


Thanet District Council
Local Plan - Issues and Options
Summary Interim Sustainability
Appraisal Report

Rev A | 30 May 2013



This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 228764

Ove Arup & Partners Ltd
Admiral House Rose Wharf
78 East Street
Leeds LS9 8EE
United Kingdom
www.arup.com

ARUP

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction	1
2 SA Objectives and Assessment Criteria	2
2.1 Significance criteria.	4
2.2 Timeframe for impacts.	5
3 Issue 1 –level of employment to be planned for	6
3.1 Growth policy options	6
3.2 Airport employment growth options	7
4 Issue 2 - How much employment land is needed and where	9
4.1 Determining the amount of land required	9
4.2 Type and location of land	10
4.3 Continue to develop existing employment sites	12
5 Issue 3 – How can we promote our economic infrastructure assets	13
5.1 Airport	13
5.2 Port	14
5.3 Rail Infrastructure	15
6 Issue 4 - How can we support communications infrastructure and home working	17
6.1 Communications Infrastructure	17
6.2 Home working	18
6.3 Work hubs	19
7 Issue 5 – How should Thanet’s town centres develop?	21
7.1 Role of town centres	21
7.2 Accommodating town centre development needs	22
7.3 Use of vacant premises	24
7.4 Westwood	25
7.5 Broadstairs	26
7.6 District, Local and Town centre development out of centres	27
8 Issue 6 Supporting the Rural Economy	29
8.1 Farm Diversification	29
8.2 Location of rural economic development	30
8.3 Village shops and services	31
8.4 Best and most versatile agricultural land	32
8.5 Agricultural related development and dwellings	33

9	Issue 7 How to support the visitor economy	35
9.1	Hotel development	35
9.2	Caravan and self-catering accommodation	36
9.3	Provision of tourist facilities	37
9.5	Language Schools	40
9.6	Amusement uses	41
9.7	Protection of beaches	42
10	Issue 8: how many homes do we need to provide?	44
10.1	Demographics and housing growth	44
11	Issue 9 - where should our new homes be provided	47
11.1	Emphasis on previously developed land	47
11.2	How greenfield element should be accommodated	49
11.3	Where greenfield element should be accommodated	51
12	Issue 10 – What types of new homes do we need to provide?	53
12.1	Proportions of market and affordable housing	53
12.2	Affordable housing	54
12.3	HMO/Student accommodation	57
12.4	Gypsies and travellers	59
13	Issue 11 How do we maintain a physical separation of open countryside between the Thanet Towns and prevent urban sprawl (Green Wedges and Countryside)	61
14	Issue 12 – How do we ensure that new development respects Thanet’s important and valued views and landscapes?	63
14.1	Emphasis on previously developed land	63
15	Issue 13: How do we protect, maintain and enhance the District’s Green Infrastructure to better support wildlife and human health	65
16	Issue 14 – How can we adapt to, and mitigate against the effects of Climate Change	68
16.1	Climate Change Adaptation	68
16.2	Climate Change Mitigation	69
17	Issue 15 - Maintain a safe and healthy environment	72
17.1	Control Polluting Development	72
17.2	Development on contaminated land	72
17.3	Development on unstable and derelict land	73
17.4	Air quality	73
17.5	Noise	74
17.6	Light pollution	74
17.7	Groundwater	75

18	Issue 16 - How can we provide high quality homes and neighbourhoods? (Quality Development)	76
18.1	Amenity value and character	76
18.2	Movement and access in new development	77
18.3	Open space and greenspace	77
18.4	Crime prevention and contributing towards public art	78
18.5	Other policy issues	79
18.6	Areas of High Townscape Value	80
18.7	Housing Density	80
18.8	Garden Land Development	81
20	Issue 17 – How do we protect and enhance Thanet’s Heritage Assets and their setting?	83
20.1	Designated heritage assets	83
20.2	Protecting assets and criteria based policies	84
21	Issue 18 Communities	86
21.1	Communities	86

1 Introduction

This document is an Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report. It has been produced to accompany the consultation on the issues and options for the Local Plan for Thanet. It summarises the results from the SA of the different policy options that the Council have identified following the preparation of various ‘topic papers’ that review the evidence base for the district and identify issues that Local Plan will have to respond to over its lifetime.

At this stage in the development of the Local Plan the purpose of the SA Report is to provide consultees with an understanding of the potential effects of the options and allow their effects to be compared. This will allow consultees to be better informed about the potential effects of different options when they respond to this consultation. The results from the SA will also be used by the Council, following the consultation on the options, to also inform their selection of preferred policy options to address the various issues highlighted by the Topic Papers.

The remainder of this report:

- Describes the criteria used for the assessment and what the SA compares the options with in order to make assessment (chapter 2); and
- Describes the results of the SA of the options themselves (chapter 3 onwards).

2 SA Objectives and Assessment Criteria

The plan objectives and options are all assessed against a suite of SA Objectives and criteria. These have been developed following a review of baseline data that characterises the current, historic and potentially future condition of the District without implementation of the plan. These have been documented in a Scoping Report that was issued for consultation in April 2013.

The SA objectives and decision making criteria are listed in the table below.

