and 2016.
- 8.20 Policy COM2 provides that in mixed use developments the amount of residential floorspace provided should be equivalent to the amount of office floorspace provided, except in certain circumstances. A similar provision is contained within Policy CENT3.
- 8.21 Policy H11 sets target ranges for the density of housing developments. To this end, various zones are set, in which specific housing densities are recommended. The three application sites fall within Zone 2, which has a target density of 250-500 habitable rooms per hectare (ha). Where proposed housing developments are close to public transport facilities and open space, planning permission may be granted even if the proposed housing density exceeds the specified range.
- 8.22 Policy H5 states that 33% of units in housing developments should be family sized (three or more bedrooms), of which 5% should have five or more habitable rooms. However, this provision is to be applied flexibly, and it is recognised that WCC may accept a lower level where the development is in a busy, noisy environment.

- 8.23 Policy H4 sets out WCC's policy on affordable housing. UDP paragraph 3.41 sets out a general principle that, within the CAZ, where the number of housing units to be provided by the scheme is 15 or more then 30% of these should be affordable. However, paragraph 3.34 of the policy sets out circumstances where on-site provision of affordable housing may not be required. Such circumstances include consideration of the development's viability taking into account site specific constraints and commitments and the need to achieve other planning objectives.

### ***Sustainability***

- 8.24 Policies STRA32 – 37 set out policies on working towards a more sustainable city. WCC therefore proposes a number of measures to achieve sustainability, including promoting energy efficient buildings, reducing the need to travel, and protecting, enhancing and increasing open space.

### **Westminster City Council Victoria Area Planning Brief, 2006**

- 8.25 The Victoria Area Planning Brief (VAPB) (Ref. 8.7) sets out the planning framework for development within the Victoria Area. Key socio-economic objectives set out in the VAPB are as follows:

- To create mixed-use developments with a good balance and mix of commercial buildings;
- To ensure local communities benefit from the employment and training opportunities presented by major developments;
- To create and incorporate measures into development designs to improve natural surveillance, safety and crime prevention in the area, in addition to increasing the overall attractiveness of the area to business, commerce and consumers;
- To ensure that new development does not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of existing residential areas or impede commercial operations;
- To ensure that a satisfactory residential environment is created;
- To ensure that major retail development does not cause harm to the vitality and viability of the shopping areas or centres in the catchment of the development; and
- To ensure that new development provides adequate facilities for the public.

- 8.26 In addition, key land use and development issues contained in the VAPB relevant to the proposed Development Scenarios are as follows:

- To maintain and enhance the mix of uses in the CAZ; and
- To provide residential floorspace equivalent to the level of commercial floorspace where increases in commercial floorspace above 200m<sup>2</sup> are proposed.

### **Westminster City Council Open Space Strategy, 2007**

- 8.27 The Westminster City Council Open Space Strategy (Ref. 8.8) sets out, amongst others, a planning policy framework for protecting and improving Westminster's open space network and identifies open space issues in Westminster by examining existing provision of open spaces, assessing need for open spaces, and identifying the key issues which need to be addressed to improve the quality, quantity and usage of open space. This document is discussed later in this chapter.

### Other Local Documents

#### City of Westminster Economic Development Strategy, 2008 - 2011

- 8.28 The City of Westminster Economic Development Strategy (Ref. 8.9) provides a framework for the council and its partners to support businesses and unemployed residents.
- 8.29 The strategy states that the South Westminster Renewal Partnership (representing the local resident and voluntary sector) has:
- “identified as one of its priorities the need to provide more support and signposting to get people job-ready so that they are able to compete for employment in the area.”*

#### South Westminster Renewal Plan, 2005

- 8.30 Delivery of the South Westminster Renewal Plan (Ref. 8.10) is being co-ordinated by the South Westminster Steering Group. The Plan sets out a long term vision for the area (which covers the three application sites) over the next 5-10 years and covers areas such as leisure, crime, employment, education, health, and housing.
- 8.31 Of particular relevance to the proposed Development Scenarios is the aim to:
- “Ensure all residents can access training and employment opportunities to meet their needs.”*

### ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

#### Assessment Methodology

- 8.32 The following assessment seeks to establish the potential economic and social contributions of the proposed Development Scenarios and then assess the predicted effects against the current baseline conditions. The assessment has been based on the methodology below:
- A review of national, regional and local planning policies, guidance and standards;
  - A review of relevant data and baseline information from various sources such as the Population Census, the Annual Population Survey, the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) data on deprivation and data supplied by the National Health Service (NHS) Information Centre;
  - A review of the three applications, and subsequent four Development Scenarios, for which planning permission is being sought; and
  - The use of conventional means of estimation and appraisal, drawing on existing data sources together with standard practice and professional judgement as appropriate.
- 8.33 Full details of the methodology employed within this assessment are provided within Technical Appendix 8a.

#### Significance Criteria

- 8.34 The scale of significance described below, together with expert judgement, has been used to assess the potential and residual effects of the four Development Scenarios against the baseline conditions of the relevant application sites. The assessment process aims to be objective and quantifies effects as far as possible. However, because of the nature of the subject matter, some effects can only be evaluated on a qualitative basis.
- **Beneficial** effects indicate an advantageous or beneficial effect to an environmental resource or receptor, which may be **minor**, **moderate**, or **substantial** in significance;
  - **Negligible** effects indicate imperceptible effects to an environmental resource or receptor; and
  - **Adverse** effects indicate a disadvantageous or adverse effect to an environmental resource or receptor, which may be **minor**, **moderate** or **substantial** in significance.

- 8.35 In accordance with Chapter 2: EIA Methodology, temporary, short to medium-term effects are considered to be those associated with the demolition and construction works of the relevant Development Scenario. Long-term effects are those associated with the completion and operation of the Development Scenarios. Local effects are those affecting neighbouring receptors, whilst effects upon receptors in the City of Westminster are considered to be at a district level. Effects across London are considered to be at a regional level, whilst effects on different parts of the country, or England as a whole, are considered to be at a national level.

### BASELINE CONDITIONS

- 8.36 This section considers the existing socio-economic characteristics in and around the three application sites and should be read in conjunction with the further detailed baseline information provided within Technical Appendix 8a. The baseline conditions are examined for the relevant administrative ward boundaries of WCC, where appropriate.
- 8.37 All three application sites are located in the St James's Ward and in the vicinity of the northern boundary of Warwick Ward. Baseline information is therefore provided for these wards. Additional information is also given for the five wards surrounding St James's Ward, as they are most likely to be most influenced by the proposed Development Scenarios. These five wards are indicated on Figure 8.2 and comprise:
- Knightsbridge and Belgravia;
  - West End;
  - Churchill
  - Tachbrook; and
  - Vincent Square.
- 8.38 Some of these wards contain elements that cause most of the statistical data available for them to be unrepresentative of the three application sites, for example:
- St James's ward contains St James's Park and Buckingham Palace;
  - Knightsbridge and Belgravia ward contains Hyde Park; and
  - The West End ward contains the prestigious West End retail outlets and theatres.
- 8.39 In consideration of the above, it is acknowledged that the four most southern wards (Warwick, Vincent Square, Tachbrook and Churchill) provide the best representation of socio-economic characteristics within the three application sites, even though they do not include the application sites themselves.

### Population

- 8.40 The population of Westminster in 2006 was 231,900, having grown by 23.1% from its 1981 level of 188,400 (Ref. 8.11). There has been sustained population growth over the eleven years from 1995 to 2006 at an average rate of 2.6% per year, equivalent to an overall growth of 33.1% over this period. The comparable population growth in London was much lower, at 10.4% between 1981 and 2006, and 8.7% during the 1995 to 2006 period.
- 8.41 The population of Westminster is made up of a relatively high percentage of young adults and a relatively low percentage of children; 17% of Westminster residents were aged 19 and under in 2006, compared with 24% in London as a whole. For the same period, 24% of Westminster residents were aged between 20 and 29 compared with 17% in London. The population level over the period of 1981 to 2006 is shown in Figure 8.3, and the age distribution for Westminster and London is shown in Figure 8.4.

- 8.42 The existing population within the three application sites comprises 118 residents, all of whom are located within application 1, and hence all four Development Scenarios. As such, the assessment of population increases in all four Development Scenarios is based on this figure. This was calculated using the breakdown of existing units by number of bedrooms and the occupancy rates in TA8.18 Technical Appendix 8a. These rates are applicable for developments with a mix of tenure types in central London.

### Ethnicity

- 8.43 Ethnicity in Westminster is relatively diverse. 73% of the population in Westminster is white compared to 71% in London as a whole (Ref. 8.12). There is a notably large non-British white population which makes up 25% of the total population in Westminster compared with just 11% in London.
- 8.44 Table TA8.2 in Technical Appendix 8a provides details on ethnicity within the seven relevant wards of Westminster, and comparisons with Westminster and London. This shows that the population in the wards surrounding the three application sites is less diverse than in Westminster or London as a whole. The proportion of white people in the seven wards ranges from 75.8% to 85.4%.

