

APPENDIX I: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (BROAD SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION)

Introduction

This appendix presents an appraisal of the alternative broad spatial distribution options consulted upon at **Stage 1: Swale Core Strategy Pick Your Own: Issues and Strategic Spatial Options (January 2011)** and **Stage 2: Bearing Fruits: Swale Borough Draft Core Strategy (March 2012)**. The approach consulted upon at Stage 2 has been carried forward as the preferred approach for the current version of the plan - **The Swale Borough Local Plan Part 1: Bearing Fruits 2031 Consultation Draft (August 2013)**:

The alternative options presented at Stage 1 and Stage 2 did include an indication of the growth quantum however the focus of the appraisal presented below is on the broad spatial distribution of development. Options for the growth quantum have been reconsidered since developing these options based on objectively assessed need and have been appraised separately. The detailed findings are discussed in Chapter 11 and Appendix II of this report.

1. Focus at urban areas for 13,500 homes and lower employment growth.

Results in housing provision of 13,500 homes, alongside the delivery of previously identified employment sites to meet a lower growth scenario of 415,000 sq m. This option focuses upon urban areas within Thames Gateway, whilst at Faversham, policies promote the meeting of local needs. Rural areas are addressed by Development Management Policies intended to encourage their continued social, economic and environmental health. For new housing, some 4,500 houses would need to be identified, with most of these (circa 3,280 homes) requiring greenfield sites as urban extensions. At the Kent Science Park, further expansion is limited to existing environmental and transport capacity. The Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road would be completed to the A2, whilst further assessment of the capacity of Junction 5 of the M2 undertaken

2. Focus at urban areas and larger villages for 13,500 homes and lower employment growth.

As per option 1, with additional greenfield housing provision (circa 3,250) diverted from urban areas to larger village centres to support/expand their sustainability, as an alternative to urban extensions. Rural areas (outside identified larger villages) are addressed by Development Management Policies intended to encourage their continued social, economic and environmental health.

3. Focus at urban areas for 13,500 homes and higher employment growth.

Housing growth levels and distribution as outlined in option 1, but led by employment provision at higher growth level (595,000 sq m), with additional 'step change' provision. Development provisions extending beyond plan period aimed at capturing greater share of economic development and meeting specific needs in key employment sectors. Greater housing focus upon urban previously developed land due to regeneration and expansion at Port of Sheerness. Villages close to employment locations considered for remaining greenfield housing provision. Major expansion of Kent Science Park with a new junction to M2 to form access to the Kent Science Park. Longer term (outside the plan period) change to the transport network at Sittingbourne with an outline framework for identifying and delivering a

Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road. The Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road is also completed and the capacity of Junction 5 of M2 is assessed. Faversham meets most of its needs within the existing urban framework, but needs to improve the quality of employment land which will require a new site(s) to be identified. Rural areas are addressed by Development Management Policies intended to encourage their continued social, economic and environmental health.

4. Focus at urban areas for 18,500 homes and higher employment growth.

Higher growth levels for housing (18,500 dwellings) and employment (595,000 sq m), with additional 'step change' provision. Development provisions extending beyond plan period aimed at capturing greater share of economic development and meeting specific needs in key employment sectors, supported by new housing. Additionally, the option focuses on the need to grow Sittingbourne as a main centre for enhanced retail and leisure facilities and to develop new transport infrastructure for the town. Focus for both greenfield and previously developed land for housing upon main urban areas at greater levels than options 1 and 2, including expansion of Port of Sheerness for housing, as part of wider employment expansion proposals. Circa 5,850 new homes on greenfield urban extensions and key village locations where close to employment opportunities and proposed new infrastructure, but with primary focus for both greenfield housing and employment growth on Sittingbourne and environs (inc. Bapchild). Faversham meets most of its needs within existing urban framework, but needs to improve the quality of employment land which will require a new site(s) to be identified. Rural areas are addressed by Development Management Policies intended to encourage their continued social, economic and environmental health. Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road is completed and the capacity of Junction 5 of M2 is assessed. Option facilitates major expansion of Kent Science Park and presents a major change to the transport network at Sittingbourne with a new junction to M2 to form access to Kent Science Park. Unlike option 3 a route for a Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road would be specifically identified, with new housing development forming part of a funding package for delivery of the road

5. The preferred spatial distribution consulted upon at Stage 2: Bearing Fruits: Swale Borough Draft Core Strategy (March 2012) – locating development in broad terms, at the following locations, descending in scale and type that is to be directed at them:

1. The principal town of Sittingbourne;
2. The other Borough urban centres of Faversham and Sheerness (and its nearby centres of Queenborough, Rushenden and Minster/Halfway);
3. Rural Local Service Centres – Iwade, Newington, Eastchurch, Leysdown, Teynham and Boughton;
4. The smaller villages

Under this approach the levels of growth are weighted toward Sittingbourne and the Isle of Sheppey reflecting their position within the Government's Thames Gateway growth area. Priority would also be given to the use of brownfield land. The availability of brownfield land is however lower than other areas within the Gateway area and will be insufficient to meet all future development needs. Urban and village extensions are therefore needed to maintain a supply of land for housing and jobs under this option.

Methodology

The following key is used to demonstrate within the matrix the individual effect of the option on the SA topic.

++	+	?	0	-	--
Very Positive	Positive	Effect Unclear	No Effect	Negative	Very Negative

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal seeks to identify ‘significant effects’ on the baseline / likely future baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Part 1 of the main report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the strategic nature of the options under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternative options even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

It is important to note that effects are predicted taking into account the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Regulations. So, for example, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are also considered. These effect ‘characteristics’ are described within the appraisal as appropriate.

The appraisal of the above options has sought to identify the potential constraints that may exist primarily with developing the differing broad spatial distribution of development presented in the options. Effects therefore carry a degree of uncertainty without more detailed site specific appraisal information.

Appraisal findings

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternative ‘broad spatial distribution’ options:

- (1) Focus at urban areas for 13,500 homes and lower employment growth.
- (2) Focus at urban areas and larger villages for 13,500 homes and lower employment growth.
- (3) Focus at urban areas for 13,500 homes and higher employment growth.
- (4) Focus at urban areas for 18,500 homes and higher employment growth.
- (5) The preferred spatial distribution consulted upon at Stage 2: Bearing Fruits: Swale Borough Draft Core Strategy (March 2012)

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the	Option 2 proposes a larger rural centre focus including around Newington and the wider A2 corridor, which could contribute towards increased traffic movements to urban areas and associated air quality issues if public transport or key services are limited at these locations. Another consideration would be the associated impact of increased traffic	-/?	- -/?	-/?	-/?	-/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
Borough	and air pollution on the A2 in some areas including Teynham. This distribution could therefore result in significant negative effects albeit this is somewhat uncertain due to limited knowledge of baseline air quality. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 would focus development in urban areas with options 4 and 5 predominantly at Sittingbourne. This development distribution focus should reduce the need to travel to key services and facilities and between housing and employment locations and therefore limit significant negative effects on local air quality. Two AQMAs have been declared in Sittingbourne and one is at Ospringe so there is potential for negative effects resulting from development close to these locations.					
Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment	There is potential for negative effects resulting from all options due to the presence and location of European protected sites in the Borough. Although all options would avoid development within these sites of international importance, urban and rural areas are located close to these sites and there is potential for increased recreational pressure from new development. There is limited detailed evidence to determine the significance of negative effects of each option distribution.	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Climate - To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency and to increase the use of renewable energy; To encourage sustainable construction materials and methods	Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 would focus development in urban areas with options 4 and 5 predominantly at Sittingbourne. This development distribution focus could have the effect of limiting emissions of greenhouse gases per capita from vehicle usage as it is likely to deliver development at more accessible/public transport linked locations. Given its urban and rural focus, Option 2 could result in substantial development in locations which are potentially less accessible to public transport and with fewer key services compared to urban areas which might therefore increase the need for people to travel and therefore increase the need to use energy. New development under all options would have the potential to incorporate energy efficiency measures and use renewable energy and sustainable construction methods as part of new development although this would depend on how this is implemented through the plan.	+/?	-/?	+/?	+/?	+/?
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-	None of the options are likely to have an effect on this SA objective.	0	0	0	0	0