SA Objective	Decision Making Criteria – will the policy?
1. To provide a sustainable supply of housing including an appropriate mix of types and tenures to reflect demand.	Supply an appropriate quantity of housing to satisfy demand? Supply an appropriate mix of types and tenures of properties in relation to the respective levels of demand? Supply 30% of new homes as affordable homes? Reduce the prevalence of unfit and derelict dwellings within the housing stock?
2. To maintain appropriate healthcare provision and access to healthcare facilities for all sectors of society.	Ensure people are adequately served by key healthcare facilities, regardless of socio-economic status?
3. To provide access to appropriate educational facilities for all sectors of society including focus on training vulnerable and welfare dependant workers with skills necessary to ensure year round employment.	Improve educational levels of the population of working age? Improve access to educational facilities for vulnerable and welfare dependant workers?
4. To increase public safety and reduce crime and fear of crime.	Reduce levels of burglaries, violent offences and vehicle crime? Reduce public perceptions and fear of crime?
5. To provide a sustainable public transport network that allows access to key facilities, services and employment opportunities without reliance on private vehicles.	Improve public transport links to key facilities for existing development? Ensure new development is appropriately serviced by public transport to enable access to key facilities?
6. To provide appropriate key facilities to support vulnerable people and reduce the level of deprivation identified across the wards.	Reduce the proportion of people living in deprived areas. Ensure new residential development is within a reasonable travel distance from key facilities. Ensure existing residences are adequately served by key facilities. Ensure vulnerable people within the community are adequately served by key facilities.
7. To create vibrant balanced communities where residents feel a 'sense of place' and individual contribution is valued.	Result in communities where residents are satisfied with their local area as a place to live? Result in harmonious and mixed communities?
8. To provide access to employment opportunities for all sectors of society ensuring that everyone who wants to work has the opportunity to secure appropriate paid employment.	Increase levels of employment in the population of working age? Reduce the proportion of people on unemployment benefits?
9. To ensure the sustainable development of the proposed economic growth and encourage employment	Increase the GVA per capita of the district's population? Encourage sustainable development of key sites across the district likely to stimulate economic growth?

SA Objective	Decision Making Criteria – will the policy?
development at key sites within the District to support priority regeneration areas.	Encourage sustainable development of key services and facilities across the district likely to stimulate economic growth? Deliver industrial and employment development in regeneration areas? Deliver industrial and employment development that reduces unemployment in deprived areas?
10. To protect and enhance the areas natural, semi-natural and street scene to support the tourist economy.	Encourage development that will boost the tourism sector? Protect and enhance natural, semi-natural and built assets that support the tourist economy?
11. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings, including reuse of materials from buildings, and encourage urban renaissance.	Encourage locating development on previously developed land, avoiding Greenfield sites? Encourage an appropriate density and mix of development that reflects the needs of the population? Encourage the redevelopment of derelict land and properties, returning them to appropriate uses?
12. To ensure that a sustainable pattern of development is pursued.	Promote development in sustainable locations that limits the need to travel to key facilities and services?
13. To conserve and enhance the character and quality of the area's landscape and townscape particularly associated with town centres and coastal areas.	Improve landscape quality and the character of open spaces and the public realm? Protect and/or enhance the character and appearance of the District's townscape and countryside?
14. To preserve and enhance sites, features and areas of historic archaeological or architectural importance, and their settings.	Preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, listed buildings, scheduled monuments and other features of cultural, historical or archaeological value and their setting? Ensure that development is sensitive towards the local environment? Support the restoration and re-use of existing buildings
15. To improve air quality in the District's Air Quality Management Areas.	Encourage improvement in air quality within Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs)?
16. To provide a sustainable public transport network that allows access to key facilities, services and employment opportunities without reliance on private vehicles. (also included as social and economic objective)	Promote a sustainable public transport network that reduces reliance on private vehicles?
17. To develop key sustainable transport links between Thanet and the wider Kent region and beyond, including road, rail and air.	Improve transport links to key facilities within the district? Reduce reliance on private vehicles Support the development of key transport links between Thanet and the wider south East?
18. To reduce waste generation and disposal and achieve the sustainable management of waste	Promote adherence to movement up the waste hierarchy? Promote reduced household waste generation rates? Promote increased waste recovery and recycling?
19. To ensure development within the District responds to the challenges associated with climate change.	Promote a proactive reduction in the volume of greenhouse gas emissions released by development across the District?
20. To ensure appropriate development control procedures in place to manage the risks of coastal erosion, coastal and	Restrict the development of property in areas of flood risk? Reduce areas available for flood storage? Ensure adequate measures are in place to manage existing

SA Objective	Decision Making Criteria – will the policy?
fluvial flood risk, in accordance with the NPPF.	flood risk? Ensure that development does not increase flood risk due to run-off? Ensure development is appropriately future proof to accommodate future levels of flood risk?
21. To conserve and enhance biodiversity.	Provide opportunities to develop or enhance new and existing wildlife and geological sites? Avoid destruction of important habitats or unique geological features? Avoid damage to designated wildlife and geological sites, protected species and their habitats? Support key objectives of the biodiversity action plan (BAP)? Support existing and /or contribute towards the creation of multifunctional green infrastructure? Support existing and/or create new green networks? Support the delivery of ecosystem services?
22.To protect and improve the quality and quantity of ground, fluvial and coastal water resources, including European designated sites.	Encourage Compliance with WFD? Encourage compliance with the EC Bathing Waters Directive? Promote management practices that will protect water features from pollution? Avoid consuming greater volumes of water resources than is available to maintain health environment?
23. To reduce the global, social and environmental impact of consumption of resources by using sustainably produced and local products.	Promote sustainability principles in the design, procurement, and operation of development? Encourage developers and operators in the District to ‘green’ their business operations and supply chains? Reduce the consumption rates of raw materials through strong sustainability policies?
24. To increase energy efficiency and the proportion of energy generated from renewable sources in the area.	Encourage reduction in energy use and increased energy efficiency? Encourage the development of renewable energy facilities within the District?