### Housing

- 8.45 In 2001, there were 91,000 households in Westminster. Table TA8.3 in Technical Appendix 8a sets out a comparison of tenure type for Westminster and London. This table shows that nearly two thirds (65%) of the properties are rented within Westminster. This figure is significantly lower in London (43%). Rates of social renting are relatively high in Westminster compared to in London; 16% of all residents rent from a social landlord compared to 9% in London as a whole.
- 8.46 Home ownership is notably low within Westminster, with 35% of residents owning their homes outright or with a mortgage, compared with 57% in London. To give a more detailed view of the situation over the whole of Westminster, a map of the percentage home ownership is presented in Figure 8.5. This map presents data at a detailed geographical level known as Lower Super Output Areas. Super Output Areas are a geographical hierarchy designed by the Office of National Statistics to improve the reporting of small area statistics. Lower Super Output Areas are the most detailed level in the hierarchy, containing a mean population of 1,500.
- 8.47 For comparison purposes, tenure types in the seven identified wards are set out in Table TA8.4 within Technical Appendix 8a. This shows that home ownership is lower than the average for Westminster in all of the wards, with the exception of the Knightsbridge and Belgravia (40%) and Warwick (37%) wards.
- 8.48 49% of households in Westminster are one person households, a much higher percentage than the 35% demonstrated within London as a whole.
- 8.49 The City of Westminster Housing Needs Assessment (Ref. 8.13) shows that there is considerable housing need within the administrative boundary of WCC. For example, it is noted that there is a net affordable housing shortfall of 5,621 units per year.

### Employment

- 8.50 Westminster has a unique employment pattern due to the large number of people who commute into the borough to work. The number of people who worked in Westminster in 2006 was 561,605 (Ref. 8.14), more than twice the 2006 population of Westminster which was 231,900. It is therefore necessary to consider the employment of people who work in Westminster and the people who live there separately, as the groups are very different. Each is considered in turn below.

**People Working in Westminster**

- 8.51 Four million people work in London, of which over 14% work in Westminster (Ref. 8.14). Employment levels and year on year percentage changes for Westminster and London are set out in Table TA8.5 within Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.52 Between 1995 and 2006 Westminster's employment grew by 9%, which is substantially below London's employment growth of 16% in that period. Westminster's employment peaked in 1999, and has since followed a generally downward path, although it recovered somewhat in 2005. In total, Westminster's employment fell by 1.9% between 1999 and 2006. In comparison, London's employment peaked a year later in 2000. However, by 2005 it had regained its 2000 level. The absolute and percentage changes in Westminster and London employment for the time periods of interest are detailed in Table TA8.6 within Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.53 The banking, finance and insurance industry is the biggest employer in Westminster, employing 37% of workers in the borough. The other two major industrial groups are the distribution, hotels and restaurants group and the public, administration, education and health group, which employ 25% and 20% of workers respectively. Table TA8.7 within Technical Appendix 8a demonstrates the employment patterns for the wards considered in this assessment.
- 8.54 There are relatively few part time workers in Westminster. 76% of workers in Westminster hold full-time jobs, which is above the 73% in London and substantially above the 69% in Great Britain as a whole. Further details are provided in Table TA8.8 within Technical Appendix 8a.

**Westminster Residents**

- 8.55 Table TA8.9 within Technical Appendix 8a shows the key characteristics of the labour market of residents within Westminster, compared to the Greater London area and the UK. This demonstrates that wages, skill levels and occupation types of Westminster residents are more favourable than London and the UK as a whole.
- 8.56 Westminster has a high proportion of residents who are in the managerial and professional occupational group or in the professional and technical group. 67% of the working population in Westminster are employed in these sectors compared to just 43% in the UK and 52% in London as a whole (Ref 8.15).
- 8.57 The biggest industry group for Westminster residents is the banking, finance and insurance industry group, which employs 38% of the resident workforce compared with 26% in London and 16% in the UK. Only 18% of Westminster's residents are employed in the public administration, education and health group, compared to 26% in London and 28% in the UK.
- 8.58 Despite the facts above, there is substantial unemployment in Westminster. 7.5% of the Westminster working age population is unemployed compared to the national average of 5.1%. In addition, 61.8% of the working population are classed as employed in Westminster compared to 74.1% in the U.K.
- 8.59 Westminster residents are very well qualified compared to the London average. 46% of Westminster residents have qualifications at NVQ Level 4 or above (broadly equivalent to degree level) compared with 35% in London (Ref 8.16).

**The Application Sites**

- 8.60 Current commercial land uses within the three application sites include offices, retail and leisure. The total estimated floorspace for the office, retail and leisure uses within applications 1, 2 and 3 (Development Scenario 1) and applications 1 and 2 (Development Scenario 2) is 31,100m<sup>2</sup> Net Internal Area (NIA). The total estimated floorspace for these uses falls to 28,900m<sup>2</sup> within applications 1 and 3 (Development Scenario 3) and also for application site 1 only (Development Scenario 4).

- 8.61 Based on standard occupancy rates, the existing commercial floorspace within applications 1, 2 and 3 (Development Scenario 1) and applications 1 and 2 (Development Scenario 2) has the potential to provide 1,935 jobs. This number falls to 1,813 jobs within applications 1 and 3 (Development Scenario 3) and application 1 (Development Scenario 4).
- 8.62 However, the standard of the office stock within the three application sites is not high, with many of the buildings only being occupied due to rents being significantly below the market rate for high quality office space. Indeed, for several of the buildings, rents are below half the level of high quality office space within the immediate area. Of the existing buildings within the three application sites, only Allington House could be regarded as high quality office space. Further information on existing land use and estimated employment can be found in Table TA8.10 within Technical Appendix 8a.

### Deprivation and Wellbeing

- 8.63 Although Westminster houses some of the wealthiest people in the country, it also has a large number of deprived people, as exemplified in Figure 8.6. In 2007, the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) scored Westminster as the 72<sup>nd</sup> most deprived local authority out of 354 in England (Ref. 8.17). Further explanation of the IMD and its seven constituent indicators is presented in Table TA8.11 within Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.64 Although it is clear that the biggest problems faced by Westminster with regards to deprivation are those of poor housing, overcrowding and high levels of homelessness, there are also areas where low incomes and unemployment are a significant problem. Further information on the percentage of Westminster's Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA) falling in the bottom 10% of all LSOA's in England, for each of the IMD indicators, is shown in Table TA8.12 within Technical Appendix 8a. A map showing the rank of Westminster's Lower Super Output Areas among the 32,482 Lower Super Output Areas in England is also presented on Figure 8.6.
- 8.65 Bordering the St James ward, which contains the three application sites, are areas within both the highest classes of deprivation and also areas within the lowest class. Whilst areas to the south of the application sites, which are in relative close proximity, do contain some areas of deprivation, the biggest concentration of deprivation within Westminster is focussed in the northwest of the City, at a significantly greater distance from the three application sites.
- 8.66 Figure 8.7 considers the crime domain of the IMD, and shows the rank of Westminster's Lower Super Output Areas among the 32,482 Lower Super Output Areas in England for this domain.

### Retail

- 8.67 Current retail floorspace provision within applications 1, 2 and 3 (Development Scenario 1) and applications 1 and 2 (Development Scenario 2) totals approximately 10,400m<sup>2</sup> NIA. This falls to approximately 8,200m<sup>2</sup> within application sites 1 and 3 (Development Scenario 3) and also for application 1 (Development Scenario 4). Further details are provided in Table TA8.13 within Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.68 Victoria Street, part of which is located within application 1 and 2 (all Development Scenarios), has the third highest retail turnover in London, at £740.3 million (Ref. 8.18).
- 8.69 The closest shopping centre to the three application sites is located in Warwick Way / Tachbrook Street, which is within 1.5km to the southeast and designated as a 'District' shopping centre in the London Plan. The centre has a total retail floorspace of 10,950m<sup>2</sup> and a turnover of £54,584,000 per annum. This retail mostly comprises convenience and local serving retail.

## Education

### Early Years Provision

- 8.70 In line with the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) requirement for universal provision for early education of 3 and 4 year olds, all such children living in Westminster are entitled to a funded early education place of up to 5 sessions of 2.5 hours per day during term time.
- 8.71 The Westminster Children's Information Service publishes an online directory which sets out full listings of early years provision in Westminster (Ref. 8.19), with a total of 116 institutions providing care in nurseries and playgroups currently available within Westminster. A breakdown of this provision is set out in Table TA8.14 within Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.72 Early years education provision within approximately 500m of the three application sites includes the independent Eaton Square Nursery School and the nursery facility provided at St Peter's Eaton Square Church of England school, both of which are located to the south west.

### Primary School Provision

- 8.73 There are currently 40 state primary schools and an academy in Westminster (Ref. 8.20). 34 of these primary schools admit pupils for their entire primary education and there are also three infant and three junior schools. The newly opened King Solomon Academy, approximately 2.8 miles to the northwest of the application sites, took its reception classes in September 2007 and will cater for their pupils' entire primary education. There are a total of 15 primary schools in the state sector, all of which are situated within approximately 1 mile of the application sites.
- 8.74 The split of provision between church schools and non-religious community schools is set out in Table TA8.15 within Technical Appendix 8a. This shows that 26 out of 40 primary schools are religious voluntary schools (Church of England or Roman Catholic).
- 8.75 Data on the surplus places at the 40 state schools is available upon request from WCC (Ref. 8.21). These figures show that there were 514 surplus primary school places in Westminster in January 2007, which is equivalent to 5% of the total primary school places in the borough.
- 8.76 The two nearest schools to the application sites are St Peter's Eaton Square Church of England School and St Vincent de Paul Roman Catholic School, both of which accept children of both sexes and are situated within approximately 500m of the application sites. These schools had 12 and two surplus places respectively, as of January 2007.