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
social behaviour and the fear of these						
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural heritage	All options would provide development in the Borough's areas of historic value, in particular land within the historic town of Faversham, for example at Faversham Creek. Without mitigation such as good design, development could result in negative effects. The significance of the effects of all the options will depend on the implementation of the strategy.	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Employment and Skills - To ensure high and stable levels of employment in accessible locations; To raise the educational achievement levels across the Borough and help people to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in employment	Options 1 and 2 propose minor expansion of the Kent Science Park, therefore providing further opportunities for new businesses. Options 3 and 4 seek to facilitate a major expansion of the Kent Science Park, as well as expansion at the Port of Sheerness. This proposed growth would meet the specific needs of key employment sectors, such as knowledge and green economies, all contributing to economic development and growth across the Borough. Option 5 provides for an employment-led regeneration strategy for Sittingbourne and an organic employment led strategy for Faversham. Smaller scales of employment development would be provided at rural local service centres also helping to maintain employment levels in these locations. Delivering economic regeneration potential of the Port of Sheerness under options 3 and 4 and sites along the A249, which are also likely to generate employment opportunities and opportunities for skills development.	+	+	+	+	+
Health - To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities in health	Urban focussed options are likely to have positive, indirect effects given that retaining the vitality and viability of town centres helps to enhance community well-being. Access to health, leisure, shops and recreational facilities would also help to improve well being and health. Option 2 focuses development on urban areas and larger villages. Access to health and other community facilities may not be as accessible in rural areas compared to urban areas.	+	-	+	+	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
Housing - To provide affordable and decent housing adaptable to future needs of the community	All options would deliver housing development to support the expansion of existing communities. The rural housing focus of Option 2 would particularly help to meet the needs of communities in these areas. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 would support these communities but at a lesser scale.	+	+	+	+	+
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape of Swale	All options would seek to avoid development in the Kent Downs AONB and would require development on greenfield land as extensions to settlements. Some locations around urban areas are considered to be of low landscape capacity change identified by the Urban Extension Landscape Capacity Study 2010 and therefore this could result in potentially negative effects on the Borough's local landscape. Option 2 proposes housing delivery within the existing urban areas (Sittingbourne, Sheerness and Queenborough), and through expansion or infill development in the larger village locations. Generally focusing development at these locations is likely to have a greater negative effect on the rural landscape and valued natural environment of the Borough compared to other options. Some of these locations are closer to the AONB and local landscape designations compared to urban areas. The significance of effects would depend on the scale and design of development and sensitivities of individual locations. Option 3 and 4 also encourages some village development and Option 5 to a lesser extent but principally focus development in urban areas where negative effects are likely to be minimised.	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Local Economy - To sustain economic growth and competitiveness	Options 3 and 4 would facilitate a major expansion of the Kent Science Park as well as expansion at the Port of Sheerness and, as such, would meet the specific needs of key employment sectors (such as knowledge and green economies), contributing to economic development and growth across the Borough. Options 1 and 2 would still contribute to the Borough's economic competitiveness through attracting some new enterprises to the Borough. These options also propose expansion of the Kent Science Park providing further opportunities for new businesses to relocate. Options 4 and 5 provide for growth at Sittingbourne as the main centre for the Borough.	+	+	++	++	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
	This has the potential to improve the business image of the town,					
Population - To meet the challenges of a growing and ageing population; To reduce poverty and social exclusion; To improve accessibility for all to key services and facilities.	All options propose development within and adjacent to existing communities which would contribute to meeting the challenges of a growing and ageing population. Options 3, 4 and 5 would involve more development focussed on previously developed land which could result in regeneration of urban areas assisting with reducing deprivation in these areas.	+	+	+	+	+
Soil - To protect and enhance soil quality and reduce contamination	<p>The Borough has a large resource of best and most versatile land and this is located within the A2 corridor therefore in areas surrounding Sittingbourne and Faversham as well as Newington and Teynham, potentially suitable for greenfield extensions. All options are therefore expected to have negative effects upon soil quality as a result of the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land but distribution of development would be limited to the Isle of Sheppey if this were to be avoided.</p> <p>Options 3, 4 and 5 would involve more development focussed on previously developed land which could reduce the loss of best and most agricultural land compared to options 1 and 2 which may see significant losses due to their distribution. In addition redevelopment of previously developed land would also potentially remediate sites and reduce contamination in the Borough. There is uncertainty regarding the level of impact upon BMV without evidence to the extent of this loss under each option.</p>	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Transport and Accessibility - To promote traffic reduction and encourage more sustainable alternative forms of transport	<p>For Options 1, 3, 4 and 5, development focussed within and adjacent to urban areas is expected to promote traffic reduction and encourage sustainable modes of transport. Developments proposed in larger rural centres under Option 2 may not reduce traffic unless accompanied by public transport investment and access to services.</p> <p>Options 3 and 4 propose transport improvements in and around Sittingbourne.</p> <p>The implications of all spatial options on the existing primary and secondary road network are somewhat uncertain particularly from increased development in the identified villages and rural areas.</p>	+/?	-/?	+/?	+/?	+/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
Waste - To achieve the sustainable management of waste	All options have the potential to incorporate recycling storage facilities within new developments and therefore encourage reductions in waste production. However, proposed levels of new development would generate considerable levels of waste, which would place pressure on the County Council's waste management arrangements and it is uncertain what the spatial effects might be.	?	?	?	?	?
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding; To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and surface) and make efficient use of water	<p>All options are expected to involve development in some areas at risk of flooding</p> <p>For option 2 – The larger villages of Iwade, Eastchurch and Leysdown located on the Isle of Sheppey are within or adjacent to areas of identified flood risk (however flood defences are in place to protect much of the Isle of Sheppey from flooding).</p> <p>Considerable areas of Sittingbourne and Faversham are also at risk of flooding, however again much of the land is protected by flood defences and requires regeneration.</p> <p>In addition focussing development on previously developed land under options 3,4 and 5 would also potentially remediate sites and reduce contamination in the Borough which could have . There is uncertainty regarding the level of impact upon BMV without evidence to the extent of this loss under each option.</p>	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?

Summary

Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 propose development predominantly within existing urban areas on previously developed land, or as extensions to urban areas which overall has the greatest potential to avoid potential impacts on the environment. All options are expected to result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural however Options 3, 4 and 5 would involve more development focussed on previously developed land compared to Options 1 and 2 which could reduce potentially significant negative effects. Option 2 has a specific rural housing focus, directing housing sites towards greenfield land at the identified larger village centres (Eastchurch, Leysdown, Iwade, Newington, Teynham and Boughton Street). Generally this is expected to have a greater negative effect on the local character of the villages and on the rural landscape and valued natural environment of the Borough and potential impacts resulting from increased travel and reduced accessibility to key services compared to the other options.

All options would provide additional employment land at urban locations contributing to ensuring increased levels of employment in accessible locations and providing the mechanism for economic growth and improved competitiveness in the Borough. Options 3 and 4 would facilitate a major expansion of the Kent Science Park as well as expansion at the Port of Sheerness and, as such, would meet the specific needs of key employment sectors (such as knowledge and green

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>				
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4	Opt 5
	<p>economies), contributing to economic development and growth across the Borough. Options 4 and 5 provide for growth at Sittingbourne as the main centre for the Borough. This has the potential to improve the business image of the town and therefore help stimulate economic growth.</p> <p>Further evidence is needed to determine the impact of the spatial options on for example the primary and secondary road network, water and waste infrastructure, biodiversity sites and landscape. These uncertainties and potentially significant negative effects highlighted in the appraisal could be addressed by policies in the plan which ensure development brought forward provides protection to best and most versatile agricultural soil by utilising brownfield land first; encourages the use of public transport and reduces the need to travel to assist with tackling climate change and potentially improve air quality; ensure the protection of international and nationally designated biodiversity sites and the management; and where possible the reduction in the risk of flooding across the Borough.</p>					

APPENDIX II: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (GROWTH QUANTUM OPTIONS)

Introduction

This appendix presents an appraisal of the following alternative growth quantum (development target) options:

Option	Jobs	Housing
1. Economic Baseline	214 per annum, 4,280 over the plan period	604 dwellings per annum, 12,080 over the plan period
2. Higher Economic Baseline	353 per annum, 7,053 over the plan period	741 dwellings per annum, 14,820 over the plan period
3. Demographic led Office of National Statistics 2011 Projection	414 per annum, 8,271 over the plan period	887 dwellings per annum, 17,745 over the plan period
4. Bearing Fruits draft Core Strategy 2012/Higher Economic Baseline	353 per annum, 7,053 over the plan period	540 dwelling per annum, 10,800 over the plan period

Methodology

The following key is used to demonstrate within the matrix the individual effect of the option on the SA topic.

++ Very Positive	+ Positive	? Effect Unclear	0 No Effect	- Negative	-- Very Negative
---------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal seeks to identify ‘significant effects’ on the baseline / likely future baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Part 1 of the main report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the strategic nature of the options under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternative options even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

It is important to note that effects are predicted taking into account the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the Regulations. So, for example, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are also considered. These effect 'characteristics' are described within the appraisal as appropriate.

For the purposes of the appraisal of growth options it was assumed the spatial distribution of these growth options was the preferred broad spatial approach that was presented in the Stage 2: Bearing Fruits: Swale Borough Draft Core Strategy (March 2012): was appropriate. The levels of growth do have a bearing on the detailed spatial approach, i.e. the specific locations that are allocated. However, a limitation of this appraisal is that an appraisal of site allocations which could comprise the spatial strategy of each of these higher growth options is not available. In the absence of individual site appraisals it has been assumed that development could proceed on land identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2011/12) and Employment Land Review (2010). The appraisal has sought to identify the potential constraints that may exist with developing differing levels of growth according to this broad spatial strategy. Effects identified therefore carry a degree of uncertainty in the absence of more detailed site specific appraisal information and also evidence to determine whether necessary infrastructure either freestanding or in combination with growth proposed in neighbouring authorities¹³¹ can actually accommodate these varying growth levels.

Appraisal findings

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternative 'growth' options:

- (1) Economic Baseline
- (2) Higher Economic Baseline
- (3) Demographic led Office of National Statistics 2011 Projection
- (4) Local Plan/Higher Economic Baseline

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the Borough	All options would increase the population of Swale therefore generating increases in vehicle movements and associated pollutants. The focus of development would be in and around the existing larger settlements principally Sittingbourne, where two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) have recently been designated. Development locations to deliver all these options would include sites in Sittingbourne as well as Faversham. Option 3 would provide the highest level of housing and employment growth compared to the other options. This option would present the greatest level of population change with associated traffic generation and emissions and larger amounts of development would be required in particular at sites south west of Sittingbourne, land west of Ospringe and also at Newington where	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?

¹³¹ Maidstone Borough Council - Working housing target of 14,800 properties to be delivered between 2011 and 2031; Canterbury City Council 15,600 units between 2011-2031 which equates to 780 dwelling per annum; Medway Council 17,930 to 2028. The Core Strategy therefore proposes the delivery of at least 815 dwellings per annum (785 within the Thames Gateway) on average over the plan period up to 2028 and Ashford Borough Council - 16,770 new dwellings in Ashfield Growth Area 2006 to 2021, plus contingency of 10% and 1,180 new dwellings in the rest of the borough.