2.1 Significance criteria.

The following significance criteria have been developed to assess the effects of the plan options. Significant effects are those as defined in the SEA Directive.

Significance of effect		Description of effect
++	Significant Positive	Likely to benefit a large area of the District and wider area and beyond or a large number of people and receptors. The effects are likely to be direct and permanent and the magnitude will be major
+	Minor Positive	The extent of predicted beneficial effects is likely to be limited to small areas within the District or small groups of people and receptors. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The magnitude of the predicted effects will be minor.
0	Neutral	Neutral effects are predicted where the option being assessed is unlikely to alter the present or future baseline situation.

Significance of effect		Description of effect
-	Minor Negative	Minor negative effects are likely to be limited to small areas within the District, or limited to small groups of people and receptors and or those with low sensitivity to change. The effects can be direct or indirect, temporary or reversible. The importance of the receptor that is effect is likely to be minor as is the magnitude of the predicted effect.
--	Significant Negative	Likely to affect the whole, or large areas of Hull or wider area. Also applies to effects on nationally or internationally important assets. The effects are likely to be direct, irreversible and permanent and or those with high sensitivity to change. The magnitude of the predicted effects will also be major.
?	Unknown	This significance criterion is applied to effects where there is insufficient information to make a robust assessment. It is also applied to the assessment of options that can have both positive and negative effects and it is not clear whether the positive or negative effects outweigh each other.
N/A	Not Applicable	This is applied to objectives that are clearly not affected by the option or policy being assessed.

Where there it an effect could have a positive or negative effect, but the magnitude is uncertain a combination of symbols will be used (e.g. - / ? would signify a potential minor adverse effect with a significant level of uncertainty associated with the predicted effect).

2.2 Timeframe for impacts.

The table below sets out when the effect is likely to occur. Short Term (ST) refers to

Term	Description
ST (Short Term).	Short term refers to the first 10 years of the plan being implemented.
LT (Long Term).	Long term refers to the 10+ years of the plan

3 Issue 1 –level of employment to be planned for

3.1 Growth policy options

Issue 1

Option 1a – Baseline scenario

Option 1b - Policy on scenario

Option 1c – Risk based scenario

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 1a - Baseline scenario	Option 1b – Policy-on scenario	Option 1c – Risk based scenario
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A		
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		
4.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT + /?		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
6.	N/A		
7.	N/A		
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
10.	N/A.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	N/A.
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - - /?
19.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?

SA Objective	Option 1a - Baseline scenario	Option 1b – Policy-on scenario	Option 1c – Risk based scenario
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?

Of the three options being considered **Option 1b has no significant negative effects** (whereas both options 1a and 1c do). Likewise **Option 1b also provides the greatest number of opportunities for positive effects**. However, all the options have the potential to result in some negative effects.

All three options have the potential for beneficial economic effects. However it is based on the evidence base and employment topic paper assumed that **Option 1b** is likely to have the greatest benefits. **Option 1b** also has indirect positive effects on climate change and resource use by highlighting the green economy as an area of potential growth which could have indirect benefits for the wider sustainability of the District.

Options 1a and 1c are predicted as being likely to have adverse effects for a number of reasons. Firstly, a growth in the number of businesses within the district is likely to generate greater volumes of waste, which might not be diverted from landfill. It is also likely to increase the total quantity of waste arising and requiring treatment and/or disposal. This is assessed against an existing trend of reducing landfill capacity within Kent which could be exceeded within the life of the Plan¹. Potentially this could result in a significant effect. Growth in jobs and employment sites is likely to increase the gross greenhouse gas emissions from the District over the life of the plan (without the intervention of other mitigation measures). Likewise, this growth in the economy is likely to increase the consumption of resources and energy. There is greater uncertainty about the nature of these effects as associated with **Option 1b** because although this will also result in job creation and economic growth the potentially adverse effects might be offset by the focus on the growing the green economy.

Notwithstanding the above comments, **all of the negative significant effects can be mitigated**, either by other Local Plan policies and the site allocation assessment process. It was not possible to assess the significance of spatial effects and as result it is recommended that this aspect of the sustainability appraisal is assessed as part of policies with a clear spatial element and the site allocations. Other potentially adverse effects have the potential to be mitigated through development management policies.

3.2 Airport employment growth options

Issue 1

Option 1d – Additional low growth

Option 1e – Additional high growth

Option 1f – no growth

¹ Based on data on landfill capacity in Kent from the Environment Agency.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 1d – Airport low growth	Option 1e – Airport high growth	Option 1f – Airport no growth
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A.		
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	N/A
4.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0 /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT + /?	N/A
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0 /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT + /?	N/A
6.	N/A.		
7.	N/A		
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +/?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT + + /?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0
10.	N/A	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.	
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.	
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.	
15.	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0
19.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST - - /?	Indirect. ST/LT 0
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST - /?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST - - /?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0

Of the three options being considered **Option 1f** has limited effects because it would not allow future growth in job opportunities at the airport. **Options 1d and 1e do have effects**; however it is **Option 1e** that could result in **significant positive and negative effects**. For example, it would support economic growth at the airport which would have ‘trickledown’ benefits for the wider economy of

Thanet, Kent and the South East. The negative effects are associated with the effects of large scale employment growth (e.g. greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation of new facilities).