### Secondary School Provision

- 8.77 There are currently nine secondary schools in Westminster, including two academies (Ref. 8.20).
- 8.78 WCC data reports that there were 54 surplus state secondary school places within Westminster in January 2007. This is equivalent to 1% of the total secondary school places in the borough.
- 8.79 The two nearest secondary schools are Westminster City Boys' School and Grey Coat Hospital Girls' School. Both are located within approximately 700m of the application sites, to the east, and have a deficit of places of 136 and 32 respectively, as of January 2007.
- 8.80 There are two other schools within approximate 1.5km of the application sites (Ref. 8.20). Pimlico School in Westminster and Saint Thomas More Language College in Kensington and Chelsea. Pimlico School had a surplus of 16 places, as of January 2007.
- 8.81 The Pimlico School Planning Brief (Ref 8.22) sets out a framework for any application to redevelop the Pimlico School site. The Brief states that the replacement of Pimlico School is the Local Education Authority's top priority within the Building School's for the Future Programme, a scheme which will provide some £200 million of capital funding.

- 8.82 The brief states:  
*“it is appropriate in planning policy terms to develop the site to provide a modern, adaptable school building to meet current, foreseen and potentially unforeseen educational requirements.”*
- 8.83 Thus, such a new school would have to be of a sufficient size to meet the needs of the local area, including new residents within the proposed Development Scenarios.
- 8.84 Conditional planning permission for the Pimlico School redevelopment was granted on the 13 December 2007. Pimlico School will be completely redeveloped into a landmark new building for 1,262 students. According to Westminster, the buildings are anticipated to be completed in phases by August 2010 and all external landscaping fully complete by February 2011.

#### **Children Educated Privately and Outside the Borough**

- 8.85 The WCC Schools Organisation Plan (SOP) 2003-2008 (Ref. 8.23) shows that a significant number of children in Westminster are educated privately or outside the borough. Table TA8.16 within Technical Appendix 8a shows that 36.1% of primary age Westminster children, and 56.4% of secondary age Westminster children, are educated privately or outside the borough. WCC advises that these figures are likely to be underestimated. This document has not been updated because the requirement to produce SOPs was repealed by the Children Act 2004 (Ref. 8.24).

#### **Health**

- 8.86 There are currently 51 General Practitioner (GP) practices in Westminster (Ref. 8.25), 11 of which are situated within approximately 1 mile of the application sites and of which 9 are currently listed as accepting new patients on the NHS website.
- 8.87 The average GP list size in Westminster is currently 1,770 (equivalent to 59 GPs (full time equivalent) per 100,000 residents) (Ref 8.26). In both London and England the average is 61 GPs per 100,000. As such the average in Westminster is marginally lower than in London and England as a whole.
- 8.88 There are currently 7 dental practices located within 1 mile of the application sites; 4 of which are listed as currently accepting new patients for NHS treatment without restriction on the NHS website. A further 2 of the dental practices are currently accepting some groups of new patients for NHS Treatment.
- 8.89 According to the data from ‘The Information Centre’ there are currently 1,365 people per NHS open contracted dentist in Westminster Primary Care Trust (PCT), compared to 1,952 people per dentist in London Strategic Health Authority (SHA) and 2,397 people per dentist in England as a whole (Ref. 8.27). There may, however, be some double counting due to dentists contracting in more than one PCT or SHA.
- 8.90 It is possible to calculate double counting uplift factors at the PCT and SHA levels by comparing the total dentists counted at these levels across England and the total across England. The PCT and SHA level data can then be adjusted by dividing by these factors. Following adjustment for double counting, there are 1,679 people per dentist in Westminster PCT compared with 2,074 people per dentist in London SHA and 2,397 per dentist in England as a whole. On this measure, Westminster PCT has the 5<sup>th</sup> lowest number of people per NHS dentist of the 31 PCTs in the London SHA.

#### **Leisure and Community Facilities**

- 8.91 Westminster provides numerous, diverse tourist attractions and entertainment activities including the West End theatre district, Buckingham Palace, St James’s Park and Westminster Abbey, all of which are within walking distance of the application sites. Westminster Palace and Westminster Abbey are also designated as World Heritage Sites. In addition to theatres, there are also a multitude of cinemas within the accessible area of Leicester Square.

- 8.92 The Queen Mother Sports Centre provides public sport facilities approximately 1km south east of the application sites on the Vauxhall Bridge Road and offers a gym, swimming pool and fitness classes (Ref 8.20). In addition there are a further 4 private gyms in the SW1V postcode district and 14 private gyms in the SW1 postcode area, as a whole (Ref 8.28).
- 8.93 The nearest public libraries are Victoria Library and St James's Library. Victoria Library is situated within walking distance to the south of the application sites on Buckingham Palace Road, with St James's Library approximately 500m east of the application sites on Victoria Street.
- 8.94 In total, there are 13 public libraries, 5 public indoor leisure and sport centres, and 30 theatres located within Westminster (Ref. 8.20).

### Open Space

- 8.95 WCC's Open Space Strategy provides information on the open space per head of population for the various areas of Westminster. The area including Victoria and the application sites are recognised in the strategy as having the lowest level of open space provision in Westminster. Westminster as a whole has 1.86ha of publicly accessible open space per 1,000 resident population. Further details are provided within Table TA8.17 of Technical Appendix 8a.
- 8.96 The WCC Open Space Strategy sets out maps showing existing deficiencies in open space in the borough. The Victoria area, which includes the three application sites is defined within the Strategy as:
- Predominantly designated as an area of public open space deficiency. Part of the application sites are situated within this designated area;
  - Designated as an area deficient in access to attractive public open space; and
  - An area deficient in publicly accessible play space.
- 8.97 The VAPB notes that, whilst there is a large amount of space around Victoria, much of it is not of a high quality and is blighted by problems such as inaccessibility, noise and confusing signage. This is particularly true of the existing application sites (refer to Chapter 9: Transportation and Access).
- 8.98 There are a number of green spaces in the vicinity of the application sites, including Grosvenor Gardens located immediately adjacent to the west, the much more substantial St James's Park, located approximately 1km to the north and Hyde Park, the fourth largest Royal Park in London, located some 2km to the north west.

## POTENTIAL EFFECTS

### Demolition and Construction

- 8.99 The following section describes the potential effects of demolition and construction works, which due to the similar nature and extent of proposals within each Development Scenarios, are described for all Development Scenarios. Where notable differences between effects for each Development Scenario exist, these are highlighted within the text.

### Development Scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4

#### *Direct and Indirect Construction Employment*

- 8.100 Construction of the four Development Scenarios would create a number of associated jobs, which although temporary for the duration of the demolition and construction works, represent a beneficial economic effect that can be estimated as a function of the scale of the construction works to be undertaken.

- 8.101 Demolition and construction derived employment (measured in job person years) can be estimated by dividing the estimated total construction cost for the relevant Development Scenario by the average gross output per construction industry employee. The output of this calculation can then be converted to full time equivalent (FTE) jobs using the established practice of equating 10 person-years to 1 FTE.
- 8.102 In addition to this direct employment, the additional expenditure and economic activity of demolition and construction related employers and employees would generate indirect employment. This is calculated using the composite multipliers set out in the English Partnerships report 'Additionality Guide Second Edition', September 2004 (Ref. 8.29), which can be used to predict indirect employment at both the local and regional level. Table 8.1 details the employment generated by demolition and construction works for all four Development Scenarios.

**Table 8.1 Direct and Indirect Construction Employment**

Employment Type	Estimated Jobs Created (FTE)			
	Development Scenario 1	Development Scenario 2	Development Scenario 3	Development Scenario 4
Direct	509	465	480	437
Indirect (local) (10% composite multiplier)	51	46	48	44
<b>Total (Local)</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>511</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>481</b>
Indirect (Regional) (50% composite multiplier)	255	232	240	219
<b>Total (Regional)</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>656</b>

- 8.103 Table 8.1 shows that direct and indirect employment generated during demolition and construction does not differ significantly for the four Development Scenarios. As such, the demolition and construction employment for all four Development Scenarios are considered to provide a **temporary, short to medium term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

#### Local Spend

- 8.104 The generation of demolition and construction jobs from the four Development Scenarios would generate additional expenditure within the locality of the application sites. On the assumption that 60% of workers would spend an average of £5 per working day, it is estimated that the additional workforces created by each Development Scenario would spend the following amounts:
- Development Scenario 1 - £0.37 million per year;
  - Development Scenario 2 - £0.34 million per year;
  - Development Scenario 3 - £0.35 million per year; and
  - Development Scenario 4 - £0.32 million per year

- 8.105 As can be seen, the amount of local expenditure anticipated per Development Scenario for new construction workers does not differ significantly. This is considered to result in a **temporary, short to medium term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance for all four Development Scenarios.

#### Existing Employment

- 8.106 During the demolition and construction works for each of the four Development Scenarios, there would be an inevitable loss of office, retail and leisure floorspace within the application sites. As such, these businesses and associated jobs would have to be relocated.

- 8.107 As the three application sites are designated as an Opportunity Area in the Consolidated London Plan 2008, policy seeks comprehensive development and change. In order to access the permanent benefits of intensification, some adverse temporary effects are therefore unavoidable. Each Development Scenario would involve the demolition of all existing buildings (and hence loss of existing businesses) within the application sites. The only exception is that No's 3-7 Bressenden Place and 120-124 Victoria Street are retained within Development Scenarios 3 and 4. However, these buildings offer a small contribution to existing employment.
- 8.108 In light of the above, the effect of demolition and construction on existing employment for all four Development Scenarios is considered to be **temporary, short to medium term, adverse** and of **minor** significance at the **local** level, and **negligible** at the regional and national levels.