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
	<p>there are AQMAs. Development for option 3 could also be needed in locations which are potentially less accessible to public transport therefore increasing the need to travel. Options 1 and 4 are more likely to avoid development at inaccessible (without good public transport links) locations. All options could, in the short term, help to reduce current out-commuting by providing enough jobs based on economic forecasting however in the longer term the ageing population may constrain the labour supply and in commuting could occur. This could therefore increase travel and associated impacts on air quality in the Borough. Given option 4 delivers a higher economic baseline but not housing provision to support this there could be negative effects upon the Borough's air quality as a result of in commuting in the long term.</p> <p>There is limited evidence to determine the significance of negative effects. There is also uncertainty about the potential effects on the future baseline as a result of growth in neighbouring authorities and their use of the Borough's transport infrastructure.</p>				
<p>Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment</p>	<p>All options would avoid development sites within, or development sites likely to have potential significant effects upon internationally and nationally designated biodiversity sites, as this was part of the suitability criteria for land set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Options 2 and 3 would provide the highest levels of housing and employment growth and could potentially put more pressure compared to the other options on greenfield sites which could have local ecological value.</p> <p>There could also be some recreational pressures on the Special Protection Area of all the options, with the higher levels of growth (Options 2 and 3) likely to have a greater effect than other options due to the need for additional development sites closer to these sensitive sites. There is uncertainty about whether these effects would be significant with or without mitigation and whether options would deliver enhancements to biodiversity as this would depend on the development which would come forward. The outcome of Habitat Regulations Assessment will help to inform whether effects are likely to be significant.</p>	-/?	-/?	--/?	-/?
<p>Climate - To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency and to increase the use of</p>	<p>All options would increase the population of Swale thus generating increases in vehicle movements, energy usage and therefore greenhouse gas emissions across the Borough. Options 1 and 4 are more likely to deliver the majority of the development required at accessible/public transport linked locations which could have the effect of minimising</p>	+/-	-/?	-/?	-/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
renewable energy; To encourage sustainable construction materials and methods	<p>emissions of greenhouse gases and the need for energy. Options 2 and 3 would provide higher levels of housing and employment growth and therefore increased traffic generation and greenhouse gas emissions compared to options 1 and 4. Development needed to deliver options 2 and 3 may also be needed in locations which are potentially less accessible to public transport, such as rural areas, therefore increasing the need to travel unless public transport connectivity between towns and villages or services at these locations are improved</p> <p>All options could, in the short term, help to reduce current out-commuting by providing enough jobs based on economic forecasting however in the long term, the ageing population may constrain the labour supply and in commuting could occur. This could therefore increase travel and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Given option 4 delivers a higher economic baseline but not housing provision to support this, it could also result in additional in-commuting in the long term.</p> <p>New development under all options would have the potential to incorporate energy efficiency measures and use renewable energy and sustainable construction methods but this would depend on implementation.</p>				
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of these	None of the options are likely to have an effect on this SA objective.	0	0	0	0
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural heritage	<p>All options would provide development in the Borough's areas of historic value, in particular land within the historic town of Faversham, for example at Faversham Creek. A large area of the town is within a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Without mitigation all options could result in negative effects upon built and cultural heritage. Higher growth options 2 and 3 are likely to require more development in these areas which could in turn result in negative effects to designated or non-designated heritage assets and the setting of heritage assets.</p>	-	-	-	-
Employment and Skills - To ensure high and stable levels of employment in accessible locations; To	Options 1, 2 and 4 make provision for jobs based on objectively assessed employment needs (Swale Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update and Development Needs Assessment 2013) with options 2 and 4 maximising the economic potential of the Borough by	+	+	+	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
raise the educational achievement levels across the Borough and help people to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in employment	seeking to achieve higher economic forecasts. Option 3 is based upon expected population change and so will also provide for high levels of employment for the expected increase in population therefore has the potential to reduce out-commuting in the short term and its associated effects. This change does however exceed past trends and the future ageing population could limit labour supply in the Borough in the long term under all options. Option 4 does not however deliver the housing required to support this economic growth and could therefore limit the labour supply further.				
Health - To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities in health	All options will focus development in and around the existing larger settlements principally Sittingbourne, and are therefore likely to have a positive, indirect effect given that retaining the vitality and viability of town centres helps to enhance community well-being. Access to health, leisure, shops and recreational facilities would also help to improve well being and health. Options 2 and 3 would lead to more development in rural service centres and smaller settlements. The smaller settlements are likely to have less accessibility to a wider range of services and facilities compared to rural service centres and urban areas.	+	+/-	+/-	+
Housing - To provide affordable and decent housing adaptable to future needs of the community	Option 4 does not provide for future housing needs of the local community based on objectively assessed expected population changes and economic forecasts. All other options meet objectively assessed demographic and economic needs. Option 3 specifically delivers housing growth to meet the forecast demographic changes of the Borough and is therefore likely to have significant positive effects with regard to providing housing to meet future needs of the community.	+	+	++	-
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape of Swale	All options would result in growth outside the AONB however they would include development at locations of low landscape capacity change identified in the Urban Extension Landscape Capacity Study 2010. This could therefore result in potentially negative effects on the Borough's landscape and townscape at the local level. Higher level options would lead to greater levels of change in areas and potentially impacts on land located in and adjacent to valued areas. Evidence to determine the significance of these effects for each option is not available.	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Local Economy - To	All options would encourage economic growth in the Borough by making provision for the	+	+	+	+/-

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
sustain economic growth and competitiveness	creation of jobs across the plan period in line with objectively assessed economic needs. Options 1, 2 and 3 would provide housing to support the labour supply for these jobs and help to sustain economic growth. The housing target for Option 4 does not however support the level of economic growth proposed under this option and therefore may not therefore assist with sustaining an appropriate labour supply to support the local economy. The Council is confident of the delivery of Options 2 and 4 as much of the land bank is already committed and at least some of the growth forecast for retail/leisure and pharmaceuticals is already being put in place. For all options the future ageing population is expected to constrain the future labour supply and therefore positive effects could be limited, particularly for achieving the higher economic options.				
Population - To meet the challenges of a growing and ageing population; To reduce poverty and social exclusion; To improve accessibility for all to key services and facilities.	Option 3 specifically delivers housing growth to meet the forecast demographic changes of the Borough and is therefore likely to have significant positive effects in meeting the challenges of a growing and ageing population. Options 1 and 2 also provide housing but in relation to economic forecasts. Option 4 does not provide for future needs of the local community based on objectively assessed targets however this option and other options would deliver proposed housing growth and employment growth in urban areas which would assist with regeneration and therefore alleviate poverty in these areas. Given the lower housing target not fully supporting the economic growth proposed Option 4 does not contribute positively to meeting the challenges of an ageing population as it is unlikely to assist with increasing the working age population of the Borough to support the economic growth proposed.	+	+	++	+/-
Soil - To protect and enhance soil quality and reduce contamination	All options would deliver some development on previously developed land therefore protecting high quality soils. Development of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land would also be required as this resource is present along the A2 corridor surrounding existing settlements. It is expected that the higher the level of housing growth the higher proportion of BMV agricultural land would need to be developed due to the extent of the resource across the Borough. It is uncertain whether this would result in a significant loss of BMV land and thus the quantity of high quality soil.	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?
Transport and Accessibility - To	All options would increase the population of Swale therefore generating increases in vehicle movements. The focus of development would be in and around the existing larger				

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
promote traffic reduction and encourage more sustainable alternative forms of transport	<p>settlements principally Sittingbourne. Options 2 and 3 would provide the highest level of housing and employment growth and therefore the potential for increases in vehicle movements. These growth options may require more locations which are potentially less accessible to public transport compared to options 1 and 4 as more growth would be required at rural service centres. The Borough has a number of transport infrastructure challenges which include junction capacity on the M2 (Junctions 5 and 7 in particular), congestion on the A2 corridor, and localised congestion in and around key settlements, particularly Sittingbourne. There is uncertainty about how the growth options would specifically affect these issues and any mitigation required in particular cumulatively with neighbouring authorities who are proposing significant levels of growth too.</p> <p>All options could help to reduce current out-commuting in the short term by providing enough jobs based on economic forecasting however in the longer term the ageing population may constrain the labour supply and in commuting could occur therefore increasing travel in the Borough. Option 4 could also increase travel by increased in commuting due to the housing growth under this option not fully supporting the economic growth proposed. .</p>	+/-	-/?	-/?	-/?
Waste - To achieve the sustainable management of waste	All options would increase the number of households therefore generating increases in waste that needs to be managed. Options 2 and 3 would place more pressure on the County's waste management facilities compared to the other options but could also create local markets for sustainable waste management. It is uncertain whether any of the options would result in significant positive or negative effects.	?	?	?	?
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding; To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and surface) and make efficient use of water	All options would place pressure on existing water resources and potentially water quality as a result of waste water treatment needs. Water companies have not identified any significant water resource capacity or quality issues with regards to housing growth outlined in option 4. It is unknown whether the other options would give rise to significant water resource issues but options could require upgrades to waste water treatment works in the longer term. Significant areas of the Isle of Sheppey and areas north of the A2 within Sittingbourne and Faversham are at significant risk of flooding (EA flood zone 3) although these do benefit from defences. All growth options are expected to need to develop some flood zone 3 land however these sites are previously developed land and are expected to meet the Exception Test. The Environment Agency has also confirmed these sites would be appropriate to	?	?	?	+/-

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
	<p>redevelop. The Council has confirmed that Options 1,2 and 3 would deliver additional growth above option 4 in areas not at risk of flooding. There is uncertainty about the effects of the growth options on water resources in combination with the growth proposed by neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Given the above, neutral effects are expected for option 4 however there is uncertainties with regards to the other options.</p>				
<p>Summary</p> <p>All options would increase the population of Swale through provision of housing and employment development albeit at differing levels. Without appropriate mitigation, the associated pressures that growth would place on the environment resulting from vehicle movements; energy and water usage; generation of pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions; and the loss of high grade agricultural land across the Borough could result in negative effects, particularly for the higher growth options. In addition, higher levels of growth could also result in negative effects on the Borough's valued local landscapes and townscapes. Evidence is however limited to determine whether these effects would be significant under each option. Given the levels of growth proposed Options 1 and 4 have the potential to deliver less significant adverse effects upon the environmental objectives.</p> <p>In terms of performance against social and economic objectives, the future ageing population is expected to constrain the future labour supply and place pressure on housing supply therefore the positive effects of employment and economic growth for all options could be limited, particularly for achieving higher levels of growth. Option 4 also does not deliver the objectively assessed housing need (identified in the Council's SHMA Update) to meet the economic growth proposed under this option, and therefore could have negative effects upon the provision of necessary housing supply and sustaining the local economy if accommodation for workers is not available locally. This option may, in the short term, reduce the amount of out-commuting which currently occurs resulting in positive effects upon the employment, air quality, transport and climate baseline. However in the long term it could also encourage commuting into the Borough resulting in negative effects upon transport, climate and air quality. Option 1 aims to deliver the future economic baseline based on objectively assessed need, and it provides a housing supply to support the labour supply needed to deliver this. Overall, this option is expected to perform better than Option 4 with regards to achieving economic and social objectives.</p> <p>More detailed evidence of the impacts of the options upon infrastructure, landscape, best and most versatile agricultural land and biodiversity sites is needed to determine the significance of effects.</p>					

APPENDIX III: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AT FAVERSHAM)

Introduction

This appendix presents an appraisal of the following employment growth options at Faversham:

Option A – Land at Perry Court Farm, Brogdale Road.

A 33 ha site framed by the Abbey School, Ashford Road, Brogdale Road and the M2.

Option B – Land between Ashford Road and Salters Lane.

A 14 ha site framed by the A2, Ashford Road, Salters Lane and the M2 Motorway.

Option C – Land at Lady Dane Farm, Love Lane

A 27 ha site comprised of farm land east of Love Lane and South of Graveney Road, whilst its southern border comprises the Faversham-Canterbury railway.

Option D – Oare Gravel Workings

A 67 ha site located to the north west of the town close to Oare village, bounded by Oare Creek, Ham Road and the open expanses of the North Kent Marshes

Methodology

The following key is used to demonstrate within the matrix the individual effect of the option on the SA topic.

