SUMMARY OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS

This table synthesises the key findings of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report and identifies the most sustainable option and any potential mitigation measures.

Climate Change: Energy Efficiency Targets

Option 1: Rely on Building Regulations	Options 2 and 3 both score well in terms of sustainability, with Option 2 being identified as being more effective in the short term. However, after 2013, energy efficiency requirements under the Building Regulation might exceed those required under Code Level 3, therefore Option 3 may be more beneficial in the longer term.	Option 2 or Option 3
Option 2: Seek to achieve Code Level 3		
Option 3: Seek to achieve Code Level 4		

Climate Change: Energy Efficiency by Design

Option 1: Kent Design SPD only	Option 2 is identified as being slightly more sustainable than Option 1 and would reinforce one aspect of sustainable design already addressed in Kent Design.	Option 2
Option 2: Kent Design SPD + MDE Policy		

Climate Change: Renewable Energy on-site

Option 1: Policy CP1.4 only	Option 1 achieves a higher sustainability score than Option 2 as no thresholds mean that the option could theoretically apply to all development. The threshold in Option 2 has the potential to apply to a much reduced proportion of development, thereby reducing the beneficial impacts.	Option 1
Option 2: Policy CP1.4 + MDE Policy		

Mitigation – Reduce size thresholds to capture renewable energy on an increased proportion of developments.

Climate Change: Micro Domestic Installations

Option 1: Generally encouraging MDE Policy	Option 2 is identified as being more sustainable than Option 1, however if too restrictive, it may prevent renewable energy developments coming forward.	Option 2

Annex E

Option 2: MDE Policy + requirement to protect local character		

Climate Change: Waste Minimisation

Option 1: Policy CP1.4 + Kent Design SPD	Options 1 and 2 both score well, however Option 2 is likely to have more certain benefits than Option 1, although it is questionable whether re-use of construction materials will be appropriate in all cases.	Option 2
Option 2: MDE Policy to require new developments to minimise waste		

Climate Change: Sustainable Drainage

Option 1: Policies CP1 & CP10 only	Option 2 is likely to have more beneficial impacts in the short term than Option 1, but as building regulations tighten up, the gap between the two options may reduce.	Option 2
Option 2: MDE Policy on SUDS		

Climate Change: Water Efficiency

Option 1: Policy CP1 + Kent Design SPD only	Option 2 is identified as the most sustainable option as a mandatory standard may prove easier to enforce and therefore achieve more certain benefits. However, Option 2 may become obsolete in the medium to longer term as building regulations tighten up, sustainable code ratings become mandatory and sustainable construction techniques become more mainstream.	Option 2
Option 2: MDE Policy to achieve water efficiency equivalent to Code Level 4		

Climate Change: New Water Resources

Option 1: MDE Policy on water storage	This option has significant potential benefits in reducing pressure on summer water supplies whilst controlling flood water and has the potential to benefit water quality in rivers and biodiversity. This option's success is highly dependent on achieving strong partnerships with landowners and environmental bodies.	Option 1

Climate Change: Reducing Solar Gain

Option 1: PPS1 only	Option 1 and Option 2 both score well in terms of sustainability and this will become more of an issue as summer maximum temperatures rise. However, Option 2 is likely to achieve greater benefits more quickly.	Option 2
Option 2: MDE Policy to require designs to maximise cooling		

Mitigation – To mitigate against negative impact, other policies would need to complement this option to ensure winter heating is energy efficiency and/or uses alternative energy sources.