**Completed Development**

**Development Scenario 1**

**Population**

- 8.109 Table 8.2 sets out the estimated residential population created by Development Scenario 1 once completed and occupied. This is based on the occupancy rates as detailed in Table TA8.18 within Technical Appendix 8a, which are given for both London as a whole and a Central London Area (comprising of Camden, Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and Fulham and Westminster).

**Table 8.2: Population Arising from Development Scenario 1**

Bedrooms	Proposed Units	Using Occupancy Rate for London	Using Occupancy Rate for Central London Area
0	16	21	20
1	58	76	73
2	80	161	153
3	46	125	114
4	5	17	16
<b>Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>376</b>

- 8.110 The Central London Area calculations are likely to be the most relevant in this case and it is therefore estimated that on completion and operation, Development Scenario 1 would yield an estimated residential population of 376. A similar analysis of the existing residential units shows that there are currently approximately 118 residents within the three application sites. It is therefore anticipated that there would be an estimated 258 additional residents created as a result of Development Scenario 1.

**Employment**

- 8.111 Once Development Scenario 1 is completed and operational, additional employment would be generated through the provision of new office, retail and library land uses. Estimation of the total jobs created by Development Scenario 1 has been based on the proposed floor space by type of land use, as shown in Table 8.3.
- 8.112 Following the calculation of new jobs created by Development Scenario 1, the estimated existing jobs identified in Table TA8.10 within Technical Appendix 8a are then subtracted. Overall, it is estimated that 2,775 additional jobs would be directly created by Development Scenario 1.

**Table 8.3: Employment of the Completed Development**

	Development Floorspace Area (m <sup>2</sup> )*	Employment Density (m <sup>2</sup> per worker)	Estimated Direct Employment
Office	79,508	19	4,185
Retail	9,833	20	492
Library	1,325	40	33
Residential	23,442	N/A	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,710</b>
Estimated Existing Employment			1,935
Estimated Additional Direct Employment			2,775

\*Note: The calculations and floorspaces are based on Gross Internal Area (GIA) basis, with the exception of Retail Employment, which is on a Net Internal Area (NIA) basis. To be conservative, all flexible space is assumed to be used as library space.

- 8.113 Indirect employment is estimated using the composite multipliers previously described. This shows that Development Scenario 1 would generate an estimated additional indirect employment of 278 jobs at the local level and 1,388 jobs at the regional level.
- 8.114 In total, approximately 4,163 jobs would be created at the regional level by the completed and operational Development Scenario 1. The breakdown of direct and indirect employment is summarised in Table 8.4.

**Table 8.4: Direct and Indirect Additional Employment from the Completed Development Scenario 1**

Employment Type	Estimated Jobs Created
Direct	2,775
Indirect (Local) (10% composite multiplier)	278
<b>Total (Local)</b>	<b>3,053</b>
Indirect (Regional) (50% composite multiplier)	1,388
<b>Total (Regional)</b>	<b>4,163</b>

- 8.115 The additional employment of the completed Development Scenario 1 is considered to have a **long-term, local to regional** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Productivity Benefits from Additional Employment

- 8.116 This section values the productivity benefits arising from the additional employment identified above. This is done by considering the agglomeration benefits resulting from Development Scenario 1. Agglomeration refers to the process of people, businesses and institutions coming together so that they are located in close proximity. Agglomeration is a common process which drives city formation. London has experienced substantial agglomeration benefits through companies operating in financial and business services.
- 8.117 Application sites 1, 2 and 3 (which comprise Development Scenario 1) are situated in a key Central London location and Development Scenario 1 would provide employment opportunities in the office and retail sectors, which show high productivity and positive effects from agglomeration. Further details of the methodology used and assumptions made are provided in Technical Appendix 8a.

- 8.118 The total stream of payments can be discounted to give a single value, as at 2008, of £1,857 million. These benefits consist of value added for the U.K. economy and are not a transfer.
- 8.119 Some of the existing office building rents are below half the level of rents for high quality office space at Victoria, whilst generally, new offices would command higher rents, and so the jobs that would be created are likely to be of higher productivity than those currently on-site. This may lead to further productivity benefits which have not been accounted for in these calculations.
- 8.120 Upskilling of the local population and provision of access of the local population to the employment opportunities generated as part of the development are key issues being addressed by the SW1st organisation, supported by the Victoria Partnership.
- 8.121 The productivity benefit from additional employment associated with Development Scenario 1 is considered to be a **long-term, regional to national** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

#### ***Additional Local Spend***

- 8.122 There would be increased levels of spending through the introduction of new residential and employment populations within and around Development Scenario 1.
- 8.123 Given an additional population of 258 residents from that existing at present, an increased spending of £2.9 million per year from the additional population is estimated based on average London expenditure.
- 8.124 Research for the GLA (Ref 8.30) estimates that the leakage of expenditure on comparison goods in Westminster is 34%. Although this is a leakage from the borough of Westminster, a significant portion of this leakage remains within London. The regional leakage from the London economy is stated as 9%.
- 8.125 Allowing for these leakages and applying appropriate multipliers, local spend arising from additional residents is estimated to create a net benefit of £2.1 million per annum in Westminster and £3.9 million per annum in London as a whole. Table 8.5 summarises these direct and indirect effects. This is likely to be a conservative estimate, as leakage from convenience goods spending would be much lower than that from comparison goods spending.

**Table 8.5: Direct and Indirect Spending from Additional Residents of Development Scenario 1**

	<b>Net Direct (£million)</b>	<b>Multiplier Effect (£million)</b>	<b>Combined (£million)</b>
<b>Westminster</b>	£1.9	£0.2	£2.1
<b>London</b>	£2.6	£1.3	£3.9

- 8.126 In addition to the spending from additional residents outlined above, there would be expenditure from the 3,053 additional workers within and surrounding Development Scenario 1. Assuming that 60% of workers spend an average of £5 per working day, it is estimated that the additional spend arising from the additional employees would be £2.0 million per year.
- 8.127 The additional spend estimated from additional residents and employees created by Development Scenario 1 is considered to be a **long term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

#### ***Retail***

- 8.128 The stand alone Retail Assessment (RA) submitted in support of the three applications considers the effect of the additional retail provision on the local and wider area. It confirms that the proposed retail land uses have qualitative benefits through creating animated street frontages and assisting in way-finding from Victoria Station to other destinations.
- 8.129 The RA reveals that there is a substantial projected comparison floorspace requirement up to 2016 in the order of 121,700m<sup>2</sup> within the West End. If left unchecked, the expenditure to support this floorspace would simply go elsewhere.

- 8.130 The provision of approximately 12,700m<sup>2</sup> of new modern retail floorspace within the Development would help to retain this projected expenditure within Westminster and reinforce the retail offer of the West End and Westminster as a whole. The RA did not identify any likely trade draw on the existing West End retail offer. It concludes that due to the limited critical mass of retail proposed, there is unlikely to be a significant diversion of trade.
- 8.131 It is considered that the additional retail provision provided within Development Scenario 1 would therefore generate a **long-term, local to district** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance

**Housing**

Demand for Housing

- 8.132 As discussed above, the London Plan sets a target of 680 new homes every year until 2016/17 for Westminster. By delivering a net increase of 143 residential units, Development Scenario 1 would contribute towards meeting this target. A breakdown of existing, proposed and total additional units is shown in Table 8.6

**Table 8.6: Breakdown of Existing, Proposed and Additional Units under Development Scenario 1**

Bedrooms	Existing Units	Proposed Units	Additional Units
0	2	16	14
1	6	58	52
2	47	80	33
3	6	46	40
4	1	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>143</b>

Type of Housing

- 8.133 Development Scenario 1 would provide a range of housing types. Approximately 64% of dwellings would consist of 2 or 3 bedrooms, of which nearly one quarter would be 3 or 4 bedroom units.
- 8.134 Development Scenario 1 would include a mix of market and affordable housing, with 24.5% of the increase in dwelling provision being affordable.

Density

- 8.135 The shortage of sites available for redevelopment in central London means that high density developments are necessary if targets for housing growth are to be achieved. As mentioned above, the application sites fall within the Victoria Opportunity Area (as identified by the London Plan) and are therefore suitable for high density redevelopment at key transport nodes. The location of Development Scenario 1 is inherently suitable for a high housing density due to the major public transport interchange at Victoria.
- 8.136 Overall, it is considered that the proposed addition of residential units at the Site would be a **long-term, local to district** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Education**

- 8.137 Development Scenario 1 would create additional demand for local schools due to the residential element. The magnitude of this effect would depend upon the number of children and the age profile of these children. Table TA8.19 and TA8.20 within Technical Appendix 8a sets out suitable child yields for various sized flats on private and social developments respectively. Table 8.7 applies these to the residential mix for Development Scenario 1.

Table 8.7: Estimated Children in Development Scenario 1

Child Age	Private Housing					Social Housing					Total
	Studio	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	Studio	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	
0-2	0	0	4	4	0	0	2	4	3	0	17
3-4	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	3	0	11
5-10	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	3	7	2	17
11-15	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	5	3	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>58</b>

8.138 Table 8.7 takes account of the different child yields that need to be applied for the private and social housing within Development Scenario 1 but not the small number of children who are already living within the three application sites. As such, Table 8.8 sets out the result of applying the same methodology to the existing residential mix to provide an estimate of the additional children resulting from Development Scenario 1 is derived.