Notwithstanding the above comments, **all of the negative significant effects can be mitigated**, either by other Local Plan (e.g. development management) policies, the site allocation assessment process and compliance with the NPPF.

4 Issue 2 - How much employment land is needed and where

4.1 Determining the amount of land required

Issue 2

Option 2a – Use of forecast labour demand

Option 2b - Use of past take up rate

Option 2c – Maintain the existing supply

Option 2d - Include contingency when determining the amount of land to allocate

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 2a – labour demand land area	Option 2b – past take up land supply	Option 2c – maintain existing supply	Option 2d – include contingency
1.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT?
2.	N/A.			
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +			
4.	N/A			
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
6.	N/A.			
7.	N/A.			
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +			
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ++
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.			
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			

SA Objective	Option 2a – labour demand land area	Option 2b – past take up land supply	Option 2c – maintain existing supply	Option 2d – include contingency
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?			
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?			

When assessed against the majority of the SA objectives it is not possible to make a comparison between the options because of uncertainties associated with the type of development, development density and potential location of development. For example identifying a higher target value the development of employment area may not necessarily be positive or negative because this is determined by how the development is undertaken. The only objectives where there were differences between the options were those related to economic development (where the larger area and / allowance for contingency performed best (**Option 2c and 2d**)).

The problems with the assessment described above can be mitigated during the assessment of issues and policies with a spatial element and the site allocation options. Potential development management policies will also help to mitigate potentially adverse spatial and ‘non-spatial’ effects.

4.2 Type and location of land

Issue 2

Option 2e – Relax the uses permitted on some of the allocated employment sites to allow other employment generating uses outside of the B classes.

Option 2f - Maintain a variety of sites in a range of locations across the district.

Option 2g – Provide all employment land in a single location or cluster in the district.

Option 2h – Allow other sites to be developed

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 2e – Use existing supply of allocated sites.	Option 2f – Variety of sites across the District.	Option 2g – Single site / cluster.	Option 2h – Allow other.
1.	N/A			
2.	N/A			
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?			
4.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?			
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		

SA Objective	Option 2e – Use existing supply of allocated sites.	Option 2f – Variety of sites across the District.	Option 2g – Single site / cluster.	Option 2h – Allow other.
6.	N/A			
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?
10.	N/A.			
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - -	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?			
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?			

All of the options have both potentially positive and negative effects. However, out of all the options **Option 2e** is less likely to result in adverse effects and also has the greatest opportunity to have beneficial effects. All of the options are likely to have a positive effect on economic growth within the District.

However under **Option 2g**, some of these benefits could be offset as a consequence concentrating all of the potential benefits in one part of the District to the disbenefit of others. As result a significant adverse effect has been predicted for this option. This is also the case for the transport and access related SA objectives because **Option 2g** could result in residents having to commute long distances to get to work and would be more likely to have to rely on private motor vehicles for transport.

In most cases the potentially adverse effects can be mitigated, either during the assessment of allocations when it will be possible to robustly assess the spatial implications of different allocations and sites or via development management

policies that identify import features to be protected from detrimental effects and/or standards for future development to achieve.

4.3 Continue to protect existing employment sites

Issue 2

Option 2i – continue to protect identified employment sites (from the 2006 Local Plan)

Option 2j – cease policy protection.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 2i – continue policy protection	Option 2j – cease policy protection for sites identified
1.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?
2.	N/A.	
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
4.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
6.	N/A	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?	
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

Neither of the options were assessed as being likely to result in a significant adverse effect. However **Option 2i** was predicted as having the potential to result in a significant positive effect, particularly in relation to job creation and

supporting economic growth and this is the main differentiator between the options.

Minor negative effects were predicted for both options, however these and the uncertain effects can be mitigated by development management policies and the site specific assessment of effects that will be required for the allocations. One area where **Option 2j** performed better was in terms of its potential to have indirect benefits for housing by potentially allowing a greater area of land for housing and other types of development.

5 Issue 3 – How can we promote our economic infrastructure assets

5.1 Airport

Issue 3 - Airport

Option 3a - Continue to safeguard the operation of the Airport (from the 2006 Local Plan)

Option 3b – cease policy protection.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 3a – safeguard airport operations and development.	Option 3b – remove policy safeguard
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0.	N/A
6.	N/A	
7.	N/A	
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Direct and Indirect ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0
15.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	
19.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

SA Objective	Option 3a – safeguard airport operations and development.	Option 3b – remove policy safeguard
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

Neither option is likely to have a significant positive or negative effect. However, **Option 3a** was assessed as being more likely to have benefits in terms of contributing towards job creation, economic growth, supporting the visitor economy and providing measures to avoid potentially significant adverse effects such as impacts on landscape, noise and air quality than **Option 3b**.

There were a number of uncertainties associated with the potential effects from removing policy safeguards as set out in **Option 3b**. Likewise, without knowing the specific details about the future development at the Airport there was a degree of uncertainty associated with the assessment.

However, the potentially adverse effects and uncertainties could be mitigated by the development of other policies (e.g. Development Management) or by national policy requirements (e.g. NPPF).

5.2 Port

Issue 3 - Port

Option 3c - Continue to policy safeguarding for the Port

Option 3d – cease policy protection.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 3c – Safeguard the Port	Option 3d – remove policy safeguard
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0.	N/A
6.	N/A	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. LT -/?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?