++ Very Positive	+ Positive	? Effect Unclear	0 No Effect	- Negative	-- Very Negative
---------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal seeks to identify ‘significant effects’ on the baseline / likely future baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Part 1 of the main report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the strategic nature of the options under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternative options even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternative employment growth options at Faversham:

- (A) Land at Perry Court Farm, Brogdale Road
- (B) Land between Ashford Road and Salters Lane
- (C) Land at Lady Dane Farm, Love Lane
- (D) Oare Gravel Workings Site

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the Borough	Options A-C are located in close proximity to the A2, M2 and Faversham town centre, which should help to reduce the need to travel long distances in order to access the primary road network / key services in the town. It is uncertain whether a reduction in air pollution would occur as a result of this. Option D is located north west of Faversham and does not currently have good links to the town's strategic road network. Results of a transport assessment for the site has indicated that the closure of the Gravel Workings would result in a reduction in commercial vehicles using local roads, particularly the A2 through Ospringe where there is an Air Quality Management Area. There is potential for net minor positive effects although cars associated with development would be generated from development here and this would need further consideration to determine the effects on local air quality here. All options have good public transport links and option D has the potential to link up to National Cycle Route 1 therefore promoting the reduction in the need to travel by private car and generate air pollutants.	?	?	?	+/?
Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment	None of the options are located within designated sites of biodiversity value. It is uncertain whether options A-C are of any local ecological value. Option D is adjacent to the internationally designated Swale Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest. Parts of Option D may also be important ecologically for supporting the interests of this wider area. Recreational disturbance at the internationally designated site is therefore a potential issue here without appropriate management. Given its size it does have potential to deliver significant enhancement. The outcome of the Habitats Regulations Assessment would be needed to determine the significance of effects at this site.	?	?	?	?
Climate - To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency and to	Options A-D perform well in terms of meeting climate change mitigation objectives. Options A-C are located in close proximity to the A2, M2 and Faversham town centre, which should help to reduce the need to travel long distances in order to access the primary road network /	+	+	+	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
increase the use of renewable energy; To encourage sustainable construction materials and methods	key services in the town. Option D is located north west of Faversham and doesn't currently have good links to the town's strategic road network but is in close proximity to Faversham town centre. A transport assessment has indicated that cessation of the Gravel Workings from the site would result in a reduction in commercial vehicles using local roads, most notably the A2 through Ospringe where there is an Air Quality Management Area. Although cars associated with development would be generated from development here.				
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of these	Options are unlikely to have significant effects in terms of crime and safety.	0	0	0	0
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural heritage	Options A and B are both judged to have negative effects in terms of cultural heritage. Development on land at Perry Court Farm (Option A) could have a detrimental impact on the setting of a listed building located on the boundary of the site. However, the option highlights the need to respect the character and setting of the listed building as part of delivering new development. Development on land between Ashford Road and Salters Lane (Option B) would be on visually prominent land, which has the potential to have a detrimental impact on the historic development/setting of the town. Option C is unlikely to have any impact on cultural heritage as there are no heritage assets located within or close to the site. Option D has a number of heritage assets related to its former use as a gunpowder factory site. Given the size of the site it is likely that these can be retained and therefore significant negative effects avoided. These assets are also neglected and therefore there is potential for enhancement. Further assessment of the extent and significance of these assets would be needed to achieve their appropriate use and integration as part of any redevelopment of the site.	-	-	+	+
Employment and Skills - To ensure high and stable levels of employment in accessible locations; To raise the educational achievement levels across the Borough and help	All options would provide 20,000 sq m of B use class employment. For Option D the Council's employment land review in 2010 indicated that the site was relatively remote with limited accessibility and above average development costs resulting from its former uses. Commercial developers are therefore expected to consider this less favourable compared to other options.	++	++	++	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
people to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in employment					
Health - To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities in health	All options would involve development on sites in close proximity to health services within Faversham. This will ensure these are accessible to people living and working on the site. Given its size and its heritage assets and ecological status Option D has the potential to provide on site recreational uses for the wider community. Options A and also have this potential with Option B less so as it is a smaller site.	+	+	+	+
Housing - To provide affordable and decent housing adaptable to future needs of the community	All options would involve development of 150 dwellings as part of the development of employment uses. This represents an important contribution towards delivering housing in the Borough.	++	++	++	++
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape of Swale	Options A and B are both judged to have negative effects in terms of local landscape. Although development on land at Perry Court Farm (Option A) is better contained visually, there is potential for adverse effects on the landscape setting. Development on land between Ashford Road and Salters Lane (Option B) would be on visually prominent land, which has the potential to have a detrimental effect on landscape setting. Development on land at Lady Dane Farm (Option C) would be relatively well contained. Option D has been the subject of restoration and is largely a mix of vegetation, lakes, open land and structures associated with its former use as a gunpowder works. There are also some existing structures and plant associated with the gravel workings. The Council's Urban Extension Landscape Capacity Study 2010 indicated that the northern part of the site is highly sensitive. Further detailed landscape evaluation suggests some development could take place in the south east area.	-	-	+	-
Local Economy - To sustain economic growth and competitiveness	All options would provide 20,000 sq m of B use class employment uses which would result in significant positive effects in terms of helping to sustain the local economy at Faversham. Option D is likely to result in higher development costs as a result of the need to remediate the land and may therefore not be as attractive to developers as other options	++	++	++	+
Population - To meet the	All options would contribute towards increasing employment opportunities and housing.	+	+	+	+

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
challenges of a growing and ageing population; To reduce poverty and social exclusion; To improve accessibility for all to key services and facilities.	Therefore contributing towards meeting the needs of the future population of Swale.				
Soil - To protect and enhance soil quality and reduce contamination	Options A, B and C are best and most versatile agricultural land and their development would result in the permanent loss of high quality agricultural soil and therefore have negative effects upon achieving this objective. Given the extent of the resource across the Borough and the size of the sites it is unlikely these effects would be significant. Option D is contaminated land and therefore development of the site would involve its remediation and reuse resulting in positive effects.	-	-	-	+
Transport and Accessibility - To promote traffic reduction and encourage more sustainable alternative forms of transport	Options A and C are well located in terms of accessing the M2. However, works would be required in order to provide an access point onto the A251 and A2 respectively from each site. The primary access for land between Ashford Road and Salters Lane (Option B) is from the A2, which as well as not being direct from the motorway, could lead to traffic difficulties at the junction with the A251. Options A and B are all located in close proximity to Faversham train station. Option D is located north west of the town and therefore not in close proximity to strategic routes. Results of a transport assessment at the site indicate that the closure of the Gravel Workings from the site would result in a reduction in commercial vehicles using local roads,. However, if redeveloped the site would increase private cars going to and from the. It is uncertain what impacts of this on the local transport network would be and needs further consideration.	+	-	+	-
Waste - To achieve the sustainable management of waste	The development of employment uses and new housing as part of all options would put pressure on existing waste facilities in the area however it is not clear what effect this would have however these sites on their own are unlikely have significant effects. Development of the sites would provide the opportunity to incorporate waste storage facilities to allow waste to be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy.	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding;	The development of employment uses and new housing as part of all options would put pressure on existing water infrastructure in the area. It is uncertain as to whether this would	-/?	+/?	+/?	-/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and surface) and make efficient use of water	<p>be significant but it is not expected to need upgrading. Option A is located within an Environment Agency groundwater protection zone 2 and therefore, without mitigation, development could have potential negative effects on groundwater resources.</p> <p>Options A-C are outside flood zone 3 however Option D is located in an area liable to flooding. A detailed survey has been undertaken and this states the south east portion of the site would be able to be made safe with respect to flood risk and therefore it is likely that the developed area could be above flood levels.</p>				
<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>All options would help to boost the amount of employment in the Borough and contribute towards delivering housing in the Borough therefore helping to sustain the local economy. Option C is considered to be the least constrained by sensitive environmental features compared to the other options but would result in the loss of high grade agricultural land and require improvements to access.</p> <p>Options A-C are located in close proximity to the primary road network and all options are within close proximity of Faversham town centre which would help reduce the need to travel long distances to get access to key services which would have positive effects on climate change, air quality and indirectly on health. Option D is located north west of Faversham and does not currently have good links to the town's strategic road network. A transport assessment has indicated that cessation of the Gravel Workings from the site would result in a reduction in commercial vehicles using local roads. There is potential for net minor positive effects although redevelopment of the site would generate car travel. All options have good public transport links and option D has the potential to link up to National Cycle Route 1. Development of Options A, B and C would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and therefore high quality agricultural soil resulting in negative effects upon achieving the soil objective. Option D is contaminated land and therefore development of the site would involve its remediation and reuse resulting in positive effects.</p> <p>Should Option A be brought forward for allocation then key considerations for its development to be incorporated into relevant policies are securing an access point onto the A251; ensuring development does not have detrimental impacts on the landscape setting here or the setting of a listed building located on the site boundary by providing a detailed assessment of impacts and implementing appropriate design mitigation; ensuring development is designed so that it does not impact on nearby groundwater resources; and ensuring development encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport. Further investigation to determine the potential biodiversity value of the site and the impact of the loss of high grade agricultural land is also be needed.</p> <p>Should Option B be brought forward then key considerations for its development to be incorporated into relevant policies are ensuring primary access for this site does not lead to traffic difficulties at the junction with the A251; ensuring development does not have detrimental impacts on the landscape setting here or the setting of the town by providing a detailed assessment of impacts and implementing appropriate design mitigation; and ensuring development encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport. Further investigation to determine the potential biodiversity value of the site and the impact of the loss of high grade agricultural land is also be needed.</p>					

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>			
		Opt A	Opt B	Opt C	Opt D
	<p>Should Option C be brought forward then key considerations for its development to be incorporated into relevant policies are securing an access point onto the A2 and ensuring development encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport. Further investigation to determine the potential biodiversity value of the site and the impact of the loss of high grade agricultural land would also be needed.</p> <p>Should Option D be brought forward then key considerations for its development to be incorporated into relevant policies are the need to provide biodiversity protection and enhancement to maximise positive effects upon the adjacent Swale Special Protection Area and the ecology value of the site itself. The significance of on site heritage assets and potential impacts of development on these assets needs to be determined to ensure sensitive development is provided. Policies should ensure development is designed sensitively to minimise the wider visual impacts from views from the north, north east and west. In addition, development would need to potentially secure localised improvements to the road network (with the consideration of air quality impacts) to ensure the site is connected to the main town and minimises impacts on the local air quality. Development would also need deliver appropriate design, such as the use of SUDS and locating development in areas of least risk on the site, to protect from flooding and so that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p>				

APPENDIX IV: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION POLICY APPROACHES)

Introduction

This appendix presents an appraisal of the following options for gypsy and traveller accommodation policy approaches:

- 1) 1% of the total number of dwellings proposed for each Local Plan housing allocation and windfall sites above 149 dwellings or above to be provided as Gypsy and Traveller serviced pitches (capped at a maximum of 10 pitches per site) and 1 pitch to be provided for each Local Plan housing allocation and windfall sites of 50-149 dwellings.
- 2) No pitch allocations as part of mainstream housing sites, and having specific Gypsy/ Traveller allocations.
- 3) No pitch allocations and just relying on windfall planning application sites for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Methodology

The following key is used to demonstrate within the matrix the individual effect of the option on the SA topic.