Table 8.8: Estimated Additional Children in Development Scenario 1

Child Age	Estimated Existing Children	Estimated Children within Development Scenario 1	Estimated Additional Children
0-2	4	17	13
3-4	1	11	10
5-10	2	17	15
11-15	1	13	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>50</b>

8.139 Advice from Savills residential estate agents suggests that the nature of Development Scenario 1 is such that to the majority of buyers are expected to be young professionals, city commuters, down-traders, empty nesters, first time buyers, young commuters and pied-a-terre purchasers. Looking at sales information for other recent developments including Westminster Green, The View, Davis House and Pimlico Apartments, very few of apartments (including the larger, 3-bedroom apartments), have actually been bought by families. This pattern is again expected to be repeated within Development Scenario 1, and indeed all other Development Scenarios (i.e. 2, 3 and 4). The estimated number of children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 as presented in Table 8.7 and Table 8.8 is therefore considered to provide an overestimation.

Early Years

8.140 In accordance with Table 8.8 it is estimated that an additional 10 children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 would qualify for fully funded early years provision. There would also be a demand for child care and nursery provision for 0-2 year olds and for 3-4 year olds in excess of the fully funded element.

8.141 There is likely to be significant leakage of early years demand out of the immediate locality. For example, many parents would find it easier to take their children to nurseries or other childcare provision on the way to or nearby their place of work. Thus, existing nurseries in Westminster and elsewhere would not necessarily need to absorb all of the newly created demand.

8.142 There are currently substantial numbers of nurseries and other childcare provision available within Westminster. Given the substantial current provision, contrasted with the likely demand flowing from the new development, it is considered that the effect of Development Scenario 1 on early years provision would be **negligible**.

Primary

- 8.143 Table TA8.16 in Technical Appendix 8a shows that 64% of children resident in Westminster attend maintained (state) schools within the Borough. The remainder are educated privately or outside the Borough. To be conservative, it is assumed that no children in social housing are privately educated, and it is therefore assumed that 89% of children living in social accommodation are educated within the Borough.
- 8.144 It is therefore calculated that approximately 14 of the additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 would require a primary place at a Westminster state school. Analysis indicates that the number of additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 requiring a place in a state primary school outside of the borough would be no more than 2.
- 8.145 In addition to the above, WCC contends in paragraph 49 of their SOP that the proportion of children attending private schools may be even higher than stated in Table TA8.16 of Technical Appendix 8a, due to identified problems with the data.
- 8.146 It is therefore considered that very few additional children (at most 14) would attend Westminster maintained primary schools as a result of Development Scenario 1. Comparing this number with primary provision in the area, which indicated a surplus of 514 places within the 40 state primary schools within the Borough, including 14 places at the two primary schools nearest to the application sites, it is concluded that the effect would therefore be **negligible**. The effect on other London boroughs would also be **negligible**.

Secondary

- 8.147 Approximately 44% of children residing in Westminster attend maintained (state) schools in Westminster although this is likely to be higher for children resident in social accommodation. To be conservative, it is assumed that no children in social housing are privately educated, and it is therefore assumed that 64% of children living in social accommodation are educated within the Borough. Therefore, approximately 6 of the additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 would require a secondary school place at a Westminster state school. Again, this number is considered to be overestimated. This small increase in demand would be insignificant. Analysis indicates that the number of additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 1 requiring a place in a state secondary school outside of the borough would be no more than 4.
- 8.148 Furthermore, the 'Building Schools for the Future' programme would commit some £200 million of capital funding to Westminster secondary schools over the forthcoming years. As discussed earlier in this chapter, conditional planning permission for the redevelopment of the Pimlico School has been granted as part of this programme to meet the future secondary school needs within the Borough. Building work has begun and the completion date for the school is September 2010 well before residential occupancy of Development Scenario 1 will occur.
- 8.149 It is therefore considered that the effect of Development Scenario 1 upon secondary education provision would be **negligible**.

**Health**

- 8.150 The additional population of approximately 258 residents implies a need for approximately 0.16 GPs based on either the average English or London list sizes, which amounts to less than 0.1% of the existing GPs in Westminster. Based on these calculations it is considered that the small increase in need for GPs would result in a potential **minor adverse** effect at the **local** level, and a **negligible** effect at all other levels.
- 8.151 As mentioned in Section 8.90, Westminster currently has substantially less residents per NHS open contracted dentists than London and England as a whole. It is therefore considered that the effect of Development Scenario 1 on dental provision would be **negligible**.

***Public Realm and Open Space***

- 8.152 Table TA8.17 within Technical Appendix 8a shows that the South Forum Area currently only has open space amounting to 0.13 ha per 1,000 residents. Development Scenario 1 would provide a total of 7,830m<sup>2</sup> of public realm, which is a significant amount in the context of identified deficiencies in the area. Provision is also made for children's play space, as detailed later in this chapter.
- 8.153 In addition to the quantity of the public realm, Development Scenario 1 would deliver benefits from improvements to the quality of the public realm in the area. The proposed North South route is designed to support diverse permanent and temporary activities, and there would be considerable improvements in the design of Allington Street, including the instillation of a waterfall.
- 8.154 Development Scenario 1 would facilitate pedestrian movements through the area. The layout would provide benefits for commuters and others by substantially improving ease of access to and from Victoria station.
- 8.155 Whilst there is little precedent for the evaluation of public realm benefits, the delivery of key projects such as Trafalgar Square demonstrates the value which is placed on public realm by Westminster and the Mayor of London, in terms of their commitment to creating a high quality Public Realm as part of these projects.
- 8.156 It is therefore considered that the provision of, and improvements to, the public realm as a result of Development Scenario 1 would provide a **long-term, local** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

***Play Space***

- 8.157 As previously noted, application sites 1, 2 and 3 (which comprise Development Scenario 1) are situated in an area that is designated as deficient in publicly accessible play space. An assessment of the amount of play space required is contained within the VT12 Masterplan Play Strategy, which is submitted separately in support of the planning application. In line with this strategy Development Scenario 1 includes provision for 449m<sup>2</sup> of accessible play space on the roofs of Building 5 and Building 7 for the 0-11 age group in each. The small number of young people aged 12-15 anticipated within Development Scenario are expected to utilise nearby existing informal sport and play facilities in nearby Hyde Park.
- 8.158 It is therefore considered that the additional play space provision within Development Scenario 1 would be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

***Wellbeing***

- 8.159 Development Scenario 1 would offer a high quality living environment for residents, and this would have a number of wellbeing benefits, both in terms of physical and mental health. As previously noted, Development Scenario 1 would provide 7,830m<sup>2</sup> of new public realm. This would offer opportunities for exercise and recreation and would provide a number of benefits to residents, employees and visitors to the area.
- 8.160 The range of land uses proposed within Development Scenario 1, which includes retail, restaurants, public realm, commercial and residential would provide a stimulating and enjoyable environment for residents, workers and visitors.
- 8.161 The design of Development Scenario 1 is such that movement is generated through the application sites, encouraging local surveillance. There would be active ground and first floor uses. Public spaces which are safe and welcoming, and in many case overlooked, would be created. These factors would reduce both real and perceived crime on the application sites.
- 8.162 The improvement to the wellbeing of local people, employees and visitors within Development Scenario 1 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Leisure and Community Facilities**

- 8.163 Development Scenario 1 contains provision for a library facility, which would add to existing library provision in the area. The library facility is considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.
- 8.164 Whilst the scheme does not include new public toilets, it is considered that adequate publically available and high quality, facilities currently exist at Cardinal Place. Although excluded from the three application sites, planned expansion and improvements to Victoria Palace Theatre would be facilitated by Development Scenario 1. Importantly, the Applicant is also a key funder of the Victoria Partnership, which undertakes community projects with the aim of improving the area.
- 8.165 As discussed previously, Westminster has a wide range of existing leisure provision. It is considered that this would be sufficient to accommodate the new population and the overall effect of Development Scenario 1 on other leisure and community facilities provision is therefore considered to be **negligible**.

**Development Scenario 2**

**Population**

- 8.166 The number and size of the proposed residential units is the same within Development Scenarios 1 and 2. Therefore the estimated residential population of Development Scenario 2 would also be 376, with the estimated additional population being 258.

**Employment**

- 8.167 Once Development Scenario 2 is completed and operational, additional employment would be generated through the provision of new office, retail and library land uses. Using the same methodology as Development Scenario 1, Table 8.9 shows that overall, it is estimated that 1,966 additional jobs would be directly created by Development Scenario 2.

**Table 8.9: Employment of the Completed Development Scenario 2**

	<b>Development Floorspace Area (m<sup>2</sup>)*</b>	<b>Employment Density (m<sup>2</sup> per worker)</b>	<b>Estimated Direct Employment</b>
Office	64,455	19	3,392
Retail	9,513	20	476
Library	1,325	40	33
Residential	23,442	N/A	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>3,901</b>
Estimated Existing Employment			<b>1,935</b>
Estimated Additional Direct Employment			<b>1,966</b>

\*Note: The calculations and floorspaces are based on Gross Internal Area (GIA) basis, with the exception of Retail Employment, which is on a Net Internal Area (NIA) basis. To be conservative, all flexible space is assumed to be used as library space.

- 8.168 Indirect employment generated by Development Scenario 2 is estimated using the composite multipliers used for Development Scenario 1. This shows that Development Scenario 2 would generate an estimated additional indirect employment of 197 jobs at the local level and 983 jobs at the regional level.

8.169 In total, approximately 2,949 jobs would be created at the regional level by the completed and operational Development Scenario 2. The breakdown of employment is summarised in Table 8.10.