SA Objective	Option 3c – Safeguard the Port	Option 3d – remove policy safeguard
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-.	Permanent. Indirect. LT -/?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	
19.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
20.	Permanent. Direct. LT -	
21.	Permanent. Direct/Indirect. ST/LT ?	
22.	Permanent. Direct/Indirect. ST/LT ?	
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

Option 3c presents the greatest potential benefits particularly with respect to maintaining the economy and supporting economic growth and has the potential to have a significant positive effect. It also contributes towards maintaining the town's sense of character as a port as well as indirectly contributing towards the transport infrastructure for Kent and the wider region.

The effects of **Option 3d** are less certain because without the policy safeguard the port might continue to operate as it does currently or development could occur that reduce its capacity to function as a port.

Both options have the potential to have negative effects on sensitive environmental receptors and sustainability issues. However these potentially adverse effects can be mitigated by development management policies and/or the NPPF.

5.3 Rail Infrastructure

Issue 3 - Rail

Option 3e – New station for Airport & commuters

Option 3f – no support for a new station.

Option 3g - Support improvements to Ramsgate Station

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 3e - New station for Airport & commuters	Option 3f no support for a new station	Option 3g – Support improvements to Ramsgate Station
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A		

SA Objective	Option 3e - New station for Airport & commuters	Option 3f no support for a new station	Option 3g – Support improvements to Ramsgate Station
3.	N/A		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-.
6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
8.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ++	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++ / ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - / ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
12.	N/A		
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
15.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT +/-.
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-.
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-.
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Direct Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-.
20.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct ST/LT 0
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?.	Permanent. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?.
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT ?.	Permanent. ST/LT 0.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT ?

Due to the fact that **Option 3f** reflects the current situation the overall effects are neutral. Of the two other options **Option 3e** is more likely to result in significant beneficial effects than **Option 3g**, particularly in terms of contributing towards employment, economic growth (particularly the visitor economy) and providing infrastructure to support modal shift.

However, without further details about what **Options 3e and 3g** would entail it is not possible to assess whether one options is likely to result in significantly greater benefits than the other.

Where potentially adverse or uncertain effects have been predicted mitigation measures can be used to ameliorate the effects. It should be noted that although

Option 3g's effects are not as potentially beneficial as **Option 3e** it too will have beneficial effects for District and Ramsgate in particular.

6 Issue 4 - How can we support communications infrastructure and home working

6.1 Communications Infrastructure

Issue 4 - Communications Infrastructure

Option 4a – Require all new developments to be provided with appropriate communications

Option 4b – no support for a new station.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 4a – provide telecommunication infrastructure with new development	Option 4b – no requirement for telecommunication infrastructure provision
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A.	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
8.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
10.	N/A.	
11.	N/A	
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0
14.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0
15.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
16.	N/A	
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
18.	N/A	
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
20.	N/A	
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. ST/LT 0
22.	N/A	

SA Objective	Option 4a – provide telecommunication infrastructure with new development	Option 4b – no requirement for telecommunication infrastructure provision
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
24.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0

Option 4a clearly has the potential to support the achievement of a number of the SA objectives by reducing the need to travel (e.g. supporting home working and reduced business travel) and supporting the creation of jobs and economic growth by ensuring that the communication infrastructure is also provided.

Any potentially uncertain and/or adverse effects can be mitigated by the requirements of the NPPF and at the local level through development management policies.

6.2 Home working

Issue 4 – Home Working

Option 4c – Provide policy support, subject to criteria to support home working.

Option 4d – no support for homeworking.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 4c – policy support for home working	Option 4d – no requirement for home working
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	N/A	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
8.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
10.	N/A	
11.	N/A	
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	N/A	
14.	N/A	
15.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
16.	N/A	
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
18.	N/A	

SA Objective	Option 4c – policy support for home working	Option 4d – no requirement for home working
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
20.	N/A	
21.	N/A	
22.	N/A	
23.	N/A	
24.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0

Option 4c clearly has the potential to support the achievement of a number of the SA objectives by reducing the need to travel (e.g. supporting home working) and by indirectly helping to make residential areas and local centres more vibrant by increasing day time weekday activity. Indirectly, this has potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve people’s quality of life. Furthermore, if more people are working

It should however be noted that the potential sustainability benefits of this option are only likely to be realised as part of wider sustainability interventions (e.g. The policy options set out in Issue 14 and Issue 16) .

Any potentially uncertain and/or adverse effects can be mitigated by the requirements of the NPPF and at the local level through development management policies.

6.3 Work hubs

Issue 4 – Work hubs

Option 4e – Provide policy support, for work hubs, particularly in rural areas.

Option 4f – no provisions – provide in existing business parks and town centres.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 4e – Provide allocations for work hubs	Option 4f – no provisions – provide in existing business parks and town centres
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	N/A	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
8.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	

SA Objective	Option 4e – Provide allocations for work hubs	Option 4f – no provisions – provide in existing business parks and town centres
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	N/A.	
16.	N/A	
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
18.	N/A	
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
22.	N/A	
23.	N/A	
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

Both options have positive and negative effects. However, **Option 4e** would specifically benefits rural areas, as well as urban ones, and consequently would help to distribute the job creation and economic benefits of business growth in rural areas.