++ Very Positive	+ Positive	? Effect Unclear	0 No Effect	- Negative	-- Very Negative
---------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal seeks to identify ‘significant effects’ on the baseline / likely future baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Part 1 of the main report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the strategic nature of the options under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternative options even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

For the purposes of the appraisal it is assumed that the allocations in option 2 would be made in accordance with the preferred broad spatial strategy.

Appraisal findings

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternative Gypsy and Traveller accommodation policy options:

- (1) 1% of the total number of dwellings proposed for each Local Plan housing allocation and windfall sites above 149 dwellings or above to be provided as Gypsy and Traveller serviced pitches (capped at a maximum of 10 pitches per site) and 1 pitch to be provided for each Local Plan housing allocation and windfall sites of 50-149 dwellings.
- (2) No pitch allocations as part of mainstream housing sites, and having specific Gypsy/ Traveller allocations.
- (3) No pitch allocations and just relying on windfall planning application sites for Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the Borough	Options 1 and 2 would locate pitches principally in, and adjacent to, urban areas in the Borough as these are linked to the local plan allocations and the settlement strategy. Gypsies and travellers would therefore not need to travel as far to access key services and sites therefore reducing per capita distance travelled. In some urban areas such as Sittingbourne there is localised poor air quality with the designation of two AQMAs. Reducing per capita distance travelled could lead to benefits for air quality; however, it is also recognised that growth could still lead to increased traffic generation. Effects of these options on the achievement of the air quality objective is therefore uncertain. There is also uncertainty surrounding the effects of Option 3 as it could result in fewer sites coming forward and locations in more remote locations.	?	?	?
Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment	Allocations under Option 1 and Option 2 are expected to avoid impacts on the natural environment however some sites within and adjacent to urban areas are located in close proximity to Swale Special Protection Area and other sensitive designated sites and option 1 could have some pitches on windfall sites. The outcome of the Habitats Regulations Assessment would determine the significance of these effects. Some of the allocations under option 1 are on greenfield land which may have some minor negative effects on local biodiversity. There is uncertainty surrounding the effects of Option 3 on biodiversity.	-/?	-/?	?
Climate - To minimise the need for energy, increase	Options 1 and 2 would locate pitches principally in, and adjacent to, urban areas in the Borough. Providing for sites and locating them close to urban areas could reduce the need for the gypsy and	+/?	+/?	-/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
energy efficiency and to increase the use of renewable energy; To encourage sustainable construction materials and methods	traveller population to travel to access key services. This could o minimise greenhouse gas emissions per capita. It is not envisaged these effects would be significant. There is uncertainty surrounding the effects of Option 3 but it could result in fewer sites coming forward and locations in more remote locations leading to increases in greenhouse gas emissions per capita.			
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of these	Significant effects upon this objective are unlikely.	0	0	0
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural heritage	Locations for allocated housing sites under option 1 and separate allocations under options 1 and 2 are expected to avoid sensitive heritage assets and impacts on their setting in accordance with the broad spatial strategy. There may be more risk that sites coming forward under Option 3 could be located in more sensitive heritage environments and not be as sensitively planned however effects are uncertain.	+	+	?
Employment and Skills - To ensure high and stable levels of employment in accessible locations; To raise the educational achievement levels across the Borough and help people to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in employment	Significant effects upon this objective are unlikely.	0	0	0
Health - To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities in health	Options 1 and 2 are likely to provide the gypsy and traveller community with greater access to health and recreational facilities and thus result in positive effects upon achieving this objective. It is unclear whether sites coming forward under Option 3 would provide good access to these	+	+	?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
	facilities.			
Housing - To provide affordable and decent housing adaptable to future needs of the community	Separate allocations for pitches and pitches as part of housing sites and allocations would both have positive effects upon meeting the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller local community by making provision. Option 3 is not taking a proactive approach to providing pitches for this part of the local community and therefore is expected to have negative effects upon this objective. Under Option 1 it is somewhat uncertain as to when the pitches would be delivered under each housing allocation or windfall site and therefore there may be short term issues with provision.	+/?	+	-
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape of Swale	Options 1 and 2 may require development on greenfield land and at sites with low capacity for change. There is therefore potential to impact negatively on landscape and townscape of Swale without mitigation. The allocations would avoid the AONB so effects are not expected to be significant. Larger site allocations could also provide more opportunity for good design. It is uncertain where sites would be located under option 3 and their potential impacts on the landscape.	-	-	?
Local Economy - To sustain economic growth and competitiveness	Effects upon this objective are unlikely for options 2 and 3. It is uncertain whether the inclusion of pitches as part of allocations under option 1 would have impacts on the costs of developing these sites.	?	0	0
Population - To meet the challenges of a growing and ageing population; To reduce poverty and social exclusion; To improve accessibility for all to key services and facilities.	Separate allocations and provision of allocations as part of housing sites are expected to have positive effects in terms of meeting the needs of this group of the local community. Option 1 is likely to have significant positive effects as this approach would help towards reducing social exclusion of this sector of the community which might not be realised as part of options 2 and 3.	++	+	+
Soil - To protect and enhance soil quality and reduce contamination	Options 1 and 2 could result in the loss of high grade agricultural land as some allocations and sites are on high grade agricultural land. However option 1 is more likely to result in the efficient use of land by co-locating pitches with new housing development rather than having separate sites. There is uncertainty about how Option 3 would be delivered and its impacts on soil resources.	+/-	-	?
Transport and	Providing pitches as part of housing allocations would allow the gypsy and traveller community to	+	+	-/?

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
Accessibility - To promote traffic reduction and encourage more sustainable alternative forms of transport	make use of access improvements and pedestrian and cycle links provided as part of these developments. This could help to reduce traffic within the urban areas. Separate allocations (option 2) and windfall sites (option 3) may require additional investment to ensure accessibility. Option 2 would however locate pitches within or adjacent to existing urban areas principally. Under option 3 there is uncertainty but a risk locations that come forward may not be within or adjacent to urban areas.			
Waste - To achieve the sustainable management of waste	All options could put pressure on existing waste facilities in the area however it is not clear what effect this would have. Development of the pitches at allocated sites would provide more opportunity to provide waste storage facilities for all dwellings and pitches together to allow waste to be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy.	+/?	?	?
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding; To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and surface) and make efficient use of water	Under options 1 and 2 areas of Sittingbourne and Faversham are at risk of flooding therefore pitches may be located in these areas as a result of allocations in the plan or locating separate allocations within and adjacent to urban areas. However these areas are protected by flood defences. Given the number of pitches to be planned for it is not expected these would give rise to significant negative effects.	-/?	-/?	?
<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Options 1 and 2 would locate pitches principally in, and adjacent to, urban areas in the Borough as these would be local plan allocations and would provide more certainty regarding the locations for development compared to Option 3. Although the location of pitches could be on greenfield land and at locations which could result in the loss of agricultural land and potential for negative effects on local landscape and biodiversity. Both options 1 and 2 would provide locations accessible to key services and facilities. Compared to other options Option 1 is likely to make more efficient use of land and access arrangements by co-locating pitches with proposed housing. Option 1 is also likely to have significant positive effects with regards to social objectives as this approach would help to reduce the social exclusion of the Gypsy and Traveller community.</p> <p>There is uncertainty surrounding the effects of Option 3 and in part Option 1 due to the unknown locations of windfall sites however this could be mitigated by having strong development management policies protecting the environment and ensuring sites come forward in accordance with the settlement strategy. Option 3 would not be a proactive approach to providing pitches for this part of the local community and therefore is expected to have negative effects upon the housing objective. Under Option 1 it is also somewhat uncertain as to when the pitches would be delivered under each housing allocation or windfall site and if their inclusion as part allocations would increase costs of developing housing sites therefore there may be short term issues with provision.</p>				

APPENDIX V: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (AFFORDABLE HOUSING TARGET OPTIONS)

Introduction

This appendix presents an appraisal of the following options for setting affordable housing targets as part of the plan:

- 1) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target of 30% (East Kent target of the now revoked South East Plan)
- 2) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target of 35% (Kent target of the now revoked South East Plan)
- 3) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target range of 30-35% according to the local housing market area (30% at Sheerness/Minster and East Sheppey and 35% at Sittingbourne, Faversham and East Swale Rural Area)

Note these targets are to be subject to viability testing.

Methodology

The following key is used to demonstrate within the matrix the individual effect of the option on the SA topic.

++ Very Positive	+ Positive	? Effect Unclear	0 No Effect	- Negative	-- Very Negative
---------------------	---------------	---------------------	----------------	---------------	---------------------

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal seeks to identify ‘significant effects’ on the baseline / likely future baseline, drawing on the sustainability objectives identified through scoping (see Part 1 of the main report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the strategic nature of the options under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternative options even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of ‘significant effects’.