**Table 8.10: Direct and Indirect Additional Employment from the Completed Development Scenario 2**

Employment Type	Estimated Jobs Created
Direct	1,966
Indirect (Local) (10% composite multiplier)	197
<b>Total (Local)</b>	<b>2,163</b>
Indirect (Regional) (50% composite multiplier)	983
<b>Total (Regional)</b>	<b>2,949</b>

8.170 The additional employment of the completed Development Scenario 2 is considered to have a **long-term, local to regional** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Productivity Benefits from Additional Employment

8.171 Using the same method as employed for Development Scenario 1, the productivity benefits arising from the additional employment identified can be discounted to give a single value as at 2008 of £1,274 million for Development Scenario 2. This productivity benefit from additional employment is considered to be a **long-term, regional to national** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

**Additional Local Spend**

8.172 As discussed in Development Scenario 1, there would be increased levels of spending through the introduction of new residential and employment populations within and around Development Scenario 2.

8.173 The additional population of 258 residents is the same as that of Development Scenario 1. Therefore, increased direct spending from residents would also be £2.9 million per year. Similarly, total local spend from new residents is estimated to create a net benefit of £2.1 million per annum in Westminster and £3.9 million per annum in London as a whole.

8.174 In addition, there would be expenditure from the 2,163 additional workers within and surrounding Development Scenario 2 which, assuming that 60% of workers spend an average of £5 per working day, would be £1.4 million per year.

8.175 The additional spend estimated from additional residents and additional employees for Development Scenario 2 is considered to be a **long term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Retail**

8.176 Similar to Development Scenario 1, the provision of approximately 12,400m<sup>2</sup> of new modern retail floorspace within Development Scenario 2 would help to retain projected expenditure within Westminster and reinforce the retail offer of the West End and Westminster as a whole. It is considered that the additional retail provision within Development Scenario 2 would therefore generate a **long-term, local to district** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

**Housing**

8.177 The residential element of Development Scenario 2 is the same as Development Scenario 1 and therefore it is also considered that the proposed addition of residential units within Development Scenario 2 would be a **long-term, local to district** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

***Education***

8.178 The residential element of Development Scenario 2 is the same as Development Scenario 1, therefore the estimated number of additional children is also 50. As such, predicted effects upon early years, primary and secondary education are the same as those predicted for Development Scenario 1, namely:

- The effect of Development Scenario 2 on early years provision would be **negligible**;
- The effect of Development Scenario 2 on primary school provision in the borough would be **negligible**, whilst effects on other London boroughs would also be **negligible**; and
- The effect of Development Scenario 2 upon secondary education provision would be **negligible**

***Health***

8.179 The residential element of Development Scenario 2 is the same as Development Scenario 1, and consequently the effects on health are also the same, namely:

- The additional need for GPs is considered to be **minor adverse** at the **local** level and **negligible** at all other levels; and
- The effect of Development Scenario 2 on dental provision would be **negligible**.

***Public Realm and Open Space***

8.180 Development Scenario 2 would provide significant improvements to the quantum and quality of public realm in the area and would provide a total of 6,004m<sup>2</sup> of public realm. Whilst this is a reduced provision over that within Development Scenario 1 (1,826m<sup>2</sup>), it is still considered a significant amount of new public realm in the context of identified deficiencies in the area. For the reasons discussed under Development Scenario 1, it is therefore considered that the provision of and improvements to the public realm within Development Scenario 2 would provide a **long-term, local** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

***Play Space***

8.181 The provision of children's play space under Development Scenario 2 is the same as Development Scenario 1, namely 449m<sup>2</sup> of play space on the roofs of Building 5 and Building 7. It is therefore considered that the additional play space provision within Development Scenario 2 would be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

***Wellbeing***

8.182 Development Scenario 2 would offer a high quality living environment for residents, and this would have a number of wellbeing benefits, as discussed for Development Scenario 1. The improvement to the wellbeing of local people, employees and visitors within Development Scenario 2 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

***Leisure and Community Facilities***

8.183 Development Scenario 2 also contains provision for a library facility, which would add to existing library provision in the area. The library facility is therefore considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

8.184 As discussed under Development Scenario 1, Westminster has a wide range of existing leisure provision, which would be sufficient to accommodate the new population of Development Scenario 2. As such, the effect of Development Scenario 2 on other leisure and community facilities provision is considered to be **negligible**.

**Development Scenario 3**

**Population**

8.185 Table 8.11 sets out the estimated residential population of Development Scenario 3 and is based on the occupancy rates as detailed in Table TA8.18 within Technical Appendix 8a.

**Table 8.11: Population Arising from Development Scenario 3**

Bedrooms	Proposed Units	Using Occupancy Rate for London	Using Occupancy Rate for Central London Area
0	16	21	20
1	49	64	62
2	66	133	126
3	36	98	89
4	3	10	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>307</b>

8.186 It is estimated that on completion and occupation, Development Scenario 3 would yield an estimated residential population of 307. The analysis for Development Scenario 1 shows that there are an estimate 118 existing residents on the Site. Therefore it is estimated that there will be an additional population of 189 residents created by Development Scenario 3.

**Employment**

8.187 Once Development Scenario 3 is completed and operational, additional employment would be generated through the provision of new office, retail and library land uses. Table 8.12 shows the total jobs that would be created as a result of Development Scenario 3.

8.188 Following the calculation of new jobs created by Development Scenario 3, the estimated existing jobs identified in Technical Appendix Table TA8.10 are then subtracted. Overall, it is estimated that 2,690 additional jobs would be directly created by Development Scenario 3.

**Table 8.12: Employment of the Completed Development Scenario 3**

	Development Scenario 3 Floorspace Area (m <sup>2</sup> )*	Employment Density (m <sup>2</sup> per worker)	Estimated Direct Employment
Office	77,075	19	4,057
Retail	8,933	20	447
Library	0	40	0
Residential	20,342	N/A	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,504</b>
Estimated Existing Employment (Technical Appendix 8a, Table TA8.10)			<b>1,813</b>
Estimated Additional Direct Employment			<b>2,690</b>

\*Note: The calculations and floorspaces are based on Gross Internal Area (GIA) basis, with the exception of Retail Employment, which is on a Net Internal Area (NIA) basis.

- 8.189 Indirect employment generated by Development Scenario 3 is estimated using composite multipliers, which show that an estimated additional indirect employment of 269 jobs at the local level and 1,345 jobs at the regional level would be generated.
- 8.190 In total, approximately 4,035 jobs would be created at the regional level by Development Scenario 3. The breakdown of direct and indirect employment is summarised in Table 8.13.

**Table 8.13: Direct and Indirect Additional Employment from the Completed Development Scenario 3**

Employment Type	Estimated Jobs Created
Direct	2,690
Indirect (Local) (10% composite multiplier)	269
<b>Total (Local)</b>	<b>2,959</b>
Indirect (Regional) (50% composite multiplier)	1,345
<b>Total (Regional)</b>	<b>4,035</b>

- 8.191 The additional employment of the completed Development Scenario 3 is considered to have a **long-term, local to regional** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Productivity Benefits from Additional Employment

- 8.192 Using the same method employed for Development Scenarios 1 and 2, the productivity benefits arising from additional employment can be discounted to give a single value as at 2008 of £1,815 million for Development Scenario 3. The productivity benefit from additional employment from Development Scenario 3 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, regional to national** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

***Additional Local Spend***

- 8.193 There would be increased levels of spending through the introduction of new residential and employment populations by Development Scenario 3. Given an additional population of 189 residents, an increased spending of £2.1 million per year is estimated.
- 8.194 Allowing for the same leakages and multipliers as Development Scenario 1 the local spend arising from additional residents within Development Scenario 3 is estimated to create a net benefit of £1.5 million per annum in Westminster and £2.9 million per annum in London as a whole, as summarised in Table 8.14.

**Table 8.14: Direct and Indirect Spending from Additional Residents of Development Scenario 3**

	Net Direct (£million)	Multiplier Effect (£million)	Combined (£million)
<b>Westminster</b>	£1.4	£0.1	£1.5
<b>London</b>	£1.9	£1.0	£2.9

- 8.195 In addition to the spending of residents outlined above, there would be expenditure from the 2,959 additional workers within Development Scenario 3 which, assuming that 60% of workers spend an average of £5 per working day, would be £2.0 million per year.
- 8.196 The additional spend estimated from additional residents and additional employees within Development Scenario 3 is considered to be a **long term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Retail**

- 8.197 Similarly to other Development Scenarios, the provision of approximately 11,800m<sup>2</sup> of new modern retail floorspace within Development Scenario 3 would help to retain projected expenditure within Westminster and reinforce the retail offer of the West End and Westminster as a whole. It is considered that the additional retail provision within Development Scenario 3 would therefore generate a **long-term, local to district** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

**Housing**Demand for Housing

- 8.198 As discussed previously, the London Plan sets a target of 680 new homes every year until 2016/17 for Westminster. By delivering a net increase of 108 residential units, Development Scenario 3 would contribute towards meeting this target. A breakdown of existing, proposed and total additional units is shown in Table 8.15

**Table 8.15: Breakdown of Existing, Proposed and Additional Units Under Development Scenario 3**

Bedrooms	Existing Units	Proposed Units	Additional Units
0	2	16	14
1	6	49	43
2	47	66	19
3	6	36	30
4	1	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>108</b>

Type of Housing

- 8.199 Development Scenario 3 would provide a range of housing types. Approximately 62% of dwellings consisting of 2 or 3 bedrooms, of which over one third would be 3 or 4 bedroom units. Under Development Scenario 3 there would, however, be no on-site provision of affordable housing.