Indirectly, **Option 4e** also has the potential to enhance the ‘sense of place’ and vibrancy of rural settlements by helping to counter the effects of being commuter / dormitory settlements.

The potentially adverse and uncertain effects can be mitigated by the requirements of the NPPF and at the local level through development management policies.

7 Issue 5 – How should Thanet’s town centres develop?

7.1 Role of town centres

Issue 5 – Role of town centres/retail

Option 5a – Maintain existing retail hierarchy.

Option 5b – Increase role of coastal town centres in convenience shopping.

Option 5c - Increase Westwood market share

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5a – Maintain existing retail hierarchy	5b Increase role of coastal town centres for convenience shopping	5c Increase Westwood market share
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A		
3.	N/A		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?		
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?		
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?		
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
15.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
16.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?		

All of the options have the potential to have positive and negative effects depending on their scale and the nature of the surrounding areas and environment. **Options 5a and 5b** also complement each other by helping to continue the current performance of the retail sector (e.g. minimising the leakage of retail spend outside of the District) whilst also supporting the role of the coastal towns for convenience shopping (e.g. reducing the need to travel and the distance travelled). Maintaining the existing hierarchy would provide benefits for the town centres. If both options were implemented together they would also help to counteract retail development of an inappropriate scale in the coastal town centres.

Option 5c would result in economic and job creation benefits at Westwood. However, these benefits are narrowly focussed they might, indirectly, result in adverse effects elsewhere in district.

Where potentially adverse effects have been predicted it is anticipated that they can be mitigated either by ensuring that development management policies are provided that counter or avoid adverse effects and/or by meeting the requirements of the NPPF.

A further opportunity to mitigate some of these potentially adverse and uncertain effects could be to create a fourth option that consists of a hybrid of options that allow the benefits of the different options whilst potentially counteracting some of the adverse effects (e.g. potential effects on accessibility).

7.2 Accommodating town centre development needs

Issue 5 – Role of town centres/retail

Option 5d – No specific sites for commercial leisure development.

Option 5e – Flexible policies to allow commercial leisure development in town centres.

Option 5f - Additional 20% floor space for A2 to A5 uses in town centres.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5d – No specific sites for commercial leisure development	5e – Flexible policies to allow commercial leisure development in town centres	5f – Additional 20% floor space for A2 to A5 uses in town centres
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A		
3.	N/A		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	

SA Objective	5d – No specific sites for commercial leisure development	5e – Flexible policies to allow commercial leisure development in town centres	5f – Additional 20% floor space for A2 to A5 uses in town centres
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	
18.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	
19.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
23.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	

Of the three options assessed here **Option 5d** is deemed as being unlikely to have any significant effects. Furthermore, because this option does not actively promote development the majority of the predicted effects are neutral.

In most cases the effects from **Options 5e and 5f** were assessed as being positive, particularly in terms of job creation, supporting the economy, sustainable travel and the tourist economy. Potentially adverse effects were predicted as a result of consuming resources to construct and operate new facilities and also greenhouse gas emissions associated with the development. Potentially uncertain effects were also predicted in terms of the effects these options might have on townscape, heritage, air quality and water resource impacts.

Where potentially adverse effects have been predicted it is anticipated that they can be mitigated either by ensuring that development management policies are provided that counter or avoid adverse effects and/or by meeting the requirements of the NPPF.

A further opportunity to mitigate some of these potentially adverse and uncertain effects could be to create a fourth option that consists of a hybrid of options that allow the benefits of the different options whilst potentially counteracting some of the adverse effects (e.g. potential effects on accessibility).

7.3 Use of vacant premises

Issue 5 – use of vacant premises

Option 5g(i) – no policy that accommodates need for town centre development in the existing vacant premises where possible (Ramsgate and Margate)

Option 5g - accommodate need for town centre development in the existing vacant premises where possible (Ramsgate and Margate)

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5g(i) - No policy requirement accommodate need for town centre development in the existing vacant premises where possible (5g – Accommodate development in vacant town centre units
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
18.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?

Of the two options assessed here **Option 5g** is deemed as being unlikely to have any significant negative effect. However, it does have the potential to have a significant positive effect on the efficient use of land by focussing on the re-use o vacant units in town centres. This option was also predicted as being likely to

have a positive effect on job creation, supporting the economy, sustainable travel, resource use and the tourist economy. Potentially adverse effects were predicted as a result of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the development. Potentially uncertain effects were also predicted in terms of the effects these options might have on townscape, heritage, air quality and water resource impacts.

Option 5g(i) was assessed as being unlikely to have any effects because it does not positively require the development of non-vacant sites in town centres (i.e. new development on vacant site).

Where potentially adverse effects have been predicted it is anticipated that they can be mitigated either by ensuring that development management policies are provided that counter or avoid adverse effects and/or by meeting the requirements of the NPPF.

A further opportunity to mitigate some of these potentially adverse and uncertain effects could be to create a fourth option that consists of a hybrid of options that allow the benefits of the different options whilst potentially counteracting some of the adverse effects (e.g. potential effects on accessibility).

7.4 Westwood

Issue 5 – Westwood

Option 5h – Accommodate development existing commercial area

Option 5i - Accommodate development in in new adjacent site

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5h – Accommodate development existing commercial area	5i – Accommodate development in in new adjacent site
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. STT -
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - -/?
12.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -	Permanent. Indirect. STT -
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. STT -
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?