Development in the Countryside

Option 1: PPS7, South East Plan, Policies CP14 and CP24 only	Option 2 is identified as being the most sustainable option as the greater policy precision would strengthen the beneficial impacts. Local policies based on character areas would encourage planning decisions to take account of the special features of the areas.	Option 2
Option 2: Locally distinctive area based policies		

Natural Environment

Option 1: Protect all RIGs and LWS sites	Option 4 is identified as being the most sustainable option as the multi-functional nature of the identified spaces would allow more sustainability objectives to be delivered. By combining this with Option 5, this would ensure that biodiversity is taken into account in all developments.	Option 4 and Option 5
Option 2: Option 1 + protect all ancient woodland sites		
Option 3: Option 2 + identify areas/sites for habitat creation		
Option 4: Option 3 + identify areas/sites for multifunctional greenspaces		
Option 5: MDE policy requiring developments to assess biodiversity opportunities		

Local Character: Landscape and Townscape

Option 1: Protect and enhance existing areas	All three options are likely to have beneficial impacts, however Option 2 is identified as being the most sustainable. Borough-wide character area based policies could have a significant beneficial impact on a range of sustainability objectives.	Option 2
Option 2: Comprehensively identify urban and rural character areas		
Option 3: Identify urban character areas		

Local Character: Quality of Life

Option 1:Existing policies only	Both options score well in sustainability terms, however Option 2 would have potentially greater benefits as it focuses on areas and issues which are important locally.	Option 2
Option 2: Criteria based MDE policies		

Historic Environment

Option 1: Protect and enhance designated sites	All three options would have beneficial impacts, however Option 3 is the most sustainable as it is more comprehensive than the other options, if likely to have more beneficial impacts on a wider range of sustainability objectives.	Option 3
Option 2: Develop policies to protect Historic Parks and Gardens		
Option 3: Comprehensively identify character areas		

Open Space: High Quality/ High Value

Option 1: MDE Policy protecting high quality/high value sites	Protecting existing high quality, high value open spaces will have a beneficial impact on a range of sustainability objectives. However as it does not improve upon the current situation, these impacts may be limited.	Option 1

Open Space: Areas of Deficiency

Option 1: Replacement of open space lost to development	Difficult to assess the precise impacts but it is broadly sustainable.	Option 1

Mitigation - A greater beneficial impact could be achieved if the replacement space was clearly required by the option to be accessible to the area of deficiency.

Open Space: Low Quality/High Value

Option 1: Policy protecting and enhancing low quality/high value sites	Difficult to assess the precise impacts but it is broadly sustainable however it is likely to have some beneficial impacts on health, accessibility to recreation provision and pollution.	Option 1

Open Space: Low Quality/Low Value

Option 1: Policy promoting enhancement of low quality/low value sites in areas of deficiency	Option 1 is the more sustainable option as increasing the quality and usage of open space may bring significant social benefits in terms of health, community and reducing deprivation. However increasing usage may have a negative impact on biodiversity.	Option 1
Option 2: Release low quality/low value sites in areas with no deficiency		

Open Space: Local Standards

Option 1: Local Standards	The application of standards designed to meet local needs will have significant benefits on a range of sustainability objectives.	Option 1

Open Space: In new Developments

Option 1: PPG17 flow diagram	Requiring this methodology to be followed ensures that new open space meets local needs and is accessible. It is likely to have a beneficial impact on a range of sustainability objectives.	Option 1

Open Space: Networks

Option 1: Policy linking new open space to the existing network	This option is broadly sustainable but the benefits would be more certain if the option required the multifunctional potential of these open spaces to be maximised. This option addresses issues raised in Theme 3.	Option 1

Open Space: Accessibility

Option 1: New open space and existing network to be accessible.	Requiring new open space to be accessible where possible will have a significant benefit on a range of sustainability objectives.	Option 1

Open Space: Safety

Option 1: Policy requiring open space to be designed to minimise risk of crime	Minimising the risk of crime is already a requirement of Core Strategy Policy CP1.7.Formalising the necessity for developers and land owners to consider and address the issue of safety in open spaces would draw attention to this issue and consequently is likely to generate significant beneficial impacts on a range of sustainability objectives.	Option 1

Open Space: Urban Rural Fringe

Option 1: Maintain and enhance urban rural fringe	This option could have beneficial impacts on a range of sustainability objectives. These benefits could be significant but this would depend on successful partnership working with landowners and other groups.	Option 1