Density

- 8.200 The shortage of sites available for redevelopment in central London means that high density developments are necessary if targets for housing growth are to be achieved. As mentioned previously, application sites 1 and 3 (Development Scenario 3) fall within the Victoria Opportunity Area (as identified by the London Plan) and is therefore suitable for high density redevelopment at key transport nodes.
- 8.201 The location of application sites 1 and 3 (Development Scenario 3) is inherently suitable for a high housing density due to the major public transport interchange at Victoria. Overall therefore, it is considered that the proposed addition of residential units within Development Scenario 3 would be a **long-term, local to district** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Education**

- 8.202 Development Scenario 3 would create additional demand for local schools due to the residential element. Table 8.16 applies the child yield figures used in Development Scenario 1 to the residential mix of Development Scenario 3.

Table 8.16: Estimated Children in New Development Scenario 3

Child Age	Private Housing					Total
	Studio	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	
0-2	0	0	4	4	0	8
3-4	0	0	1	3	0	4
5-10	0	0	1	4	0	5
11-15	0	0	1	1	2	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>21</b>

8.203 Table 8.16 does not take into account the small number of children currently living within application sites 1 and 3, which is shown in Table 8.17 below.

Table 8.17: Estimated Additional Children in New Development Scenario 3

Child Age	Estimated Existing Children	Estimated Children within Development Scenario 3	Estimated Additional Children
0-2	4	8	4
3-4	1	4	3
5-10	2	5	3
11-15	1	4	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>

8.204 Advice from Savills residential estate agents suggests that the nature of Development Scenario 3 is such that the private housing may be particularly attractive to young professionals and those using the flats during the week, whilst living further afield. The estimated number of children presented in Table 8.16 and Table 8.17 is therefore considered to provide an overestimation.

#### Early Years

8.205 In accordance with Table 8.17 it is estimated that an additional 3 children inhabiting Development Scenario 3 would qualify for fully funded early years provision and that there would also be a demand for child care and nursery provision for 0-2 year olds and for 3-4 year olds in excess of the fully funded element.

8.206 Given the substantial current provision, contrasted with the likely demand flowing from the new development, it is considered that the effect of Development Scenario 3 on early years provision would be **negligible**.

#### Primary

8.207 Following the method used in Development Scenario 1, it is estimated that approximately 2 of the additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 3 would require a primary place at a Westminster state school. Analysis indicates that the number of additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 3 requiring a place in a state primary school outside of the borough would be no more than 1.

8.208 It is therefore considered that very few additional children (at most 2) would attend Westminster maintained primary schools as a result of Development Scenario 3. Contrasting this number with primary provision in the area, which indicated a surplus of 514 places within the 40 state primary schools within the Borough, including 14 places at the two primary schools nearest to the application sites, it is concluded that the effect would therefore be **negligible**. The effect on other London boroughs would also be **negligible**.

Secondary

- 8.209 Following the method used in Development Scenario 1, approximately 1 of the additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 3 would require a secondary school place at a Westminster state school. This small increase in demand would be insignificant. Analysis indicates that the number of additional children inhabiting Development Scenario 3 requiring a place in a state secondary school outside of the borough would also be no more than 1.
- 8.210 It is therefore considered that the effect of Development Scenario 3 upon secondary education provision would be **negligible**.

**Health**

- 8.211 The additional population of approximately 189 residents implies a need for approximately 0.12 GPs based on either the average English or London list sizes, which amounts to less than 0.1% of the existing GPs in Westminster. Based on these calculations it is considered that the small increase in need for GPs would result in a potential **minor adverse** effect at the **local** level, and a **negligible** effect at all other levels.
- 8.212 As mentioned previously, Westminster currently has substantially less residents per NHS open contracted dentists than London and England as a whole. It is therefore considered that the effect of Development Scenario 3 on dental provision would be **negligible**.

**Public Realm and Open Space**

- 8.213 As with Development Scenario 2, Development Scenario 3 would provide significant improvements to the quantum and quality of public realm in the area, namely a total of 6,004m<sup>2</sup> of new public realm, which is a significant amount in the context of identified deficiencies in the area.
- 8.214 For the reasons previously discussed, it is therefore considered that the provision of and improvements to the public realm within Development Scenario 3 would provide a **long-term, local** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

**Play Space**

As previously noted, the application sites are situated in an area that is designated as deficient in publicly accessible play space and Development Scenario 3 includes provision for 270m<sup>2</sup> of play space on the roof of Building 5. It is therefore considered that this additional play space provision would be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

**Wellbeing**

- 8.215 Development Scenario 3 would offer a high quality living environment for residents, and this would have a number of wellbeing benefits, as discussed for Development Scenario 1. The improvement to the wellbeing of local people, employees and visitors associated with Development Scenario 3 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Leisure and Community Facilities**

- 8.216 Under Development Scenario 3 there is no provision for a library onsite. It is considered, however, that the existing library provision within the surrounding area will be sufficient to accommodate the additional population arising from Development Scenario 3.
- 8.217 As discussed previously, Westminster has a wide range of existing leisure provision, which would be sufficient to accommodate the new population of Development Scenario 3, with resultant effects on leisure and community facilities provision considered to be **negligible**.

**Development Scenario 4****Population**

- 8.218 The number and size of the proposed units is the same as Development Scenarios 3 and therefore the estimated residential population of Development Scenario 4 is therefore 307, with the estimated additional population being 189.

**Employment**

- 8.219 Once Development Scenario 4 is completed and operational, additional employment would be generated through the provision of new office and retail land uses, as discussed in Development Scenario 1. Table 8.18 shows the total jobs that would be created as a result of Development Scenario 4.
- 8.220 Following the calculation of new jobs created by Development Scenario 4, the estimated existing jobs identified in Technical Appendix Table TA8.10 are then subtracted. Overall, it is estimated that 1,889 additional jobs would be directly created by Development Scenario 4.

**Table 8.18: Employment of the Completed Development Scenario 4**

	<b>Development Scenario 4 Floorspace Area (m<sup>2</sup>)*</b>	<b>Employment Density (m<sup>2</sup> per worker)</b>	<b>Estimated Direct Employment</b>
Office	62,022	19	3,264
Retail	8,613	20	431
Library	0	40	0
Residential	20,342	N/A	0
<b>Total</b>			<b>3,695</b>
Estimated Existing Employment (Technical Appendix 8a, Table TA8.10)			<b>1,813</b>
Estimated Additional Direct Employment			<b>1,882</b>

\*Note: The calculations and floorspaces are based on Gross Internal Area (GIA) basis, with the exception of Retail Employment, which is on a Net Internal Area (NIA) basis.

- 8.221 Indirect employment generated by Development Scenario 4 is estimated using composite multipliers, which shows that an estimated additional indirect employment of 188 jobs at the local level and 942 jobs at the regional level would be generated.
- 8.222 In total, approximately 2,825 jobs would be created at the regional level by Development Scenario 4. The breakdown of direct and indirect employment is summarised in Table 8.19.

**Table 8.19: Direct and Indirect Additional Employment from Development Scenario 4**

<b>Employment Type</b>	<b>Estimated Jobs Created</b>
Direct	1,883
Indirect (Local) (10% composite multiplier)	188
<b>Total (Local)</b>	<b>2,071</b>
Indirect (Regional) (50% composite multiplier)	942
<b>Total (Regional)</b>	<b>2,825</b>

- 8.223 The additional employment of the completed Development Scenario 4 is considered to have a **long-term, local to regional** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

Productivity Benefits from Additional Employment

- 8.224 Using the same method as Development Scenarios 1, 2 and 3, the productivity benefits arising from additional employment within Development Scenario 4 can be discounted to give a single value as at 2008 of £1,308 million. The productivity benefit from additional employment created by Development Scenario 4 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, regional to national** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

***Additional Local Spend***

- 8.225 There would be increased levels of spending through the introduction of new residential and employment populations by Development Scenario 4.
- 8.226 The additional population of 189 residents for Development Scenario 4 is the same as that of Development Scenario 3, therefore the increased direct spending from the additional population is the same at £2.1 million per year. Furthermore, the total local spend arising from the additional residents is also estimated to create a net benefit of £1.5 million per annum in Westminster and £2.9 million per annum in London as a whole.
- 8.227 In addition to the spending outlined above, there would be expenditure from the 2,071 additional workers within Development Scenario 4 which, assuming that 60% of workers spend an average of £5 per working day, would be £1.4 million per year.
- 8.228 The additional spend estimated from additional residents and additional employees within Development Scenario 4 is considered to be a **long term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

***Retail***

- 8.229 Similarly to other Development Scenarios, the provision of approximately 11,500m<sup>2</sup> of new modern retail floorspace within Development Scenario 4 would help to retain projected expenditure within Westminster and reinforce the retail offer of the West End and Westminster as a whole. It is therefore considered that the additional retail provision within Development Scenario 4 would therefore generate a **long-term, local to district** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

***Housing***

- 8.230 The residential element of Development Scenario 4 is the same as Development Scenario 3 and therefore, it is considered that the proposed addition of residential units would also be a **long-term, local to district** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

***Education***

- 8.231 The residential element of Development Scenario 4 is the same as Development Scenario 3, therefore the estimated number of additional children is also 13. As such, predicted effects upon early years, primary and secondary education are the same as those predicted for Development Scenario 3, namely:
- The effect of Development Scenario 4 on early years provision would be **negligible**;
  - The effect of Development Scenario 4 on primary school provision in the borough would be **negligible**, whilst effects on other London boroughs would also be **negligible**; and
  - The effect of Development Scenario 4 upon secondary education provision would be **negligible**.