SA Objective	5h – Accommodate development existing commercial area	5i – Accommodate development in in new adjacent site
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - /?	Permanent. Indirect. STT - /?
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - /?	Permanent. Indirect. STT - /?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - / ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT - /?

Both options have positive effects, particularly in terms of supporting job creation and economic growth (where a significant effect was predicted) and locating development where there are already good public transport links. However, **Option 5i** is predicted as having potentially significant negative effects because it directs development towards a greenfield site instead of previously developed land. Conversely **Option 5h** does support the sustainable use of land by directing development at Westwood to an area that includes substantial areas of previously developed land.

All of the adverse or uncertain effects can be avoided, or mitigated to a certain extent, by development management type policies, the implementation of the NPPF and compliance with environmental legislation.

7.5 Broadstairs

Issue 5 – Broadstairs

Option 5j – Accommodate town centre development close to existing commercial area

Option 5k - Accommodate town centre development at Westwood

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5j – Accommodate town centre development close to existing commercial area	5k – Accommodate town centre development at Westwood
1.	N/A	
2.	N/A	
3.	N/A	
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT + /?
6.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - /?
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - - /?
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +

SA Objective	5j – Accommodate town centre development close to existing commercial area	5k – Accommodate town centre development at Westwood
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT --/?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + /?
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT - / ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?

Both options have positive and negative effects. However, **Option 5j** have a number of significant positive effects, particularly in terms of accessibility, contributing to job creation, economic growth, sustainable distribution of development and supporting a shift away from private car use to access the commercial core of Broadstairs.

Conversely, **Option 5k** has the potential to result in significant negative effects, particularly by detracting from the sense of place in Broadstairs by drawing away retail footfall to Westwood. This option would also locate services in a location that cannot easily be accessed on foot or by bicycle thereby requiring people to use private cars or public transport to access services and shops.

All other adverse or uncertain effects can be avoided, or mitigated to a certain extent, by development management type policies, the implementation of the NPPF and compliance with environmental legislation.

7.6 District, Local and Town centre development out of centres

Issue 5 – District and Local Centres and criteria for out of centre Town Centre development

Option 5l – Allow retail development to support community needs (support out of centre Town Centre development to support community needs)

Option 5m - Set local thresholds for town centre development outside of town centres (area specific thresholds)

Option 5n - Use NPPF thresholds for town centre development outside of town centres

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	5l – Allow retail development to support community needs	5m – Set local thresholds for town centre development outside of town centres	5n – Use NPPF thresholds for town centre development outside of town centres
1.	N/A		
2.	N/A		
3.	N/A		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
6.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
24.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		

All of the options have positive and negative effects. However, the effects of **Options 5l and 5m** are generally more certain and likely to result in a beneficial effect than **Option 5n**. This is because **Options 5l and 5m** were more likely to contribute towards sustainable economic growth, the local sense of place, and sustainable transport. This is on the basis that locating small convenience type shops in or close to residential areas and by setting thresholds lower than NPPF, would avoid larger retail units being developed that could detract and potentially weaken the market for the larger retailers at Westwood and the Town Centres.

All of the adverse or uncertain effects can be avoided, or mitigated to a certain extent, by development management type policies, the implementation of the NPPF and compliance with environmental legislation.

8 Issue 6 Supporting the Rural Economy

8.1 Farm Diversification

Issue 6 – Farm diversification

Option 6a – Support farm diversification where it complements farm function (subject to criteria)

Option 6b - No policy support for farm diversification (area specific thresholds).

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	6a – Support farm diversification where it complements farm function	6b – No policy support
1 to 4	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
16.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?

Both options have positive and negative effects. However, **Option 6a** is more likely to result in neutral and beneficial effects than **Option 6b** because, by the use of criteria, it would allow the District to gain the benefits from agricultural diversification whilst avoiding many of the potential downsides (e.g. traffic impact, visual and landscape effects and adverse effects on nature conservation).

All of the negative and uncertain effects associated with **Option 6a** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements. However it may not be possible to enhance the effects of **Option 6b** because it has been included to reflect the sustainability issues of a 'policy void'.

8.2 Location of rural economic development

Issue 6 – Location of rural economic development

Option 6c – New build economic development in settlements

Option 6d - New build economic development (subject to sustainability and design criteria).

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	6c – New build economic development in settlements	6d – New build economic development (subject to design and sustainability criteria)
1 to 4	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
6.	N/A	N/A
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
16.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?

Both options have positive and negative effects and neither one appears to perform better than the other in sustainability terms. **Option 6c** has beneficial effects on the local economy, the sense of place, sustainable transport (by locating development in settlements and thereby reducing reliance on private car use). However, the option may result in adverse effects without specific criteria or controls that limit the magnitude and extent of potentially adverse effects.

The effects of **Option 6d** are potentially uncertain because it could potentially result in development at isolated locations as well as in rural settlements. This uncertainty makes it difficult to robustly assess its effects on some of the SA objectives. However, by including sustainability and design criteria some or all of the negative and uncertain effects could be mitigated if relevant measures are included.

8.3 Village shops and services

Issue 6 – Village shops and services

Option 6e – Policy support for new village shops and services

Option 6f – Policy protection for existing village shops and services

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	6e – Policy support of new village shops and services	6f– Policy protection for existing village shops and services
1.	N/A	
2.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
3.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
24.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?

Both options have positive and negative effects and neither one appears to perform better than the other in sustainability terms. **Both Options** have beneficial effects on the local economy, the sense of place, sustainable transport (by locating development in settlements and thereby reducing reliance on private car use). Potentially uncertain effects relate to the site specific issues that cannot be assessed as part of a generic district wide policy option.