Appraisal findings

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternative affordable housing target options:

- (1) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target of 30%
- (2) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target of 35%
- (3) Number of affordable housing units to be determined in accordance with the affordable housing target range of 30-35% according to the local housing market area (30% at Sheerness/Minster and East Sheppey and 35% at Sittingbourne, Faversham and East Swale Rural Area)

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the Borough	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Climate - To minimise the need for energy, increase energy efficiency and to increase the use of renewable energy; To encourage sustainable construction materials and methods	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of these	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural heritage				
Employment and Skills- To ensure high and stable levels of employment in accessible locations; To raise the educational achievement levels across the Borough and help people to acquire the skills needed to find and remain in employment	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Health - To improve health and well-being and reduce inequalities in health	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Housing - To provide affordable and decent housing adaptable to future needs of the community	All options aim to provide affordable housing with Option 2 providing the highest level across the plan area. However given the current economic climate and past trends of affordable housing delivery it is uncertain whether the targets can be achieved. In addition, the targets are unlikely to deliver the affordable housing need required to meet the current as well as future need as there is a large backlog and the proposed level of growth would not fully address the need. Option 3 has considered evidence associated with each location and is likely to be more deliverable providing more affordable housing in the principal urban areas at Sittingbourne and Faversham where the focus of the majority of development will be. Option 1 provides for a lower level of affordable housing overall and is therefore not maximising the delivery of affordable housing in areas that could potentially provide up to 35%. .	+/?	+/?	+/?
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	Overall likely effect		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
of Swale				
Local Economy - To sustain economic growth and competitiveness	Higher levels of affordable housing proposed by Options 2 and 3 could result in developments not coming forward in areas where evidence suggests a lower level target is likely to be more deliverable. Option 3 does however seek to take into consideration local market conditions and option 1 would deliver a lower level overall. It is uncertain whether targets are actually achievable given the development costs of potential sites and their viability.	+/?	-/?	+/?
Population - To meet the challenges of a growing and ageing population; To reduce poverty and social exclusion; To improve accessibility for all to key services and facilities.	All options will contribute to providing affordable housing for the local population however all options are unlikely to fully meet the identified need of the local population over the plan period.	+/-	+/-	+/-
Soil - To protect and enhance soil quality and reduce contamination	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Transport and Accessibility - To promote traffic reduction and encourage more sustainable alternative forms of transport	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Waste - To achieve the sustainable management of waste	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding; To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and	No significant effects likely or differences between options.	0	0	0

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> and <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms	<u>Overall likely effect</u>		
		Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3
surface) and make efficient use of water				
<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>All options are unlikely to have significant effects on environmental and some social and economic SA objectives. All options would have a potentially positive effect upon the housing objective as they would provide affordable housing across the Borough therefore helping to meet the considerable need for affordable housing. None of the options however meet the identified local population need fully and given the current economic climate and recent past trends of affordable housing delivery this may be difficult to deliver and address the current high level of need unless significantly high levels of growth are delivered.</p> <p>Option 3 has considered evidence (relative price, need and economic ambition) associated with each location where this is available and is therefore likely to be more deliverable. It is also likely to provide more affordable housing in the principal urban areas at Sittingbourne and Faversham where the focus of the majority of development will be. Option 1 provides for a lower level of affordable housing overall and is therefore not maximising the delivery of affordable housing in areas that could potentially provide up to 35%.</p> <p>Higher levels of affordable housing proposed by Option 2 could result in developments not coming forward in areas where evidence suggests a lower level target is likely to be more deliverable. Option 3 seeks to take into consideration local market conditions and Option 1 would deliver a lower level overall. All targets may not be achievable given the development costs of potential sites and consideration of viability.</p>				

APPENDIX VI REVISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN POLICIES

Preferred strategy

Policy ST 1 Delivering sustainable development in Swale
 Policy ST 2 Development targets for jobs and new homes 2011 -2031
 Policy ST 3 The Swale settlement strategy
 Policy ST 4 Meeting the Local Plan development targets
 Policy ST 5 The Sittingbourne area strategy
 Policy ST 6 The Strategy for the Isle of Sheppey area
 Policy ST 7 Our approach to the Faversham area and the Kent Downs

Locations for new development and longer term opportunities

Policy A 1 North West Sittingbourne
 Policy A 2 Land at North East Sittingbourne
 Policy A 3 Land south of Kemsley Mill, Sittingbourne
 Policy A 4 Land at Frogna Lane, Teynham
 Policy A 5 Land to the west of Barton Hill Drive, Minster
 Policy A 6 Land at the Western Link, Faversham
 Policy A 7 The Oare Gravel Workings, Oare Road, Faversham
 Policy A 8 Reserve Employment and Housing Site: Land East of Love Lane, Faversham
 Policy A 9 New smaller allocations as extensions to settlements
 Policy A 10 Land at Cowstead Corner, Queenborough
 Policy A 11 New allocations on sites within existing settlements
 Policy NP 1 Faversham Creek Neighbourhood Plan
 Policy AS 1 Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road - Bapchild section
 Policy AFC 1 The Port of Sheerness and its surroundings
 Policy AFC 2 The Kent Science Park
 Policy AFC 3 Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road

Saved Policy B2 Providing for new employment
 Saved Policy B11 Ridham and Kemsley , Sittingbourne
 Saved Policy B12 East Hall Farm, Sittingbourne (employment)
 Saved Policy B14 New Employment sites
 Saved Policy B16 Standard House and adj land, Faversham
 Saved Policy B17 The Creek Basin, Faversham
 Saved Policy B18 Land and buildings to the west of Selling Road, Faversham
 Saved Policy B19 Land east of Faversham
 Saved Policy B21 Neatscourt, Queenborough, Sheppey
 Saved Policy B22 Land at West Minster, east of Brielle Way Queenborough
 Saved Policy B23 Land at Whiteway Rd and south of West Minster, Queenborough
 Saved Policy MU2 Land at Graveney Rd, Faversham
 Saved Policy B27 Sittingbourne town centre
 Saved Policy H5 Housing allocations
 Saved Policy H7 East Hall Farm, Sittingbourne (housing)
 Saved Policy H8 Thistle Hill, Minster, Sheppey
 Saved Policy H9 Land at Plover Road, Minster
 Saved Policy H10 Stones Farm, Sittingbourne
 Saved Policy C5 Open Space, Stones Farm, Sittingbourne
 Saved Policy C8 Learning hub, Sittingbourne Town Centre
 Saved Policy C9 Four Gun Field, Otterham Quay Lane
 Saved Policy AAP1 Faversham town centre
 Saved Policy AAP2 Faversham Creekside
 Saved Policy AAP4 Sheerness town centre
 Saved Policy AAP6 Queenborough and Rushenden
 Saved Policy MU5 Land south of Queenborough Creek
 Saved Policy MU6 Land north of Queenborough Creek
 Saved Policy AAP7 Sittingbourne Town Centre

Saved Policy MU7 Bell Centre and adjacent land
 Saved Policy AAP8 Land at Milton Creek, Sittingbourne
 Saved Policy AAP9 Iwade

Core planning policies

Policy CP 1 Building a strong, competitive economy
 Policy CP 2 Transport infrastructure
 Policy CP 3 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
 Policy CP 4 Promoting healthy communities
 Policy CP 5 Infrastructure
 Policy CP 6 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment - providing for green infrastructure
 Policy CP 7 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Development management policies

Policy DM 1 Maintaining and enhancing vitality and viability of the town centres
 Policy DM 2 New retail development
 Policy DM 3 The rural economy
 Policy DM 4 New or extensions to existing holiday parks
 Policy DM 5 The occupancy of holiday parks
 Policy DM 6 Managing transport demand and impact
 Policy DM 7 Vehicle parking
 Policy DM 8 Affordable housing
 Policy DM 9 Rural exceptions housing
 Policy DM 10 Gypsy and Traveller sites
 Policy DM 11 Extensions to, and replacement of, dwellings in the rural area
 Policy DM 12 Dwellings for rural workers
 Policy DM 13 Extending the garden of a dwelling in the rural area
 Policy DM 14 General development criteria
 Policy DM 15 Achieving high quality design and distinctiveness
 Policy DM 16 New shopfronts, signs and advertisements
 Policy DM 17 Alterations and extensions
 Policy DM 18 Open space, sports and recreation provision
 Policy DM 19 Local green spaces
 Policy DM 20 Sustainable design and construction
 Policy DM 21 Water, flooding and drainage
 Policy DM 22 The coast
 Policy DM 23 Coastal change management area
 Policy DM 24 Conserving and enhancing valued landscapes
 Policy DM 25 Rural lanes
 Policy DM 26 The Keeping and Grazing of Horses
 Policy DM 27 Biodiversity and geological conservation
 Policy DM 28 Trees and hedges
 Policy DM 29 Enabling development for landscape and biodiversity enhancement
 Policy DM 30 Agricultural land
 Policy DM 31 Development involving listed buildings
 Policy DM 32 Development affecting a conservation area
 Policy DM 33 Scheduled ancient monuments and archaeological sites
 Policy DM 34 Historic parks and gardens
 Policy DM 35 Area of high townscape value

APPENDIX VII APPRAISAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM STAGE 2

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Stage 2 Interim Appraisal	How has this been addressed in the current version of the plan (Stage 3) ?
Air - To reduce air pollution and ensure air quality continues to improve across the Borough	The positive impact on Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) could be further improved by adding an additional bullet point under the principles of sustainability, which emphasises the need to ensure that new development addresses the need to improve air quality within the Borough.	Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) is not part of this latest version of the plan. Instead Policy ST1 (Delivering sustainable development in Swale) sets out how Swale intends to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development required by national policy. Policy ST1 requires all parties and development proposals to commit to applying national policy with respect to pollution. The area based policy for the Sittingbourne area (ST5), where three AQMAs are currently designated, expects development to be consistent with local air quality action plans. For the Faversham area where another AQMA is designated this is not covered in the policy and therefore the current appraisal recommends the inclusion of this.
Biodiversity - To conserve and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment	Within Policy ST4 (Isle of Sheppey), incorporate policy wording that emphasises the importance of protecting key biodiversity assets as part of delivering economic regeneration on the Isle of Sheppey.	Policy ST4 (Isle of Sheppey) now Policy ST6 (Isle of Sheppey) includes at point 9 support for development proposals which establish Sheppey as a focus for achieving net gains in biodiversity both through the appropriate mitigation and compensation of projects within the Borough and further afield. The supporting text for this policy recognises the presence of the international, national and local biodiversity interests of designated areas of the coast and estuarine and these areas needing to be protected and enhanced. It identifies that enhancements would be through compensatory land needed as a result of development in this area.
Crime and Safety - To reduce crime and anti-social behaviour and the fear of these	The need to reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour is not directly addressed within the draft Core Strategy. It is recommended that Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) incorporates a principle relating to 'designing out crime'..	Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) is not part of this latest version of the plan. Instead Policy ST1 (Delivering sustainable development in Swale) sets out how Swale intends to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development required by national policy. Policy ST1 expects development proposals to deliver good design and core policies CP3 (Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes) and CP4 (Promoting healthy communities) aims to create social interaction and safe environment which will minimise the fear of crime
Cultural Heritage - To reinforce local distinctiveness, local environmental quality and amenity through the conservation and enhancement of built and cultural	The positive impact identified for Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) could be further enhanced by clearly identifying the need to protect areas of heritage value (including listed buildings and conservation areas) as part of delivering new development in Swale.	Policy CP1 (Sustainable Development) is not part of this latest version of the plan. Instead Policy ST1 (Delivering sustainable development in Swale) sets out how Swale intends to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development required by national policy. Policy ST1 expects all parties and development proposals to conserve and enhance the historic environment by applying national policy to heritage assets, ensuring all assets are central to