**Health**

- 8.232 The residential element of Development Scenario 4 is the same as Development Scenario 3, and consequently the effects on health are also the same, namely:
- The additional need for GPs is considered to be **minor adverse** at the **local** level and **negligible** at all other levels; and
  - The effect of Development Scenario 4 on dental provision would be **negligible**.

**Public Realm and Open Space**

- 8.233 As discussed in Development Scenarios 2 and 3, Development Scenario 4 would provide significant improvements to the quantum and quality of public realm in the area, namely a total of 6,004m<sup>2</sup> of new public realm, which is a significant amount in the context of identified deficiencies in the area.
- 8.234 For the reasons previously discussed, it is therefore considered that the provision of, and improvements to, the public realm within Development Scenario 4 would provide a **long-term, local** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance.

**Play Space**

- 8.235 The provision of children's play space under Development Scenario 4 is the same as under Development Scenario 3, namely 270m<sup>2</sup> of play space on the roof of Building 5. It is therefore considered that the additional play space provision within Development Scenario 4 would be a **long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance.

**Wellbeing**

- 8.236 Development Scenario 4 would offer a high quality living environment for residents, and this would have a number of wellbeing benefits, as discussed for Development Scenario 1. The improvement to the wellbeing of local people, employees and visitors within Development Scenario 4 is therefore considered to be a **long-term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance.

**Leisure and Community Facilities**

- 8.237 The effects on leisure and community facilities would be the same as under Development Scenario 3 in that the wide range of existing leisure provision would be sufficient to accommodate the new population. The effect of Development Scenario 4 on leisure and community facilities provision is therefore considered to be **negligible**.

**MITIGATION****Demolition and Construction****Development Scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4**

- 8.238 Due to the similar nature and extent of predicted effects for all four Development Scenarios during demolition and construction, the recommended mitigation measures discussed below are applicable to all four Development Scenarios.
- 8.239 The only socio-economic adverse effect identified during the demolition and construction phase is the temporary, local effect of the loss of existing on-site employment. However, this temporary loss is inevitable if the substantial benefits of the additional jobs that would be provided are to be realised in the long term. Therefore, no mitigation is recommended for this temporary effect.

- 8.240 Ensuring that local communities benefit from the opportunities arising from major developments is of crucial importance. Local agencies, such as SW1st, exist to ensure jobs created in the area are accessible to the local population. The Applicant is a member of the Victoria Partnership which comprises a number of businesses and seeks to improve the business district. The partnership would be working with SW1st to coordinate employment and training opportunities for the local population as they arise from the consented Development Scenario and elsewhere in the local area.
- 8.241 Furthermore, the Applicant is currently involved in the Construction Youth Trust, a charity which encourages employment in the construction industry. This relationship would help to ensure that construction benefits are secured for local residents.
- 8.242 To ensure that local communities are able to benefit from the opportunities arising from the proposals, the Applicant is preparing a management strategy (or similar) for agreement in due course. Such a strategy would build on the Applicant's existing commitment to the Victoria Partnership and the Construction Youth Trust, and would seek to work with the South Westminster Renewal Partnership so that the business, resident and voluntary sectors can effectively work together to benefit local residents.
- 8.243 These arrangements would maximise the opportunity for existing residents to share in the benefits of the consented Development Scenario and take up the opportunities for employment that would arise. This would be particularly valuable given the current deprivation levels that have been identified in the area of the application sites.

### Completed Development

#### Development Scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4

- 8.244 In the case of effects associated with the completion and operation of the four Development Scenarios that have been identified as being either negligible or beneficial in nature, no further mitigation is required.
- 8.245 In order to address the potential minor effect at the local level on need for healthcare arising from all four Development Scenarios, the Applicant intends to make a financial contribution to cover the small increase in health need, which would be negotiated and secured through a Section 106 agreement. It is considered that such a contribution would reduce effects at the local level to **negligible** for all four Development Scenarios.
- 8.246 As mentioned in the mitigation section for demolition and construction above, the Applicant is preparing a management strategy (or equivalent) for agreement in due course which would ensure that local communities are able to benefit from the opportunities arising from the completed and operational, consented Development Scenario.

#### Development Scenarios 2, 3 and 4

- 8.247 As detailed within Chapter 5: The Proposed Development Scenarios, the Applicant is committed to delivering the overall public realm improvements inherent to Development Scenario 1 within all other Development Scenarios. In order to enable this, it is anticipated that the remainder of public realm enhancements for Development Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 would be delivered through appropriate section 278 highway works agreements. Under this mechanism, the amount of additional public realm that would be delivered for Development Scenarios 2 and 4 would be 1,507m<sup>2</sup> and in the case of Development Scenario 3 would be 1,827m<sup>2</sup>.

#### Development Scenarios 3 and 4

- 8.248 In the case of Development Scenarios 3 and 4, no affordable housing will be provided on site. The Applicant has indicated, however, that they are prepared to make alternative provision for affordable housing either off site or through a financial contribution. It is anticipated that such provision would be secured under a Section 106 agreement.

## RESIDUAL EFFECTS

### Demolition and Construction

#### Development Scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4

- 8.249 The management strategy (or equivalent) mentioned in the mitigation section above will offset the adverse effect of losses in existing employment, as far as possible, for all four Development Scenarios. The strategy would also ensure that further benefits are delivered to residents of the local area. With this exception, the residual effects for the demolition and construction phase of all Development Scenarios would therefore be identical to those described for the potential effects, namely:
- Demolition and construction employment for all four Development Scenarios is considered to provide a **temporary, short to medium term, local to regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance;
  - The amount of expenditure anticipated within the local area by new construction workers is considered to be a **temporary, short to medium term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance for all four Development Scenarios; and
  - The effect of demolition and construction on existing employment for all four Development Scenarios is considered to be **temporary, short to medium term, adverse** and of **minor** significance at the **local** level, and **negligible** at the regional and national levels. This will, however, be offset by the implementation of a management strategy to ensure that the consented Development Scenario provides employment benefits to local residents.

### Completed Development

#### Development Scenarios 1, 2, 3 and 4

- 8.250 In the case of potential effects being negligible or beneficial in nature for all four Development Scenarios, no mitigation is required and therefore, the residual effects are the same as the potential effects identified earlier in this chapter. However, in the case of need for healthcare at the local level, the securing of financial contributions through s106 agreements will reduce potential minor adverse effects at the local level to negligible. Similarly, it is proposed that s106 agreements are used to facilitate off-site contributions to the provision of affordable housing for Development Scenarios 3 and 4. This is not anticipated, however, to alter the significance of the overall effect of housing provision for these Development Scenarios.
- 8.251 The implementation of a management strategy (or equivalent) by the Applicant will also ensure that further benefits are delivered to residents of the local area, though this is not deemed to alter the significance of the potential effects, for example through job creation.
- 8.252 Whilst the number of jobs, population, expenditure and public realm/play space differ slightly between the four Development Scenarios, the assessment has concluded that the significance of effects on socio-economic factors, taking into account the mitigation measures described previously, is the same for all four Development Scenarios. The only notable exception to this is the additional benefits created by the library provision within Development Scenarios 1 and 2.
- 8.253 The effects of the four Development Scenarios are summarised below:
- Generation of direct and indirect jobs through operation of the Development Scenario - **Long-term, local-regional** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance;
  - Generation of productivity benefits over the life of the Development Scenario - **Long-term, regional-national** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance;
  - Generation of additional spending by residents and employees - **Long-term, local-regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance;
  - Additional retail provision - **Long-term, local-district** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance;

- Provision of additional housing units - **Long-term, local-regional** effect of **minor beneficial** significance;
- Additional demand for school places (early years, primary and secondary) – **negligible**;
- Additional demand for GPs and dentists – **negligible**;
- Provision of, and improvements to, the public realm, including that secured through section 278 agreements for Development Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 - **Long-term, local** effect of **substantial beneficial** significance;
- Provision of additional playspace - **Long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance;
- Improvements to the well-being of residents, employees and visitors - **Long-term, local** effect of **minor beneficial** significance;
- For Development Scenarios 1 and 2, provision of a new library facility - **Long-term, local** effect of **moderate beneficial** significance; and
- Impact on other leisure and community facilities – **negligible**.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 8.254 Various information sources have been consulted to assess the effect of the four Development Scenarios on socio-economic factors, including official data sources, professional experience of similar schemes and relevant guidance and policy.
- 8.255 The four Development Scenarios all result in the creation of significant socio-economic benefits and would contribute significantly to the regeneration of the Victoria area. The most notable benefits associated with the four Development Scenarios are the creation of new jobs and associated generation of significant productivity benefits. Other benefits include the provision of new housing, improved public realm, children's playspace and, in the case of Development Scenarios 1 and 2, the provision of a new library.
- 8.256 Furthermore, the Applicant is planning to prepare a management strategy (or equivalent) which would ensure that local communities are able to benefit from the opportunities arising from the consented Development Scenario. The Applicant is also prepared to provide contributions, through s106 agreements, towards healthcare and affordable housing provision.
- 8.257 Despite the increases in local population afforded by the four Development Scenarios, it has been shown that demand for education, healthcare and leisure/community facilities can be accommodated within the Westminster area.