Sustainability topic / objective(s)	Stage 2 Interim Appraisal	How has this been addressed in the current version of the plan (Stage 3) ?
heritage		strategies, plans, policies and development proposals through the identification, assessment and positive integration of the importance, form and character of buildings, features, settlements and historic landscapes.
Landscape - To protect and enhance the valued landscape and townscape of Swale	The Kent Downs AONB is located in close proximity to the M2. It is recommended that the supporting text for Policy AC1 should acknowledge the need to protect the Kent Downs AONB as part of delivering the Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road.	Policy AC1 (Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road) is now renamed policy AFC3 (Sittingbourne Southern Relief Road). The supporting text for this policy now states that as the scheme is likely to have a significant environmental impact, the routes selection and design process by the operators would need to undertake appropriate studies to evaluate these matters.
Water - To manage and reduce the risk of flooding; To maintain and enhance water quality (ground and surface) and make efficient use of water	<p>Within policies ST3 (Sittingbourne) and ST4 (Isle of Sheppey), incorporate policy wording that emphasises the importance of avoiding inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding in Sittingbourne and on the Isle of Sheppey.</p> <p>Neither the supporting text nor the policy wording for SA1, SA2 or SA3 provide a reference to the need to improve waste water treatment facilities in Sittingbourne or Teynham as part of delivering new development. These policies would be improved by such a reference.</p>	<p>Policy ST4 (Isle of Sheppey) now Policy ST6 (Isle of Sheppey) states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals which are appropriate to the level of risk from climate change, flooding and coastal change. For policy ST3 now policy ST5 (The Sittingbourne area strategy) policy wording that emphasises the importance of new development addressing the risks of flooding is not included and this is a recommendation of the appraisal of the current plan.</p> <p>Policy A4 (Land at Frogmal Lane, Teynham) sets out that the development brief and planning applications at this site ensure waste water connections at points that are adequate in their capacity. Policies relating to Sittingbourne sites do not provide a reference to this need for improvement. It is understood that Southern Water has not confirmed to the Council the need for improvements at Sittingbourne. Policy DM10 (Water, flood and drainage) expects proposals to demonstrate there is or will be adequate wastewater connections and treatment facilities in place before construction commences and that these details have been approved by the appropriate water company</p>

APPENDIX VIII BROAD IMPLICATIONS OF PREFERRED LOCATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The following table considers the broad implications of the preferred locations for development, which include all new and saved local plan 2008 allocations, against each sustainability topic **and has been prepared by the Council's planning officers**. It is understood the appraisal has been mainly drawn from information held on each site in the Swale Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2011/12) and Employment Land Review (2010).

↗	Positive implications
↔	No/neutral implications

↘	Negative implications
?	Unclear implications

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Policy A1	↔	↗	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↗	This substantial greenfield site comprises high quality agricultural land, but is visually well contained by existing development and the A249. The site is well located, close to employment options and adjacent to a rail station. The development will bring forward new schools, employment, housing and considerable amounts of greenspace and has potential to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and improvements to health. There is some risk of fluvial flooding on part of the site, but this is appropriately addressed within the policy. Development of this site offers significant opportunities for the use of sustainable energy production and carbon reduction measures.
Policy A2	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↔	This substantial greenfield site has potential to bring forward a considerable level of new jobs, alongside a further phase of development adjacent the existing East Hall Farm housing area. It is a greenfield site, some of which is likely to be high quality agricultural land. The employment elements of the proposals are already subject to a resolution to grant planning permission. Although a considerable extension into open countryside, the proposals include considerable amounts of greenspace where there is the potential to both mitigate visual impacts upon the nearby local landscape designation and achieve a net gain in biodiversity and improvements to health. The site is close to an SPA and whilst the housing proposals would require an Appropriate Assessment, the amount of open space offers considerable potential to be able limit wider impacts. The proposals are also able to facilitate new transport infrastructure.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Policy A3	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↔	↘	↗	?	↔	A modest greenfield extension of an existing employment area, the site nevertheless occupies a prominent location above the Milton Creek Country Park. The policy requires visual impacts to be minimised, whilst the development is expected to provide a substantial expansion of the country park which should secure landscape, biodiversity and heritage benefits as well as securing greater public access and encourage improvements to heath. The site is well located close to transport infrastructure and local labour supplies and will ultimately make a good contribution toward the provision of local jobs.
Policy A4	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↔	This substantial greenfield site comprises high quality agricultural land, but is visually well contained by existing development. It will bring forward increased housing and employment opportunities. Land to the west (comprising the access road) is less well contained, but the policy requires a considerable area of land around it to be made available for landscaping and open space which should lead to overall enhancements. The site is well located close to existing housing and employment options and close to transport options including rail. The development will facilitate improvements to health and education in the village and is close to a variety of local services. It will also secure the village's existing sports pitches. There is potential for additional traffic using the A2 corridor, however, the policy makes appropriate provision for these matters to be taken into account.
Policy A5	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↔	Although a substantial greenfield site, its agricultural land quality is likely to be variable. The site would bring forward a significant number of houses. However, there are potential negative visual/landscape impacts due to the site's topography. The policy seeks considerable levels of landscaping both on an off-site and given the existing open character of the land there is the potential for both landscape and biodiversity enhancements and opportunities to improve health. Existing heritage and biodiversity assets are also appropriately safeguarded by the policy. The main constraint is its Lower Road access to the A249; however, the policy requires improvements to this section of the road to improve peak time congestion.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Policy A6	?	↗	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	<p>This site brings forward housing. The site is well contained by existing development and the Western Link road. The site has been previously used, although much has been vegetated to the point that parts may not comprise previously developed land. Given this, the policy appropriately requires the site to achieve a net gain in biodiversity; however, further work is needed to demonstrate that this can be achieved. This again is highlighted by the policy. At the existing brickworks, development has the potential to improve the visual appearance of the area and the development is potentially positive for the existing deprived community, provided it's design approach is such that it alters perceptions of the local housing market here. There are opportunities for the improvements of health through the introduction of open space and pedestrian and cycling links. There are potential adverse traffic and air quality issues on the A2 at Ospringe, but these are appropriately highlighted by the policy as needing to be addressed.</p>
Policy A7	?	?	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↗	↗	↗	↔	?	↗	<p>This site is located north west of Faversham close to Oare Village and proposed for employment uses with some enabling housing development. Localised road improvements would be needed to connect it to the town. It is located adjacent to the Swale Special Protection Area and the site itself has local ecological value. Recreational pressure is a potential issue here without appropriate management. Heritage assets associated with the site's former uses are located on the site. Given its size it does have potential to deliver significant enhancement for biodiversity and heritage. The site is located in an area liable to flooding. A detailed survey has been undertaken and this states the south east portion of the site would be able to be made safe with respect to flood risk and therefore it is likely that the developed area could be above flood levels. The northern part of the site is highly sensitive to landscape change. Detailed landscape evaluation of this site suggests some development could take place in the south east area of the site although there could be wider visual impacts from views from the north, north east and west.</p>

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Policy A8	↔	?	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↔	Development would be relatively well contained visually and is well located to the strategic road network and Faversham town centre. Development would require an access point on to the A2. The development of the site would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. There are no heritage assets located within or close to the site and the site is outside Environment Agency flood zones 2 and 3.
Policy A9*	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↗	↗	↘	↔	?	↔	In combination these sites comprise a mix of small to modest sized greenfield urban extensions either using unused agricultural land of varying quality (lower on the Isle of Sheppey, higher at Sittingbourne). The sites are generally well contained visually and the policy appropriately highlights such issues and landscape and settlement gap mitigation. One site, at Queenborough, is noted as being next to the SPA and an Appropriate Assessment is highlighted as being required to address issues. However, the site is modest in size and is likely to be able to utilise the recreational facilities being put in place in adjacent Queenborough-Rushenden regeneration area.
Policy A10	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↘	↔	?	↔	A modest rounding off of an existing employment allocation and although greenfield and currently designated a local landscape area, the soil quality is low and the landscape quality judged to be degraded by the recent construction of the employment area and the A249. The site has some modest potential for job creation and is well located in relation to transport infrastructure and the local populations.
Policy A11**	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	?	↔	↗	↔	?	↗	↗	↔	?	↔	In combination, these sites mostly involve the development of previously developed land, including sites either formally or currently in employment use. There may be some negative effects arising from the loss of the employment sites, however, this is largely unknown as the site's themselves are judged no longer suitable to meet modern employment needs. The sites are well located close to local facilities and transport choices. As appropriate, the policy appropriately highlights where contamination, biodiversity and other issues need to be addressed.
Policy NP1	↔	?	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	?	?	Although the detail of development is subject to the neighbourhood planning process, the creek is sustainably located close to Faversham town centre and its amenities and has the potential to deliver new jobs, homes and other facilities within a high quality environment encouraging health improvements. Flood risk and heritage issues are appropriately highlighted by the policy.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Policy AS1	↗	?	↔	↔	?	↔	↔	↔	✓	↗	↔	✓	↗	?	↔	Although the detailed route for the road is subject to a future process, the search area potentially impacts upon soil, landscape and heritage resources. However, the policy appropriately highlights the need for environmental issues to be addressed, including the potential for adverse transport impacts elsewhere on the A2 corridor. Completion of the road to the A2 also has the potential for positive impacts within Sittingbourne town centre and for communities affected by its traffic levels and associated air quality.
Policy AFC1	↔	?	?	↔	?	↗	?	?	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	?	↔	Although not part of the Local Plan strategy, the policy appropriately highlights the issues needing to be addressed in order that a balance between the economic benefits of the proposals and any environmental impacts can be judged in future.
Policy AFC2	?	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	?	↔	↗	↔	✓	↗	?	↔	Although not part of the Local Plan strategy, the policy appropriately highlights the issues needing to be addressed in order that a balance between the economic benefits of the proposals and any environmental impacts can be judged in future.
Policy AFC3	↗	?	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	✓	↗	↔	✓	?	?	↔	Although not part of the Local Plan strategy, the supporting text appropriately highlights the issues needing to be addressed.
Saved Policy B11	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	✓	✓	?	↔	This site is a mix of derelict and despoiled land with existing uses, although there is some greenfield land. Much of the site is already developed, leaving some greenfield land still available. The site is well located to the trunk road network and is strongly supportive of the Borough's economic strengths. An outline planning permission is in place for the whole site and a development brief which addresses key issues, including its location next to the SPA.
Saved Policy B12	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	✓	↗	?	↔	An outline planning permission is already in place for this employment site and most of it is now complete. As a result the sustainability implications of the proposal are limited to the remaining plots needing to be developed. In this regard a development brief is already in place to deal with any issues.
Saved Policy B16	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↔	?	↔	This allocation has yet to be implemented and is broadly positive due to its potential to deliver jobs and restore an unused heritage asset on a brownfield site in an accessible location. Constraints, including those from flooding, are appropriately highlighted by the policy. This allocation is to be reviewed by the proposed neighbourhood plan at Policy NP1.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy B17	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↔	?	↔	This allocation has yet to be implemented and is broadly positive due to its potential to deliver jobs and restore an unused heritage asset on a brownfield site in an accessible location. Constraints, including those from flooding, are appropriately highlighted by the policy. This allocation is to be reviewed by the proposed neighbourhood plan at Policy NP1.
Saved Policy B18	↔	?	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↔	?	↔	This allocation has yet to be implemented and is broadly positive due to its potential to deliver jobs and restore unused heritage assets on brownfield land. The site is reasonably well located close to Faversham town centre and the railway station. The site's heritage constraints and its highway access are appropriately highlighted by the policy. The potential impacts on biodiversity are not highlighted by the policy, although it seems likely that these could be addressed at the planning application stage.
Saved Policy B19	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↘	↔	?	↔	The site is in an established employment location close to the primary road network and has the potential to perform well economically. The site is greenfield and likely to be of high quality agricultural land, but will be visually well contained provided that the levels of the site are utilised appropriately.
Saved Policy B21	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↘	↗	↔	↘	↗	?	↔	A major employment allocation on greenfield site, some of which was grazing marsh. The site has an outline planning permission and aspects of it have been or are being implemented. The sustainability issues have therefore largely already been considered although it is noted that the loss of grazing marsh has been compensated via habitat creation elsewhere on Sheppey. Once implemented the site should present a well located opportunity to create considerable numbers of jobs contributing positively to the economic position of the Island as a whole.
Saved Policy B22	↔	?	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↔	↔	?	↔	The development of this mostly brownfield site well located next to the trunk road should have positive economic effects and improve the overall appearance of the site. A small portion of the site is designated for local biodiversity importance. The policy does not refer to this.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy B23	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↘	↔	?	↔	The policy is positive in terms of its ability to create jobs on Sheppey in a location highly accessible to the trunk road. The site itself is sensitively located in terms of landscape and biodiversity and the policy details the exceptional nature of development and the steps taken in 2002 to address the biodiversity interest of the site, including a mitigation and compensation scheme. An agreed development brief considers the issues. The policy also ensures that the site cannot be used for general employment use which is not judged to be sufficiently overriding of the biodiversity interest. Although the policy therefore contains the necessary safeguards, these were based on the situation in 2002.
Saved Policy MU2	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	This brownfield site is proposed for mixed use development, intended to secure the viability of an existing employment use on the site. Since the policy was adopted, the company in question has ceased to trade, but the policy remains in place to highlight the specific circumstances of allowing residential use on the site and to serve to emphasise that the principle applied to the former company does not apply to others. As a well located site close to the transport network and town centre future development would perform well against sustainability criteria, although there are likely to be development pressures for housing which would perform poorly against economic criteria. As a site within the existing urban framework, it is open to the Council to consider applications for this site on a 'windfall' basis.
Saved Policy B27	?	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	↔	This is a well located previously developed site with the strong potential to deliver retail jobs, environmental uplift and regeneration in central Sittingbourne. The site performs well against sustainability criteria, based upon the need to link the site with the existing town centre and the implementation of the proposed bridge across the railway (with outline planning permission). Within the policy and its associated Supplementary Planning Document there are appropriate safeguards to deal with such issues as transport and associated improvements. However, it is noted that the developer involved with the site no longer intends to pursue a retail led option and as such the Council is considering whether it should revise its approach through its draft Local Plan. Although the Supplementary Planning Document is flexible concerning the area, the saved policy allocation is quite specific and the Council will need to consider, following its consultations, whether a change in its approach for the site will require a new allocation.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy H5	↔	?	↔	↗	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↔	?	↔	The main sites in this collective allocation policy are appraised separately elsewhere. However, the policy includes reference to a large number of sites allocated within the urban areas of the Borough, mostly on previously developed sites in locations close to facilities and public transport options. Whilst a good number of the sites have been implemented, for those remaining, the appendix appropriately highlights the issues to be addressed, such as flood risk and affordable housing and many of the sites offer opportunities for improving cultural heritage and reducing crime.
Saved Policy H7	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↗	?	↔	This greenfield site is largely built out and as such it is considered that the sustainability implications for the site have already been addressed.
Saved Policy H8	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↔	?	↔	This greenfield site is largely built out and as such it is considered that the sustainability implications for the site have already largely been addressed. It is clear however that yields from the site have been successively increased. These will deliver additional housing which will be positive in terms of population, but could result in local highway impacts. However, such concerns are appropriately addressed by the policy. Caveats to ensure that development takes place in association with employment development have been met.
Saved Policy H9	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↔	?	↔	This greenfield site is now contained within the urban area by the development of the adjacent Thistle Hill site. It is well located close to existing and emerging local facilities. Caveats to ensure that development takes place in association with employment development have been met.
Saved Policy H10	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↔	?	↔	This greenfield site is on high quality agricultural land and has potential for adverse landscape/visual impacts. However, these impacts have been minimised through the preparation and adoption of a development brief which should bring forward landscape and biodiversity enhancements through the creation of new open space within and adjacent the site (see saved policy C9). The site is relatively well located close to existing services and transport options on the A2
Saved Policy C5	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↔	↗	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	↔	?	↔	This policy brings forward a considerable area of open space to serve the existing and adjacent new development. It has the potential to bring forward landscape and biodiversity enhancements.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy C8	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	↔	↗	↔	↔	↔	?	↔	The site is centrally located within the heart of Sittingbourne town centre and has the significant potential to support the economy through improved opportunities for learning and skills. It also offers a opportunity to significantly improve the setting of nearby heritage assets, including Sittingbourne High Street conservation area.
Saved Policy C9	↗	↗	↔	↔	↔	↘	↗	↔	↗	↘	↔	↗	↔	?	↔	The policy is likely to be superseded shortly by the resolution to grant planning permission for residential development on the site, thus, the sustainability issues raised by this policy do not require consideration.
Saved Policy AAP1	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	↔	By encouraging a strong and diverse economy and a wide range of uses, the policy should assist in ensuring the continued health, vitality, viability and sustainability of Faversham town centre in recognition of its historic character and role.
Saved Policy AAP2	↔	?	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	?	↘	The policy will be superseded upon adoption of the creek neighbourhood plan (Policy NP1). In the meantime, the policy should seek to ensure that the creek continues to function as a place of special interest with strong associations with the water. The policy appropriately highlights the area's strong heritage interest and the need to safeguard the biodiversity interest of neighbouring designated sites. Although addressed by other policies, the issue of flood risk is not specifically addressed by the policy; this will be addressed by the developing neighbourhood plan in any event.
Saved Policy AAP4	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	↔	By looking to retain and consolidate Sheerness town centre's retail and service role, the policy should assist in ensuring its improving health, the cultural heritage of the area and create jobs.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy AAP6	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	The policy provides the framework for the mixed use regeneration of Queenborough-Rushenden. By utilising brownfield sites within a deprived community, the proposals present the opportunity to provide considerable benefits in terms of new jobs, housing and community facilities perform positively across a range of indicators, including cultural heritage. Additionally, appropriate measures are in place within the policy to address potential impacts upon neighbouring wildlife designations (mitigation and compensation already on-going). Parts of the regeneration area are already being implemented with new highway infrastructure and retrofitting of energy conservation measures in an existing neighbourhood. Overall, development here would have a positive effect upon the achievement of sustainability objectives, with this performance reinforced by the adoption of an overall Masterplan for the area endorsed by Borough Council and the Homes and Communities Agency.
Saved Policy MU5	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	As per Policy AAP6.
Saved Policy MU6	↔	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	↗	↗	↗	?	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	As per Policy AAP6. There is some uncertainty in respect of local employment issues and development could potentially displace existing businesses at the Creekside. Although the policy supports mixed use development it does not specifically refer to the need to address existing businesses. However, the supporting text looks for early consideration of this issue, whilst it is understood that the Masterplan also includes provision for this to be examined. The policy encourages mitigation of climate change issues by recommending innovative design including green measures. The policy also recognises the need to improve health, air quality and improve cultural heritage and encourages the provision of open space, landscaping and improvements to wildlife habitats
Saved Policy AAP7	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↔	↗	?	↔	This policy positively supports Sittingbourne town centre's position as a retail, business, cultural, community, education and civic centre by ensuring its vitality and viability and supporting the expansion of its retail and leisure offer. This approach is reinforced by the adoption of a town centre Masterplan by the Council which provides for a variety of development opportunities around the town centre, including new housing and improvements to public transport facilities. The Council is reviewing the recent decision by a major land owner not to pursue their proposals for the area.

SA Topic Policy	Air	Biodiversity	Climate change	Crime and safety	Cultural heritage	Employment and skills	Health	Housing	Landscape	Economy	Population	Soil	Transport	Waste	Water	Commentary
Saved Policy MU7	↔	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	These proposals are the subject of a planning permission and thus the sustainability implications of this policy have already been considered.
Saved Policy AAP8	↔	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	?	↔	This policy identified a large 75 ha regeneration area around the derelict Milton Creek area. The policy by encouraging a range of mixed uses, including retail and housing, has considerable potential to perform strongly in terms of achieving sustainability objectives. This performance is further strengthened by the adoption of a Masterplan for the area by the Council. There is potential for ecological and landscape enhancements around Milton Creek improving the cultural heritage of the area and whilst part of the area is subject to tidal flooding, the policy appropriately highlights this as an issue needing to be addressed.
Saved Policy AAP9	↔	↗	↔	↔	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘	↘	?	↔	This policy addresses the on-going expansion of the village of Iwade. Development envisaged by this policy already has the benefit of planning permission and as such the sustainability implications of it have already been considered. The Council is reviewing the recent decision by a major land owner not to pursue their proposals for the area.
Notes	<p>* Policy A9 covers a range of sites allocated for housing development at the edge of existing settlements. Whilst the sites share some similar issues, some have individual issues that need special consideration. For the purposes of the matrix above, the sites have been considered collectively. However, it should be noted that the following sites have the possibility of securing a net gain in biodiversity: Cryalls Lane, North of Key Street and Mayfield. In respect of soil quality, although collectively there would be no impact, individually the following sites have existing contamination issues that would be cleaned up as part of a development: Transit Works and HBC Engineering Sites, Ham Road and Barrow Green. In terms of transport and accessibility, the sites collectively would not result in a significant impact. However, the following sites may have more negative transport and accessibility issues: Land at Belgrave Road, Scocles Court, Colonels Lane, Bull Lane and Barrow Green.</p> <p>** Policy A11 also covers a range of sites, although these provide housing allocations within existing settlements. However, it should be noted that the following sites could potentially impact on biodiversity: Bysingwood Primary School, Minster Academy and Minster Road. Orbital and Minster Road could impact upon transport and accessibility.</p> <p>*** Saved Policy H5 covers a large number of sites. Some of these sites are assessed in terms of sustainability individually elsewhere within this matrix. Those that have already been assessed have not been considered as part of the assessment for Saved Policy H5.</p>															