All of the negative and uncertain effects associated with **both Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

It should also be noted that both options are complementary and could potentially both be selected.

8.4 Best and most versatile agricultural land

Issue 6 – Best and most versatile agricultural land

Option 6g – Protect best and most versatile agricultural land

Option 6f – No policy support for best and most versatile agricultural land

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	6g – Protect best and most versatile agricultural land	6h – No policy support
1 to 7	N/A	
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. STT -/?
12.	N/A	
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15 to 18	N/A	
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
21.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?
24.	N/A	

Of the two options **Option 6h** is not predicted as being likely to have any positive effects where they are not counteracted by potentially adverse effects as illustrated by the ‘uncertain’ effects. **Option 6g** has the potential to contribute towards the economy, avoiding increases in flood risk and significant benefits for the protection of greenfield land from development.

All of the negative and uncertain effects associated with **both Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

8.5 Agricultural related development and dwellings

Issue 6 – Agricultural related development and dwellings

Option 6h – Policy support for agricultural development including retail

Option 6i – Policy support for agricultural related dwellings

Option 6j - No specific policy of agricultural development

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	6i – Policy support for agricultural development including retail	6j – Policy support for agricultural related dwellings	6k – No specific policy of agricultural development
1.	N/A	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/?	N/A
2.	N/A		
3.	N/A		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
6.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
8..	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
15.	N/A		
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?

SA Objective	6i – Policy support for agricultural development including retail	6j – Policy support for agricultural related dwellings	6k – No specific policy of agricultural development
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?		

Of the three options **Option 6k** is not predicted as being likely to have any positive effects where they are not counteracted by potentially adverse effects as illustrated by the ‘uncertain’ effects.

However **Options 6i and 6j** have the potential to contribute towards the economy, rural housing supply, job creation and reducing the need for people to travel to access jobs, services and local facilities. However because neither option is specific about where development would occur uncertain effects on the built environment, landscape, heritage, ecology and the water environment are uncertain. Potentially adverse effects have also been predicted in terms of energy an resource consumption as well as waste generation because new development will result, to a lesser or greater extent, in these effects.

All of the negative and uncertain effects associated with **both Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9 Issue 7 How to support the visitor economy

9.1 Hotel development

Issue 7 – Hotel development

Option 7a – Hotel development outside of town centres

Option 7b – No policy support for Hotel development outside of town centres

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	7a – Hotel development outside of town centres	7b – No policy support for Hotel development outside of town centres
1 to 4	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	N/A	
7.	N/A	
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
16.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?	

The effects of the two options include positive and negative effects. The effects of **Option 7a** are slightly better than **Option 7b** because it is assumed that allow out of town centre hotel development will provide the space for the facilities that are often also provided with high end hotels (e.g. Spa, leisure facilities and golf courses). As a result it is predicted that **Option 7a** would be likely to have significant beneficial effect on the tourism sector.

Both options have an uncertain effect because the options do not specific in any detail where development is likely to occur. This uncertainty can be addressed during the assessment of specific site allocations.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with **both Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9.2 Caravan and self-catering accommodation

Issue 7 – Hotel development

Option 7c – Support self-catering accommodation (subject to criteria except caravan accommodation at the coast)

Option 7d – No policy restriction for caravan accommodation at the coast

Option 7e – No policy support for self-catered accommodation

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 7c – Support self-catering accommodation (subject to criteria except caravan accommodation at the coast)	Option 7d – No policy restriction for caravan accommodation at the coast	Option 7e – No policy support for self-catered accommodation
1 to 4	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Temporary. Direct. ST/LT - - /?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
15.	N/A		
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		

SA Objective	Option 7c – Support self-catering accommodation (subject to criteria except caravan accommodation at the coast)	Option 7d – No policy restriction for caravan accommodation at the coast	Option 7e – No policy support for self-catered accommodation
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?		

All three options have some positive and negative effects. **Option 7c** performs the best because it allows caravan and self-catering development to contribute toward the tourism sector, job creation and economic growth without some of the potential downsides (e.g. the visual effects of caravan accommodation on the coastline and the detrimental effect this can have natural environment as an important part of the visitor economy). Option 7d performs the worst and is predicted as being likely to have a significant negative effect on landscape and visual receptors.

All options are likely to have uncertain effects. This is particularly because the options do not identify in any detail where development is likely to occur. This uncertainty can be addressed during the assessment of specific site allocations.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with **all Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9.3 Provision of tourist facilities

Issue 7 – Provision of tourism facilities

Option 7f Policy support for new tourist facilities (Policy T1 of Thanet Local Plan)

Option 7g No policy support for new tourist facilities

Option 7h Blanket policy protection of existing tourism facilities

Option 7i Policy protecting existing tourism facilities except where it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer viable

Option 7j Protect identified sites which are of particular importance to Thanet's visitor economy

Option 7k No policy protection of existing tourism facilities

SA Objective	7f Policy support for new tourist facilities	7g No policy support for new tourist facilities	7h Blanket policy protection of existing tourism facilities	7i Policy protecting existing tourism facilities except where it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer viable	7j Protect identified sites which are of particular importance to Thanet's visitor economy	Option 7k No policy protection of existing tourism facilities
1 to 4	N/A					
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?					
6.	N/A					
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?					
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
14.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?					
16.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?					
17.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?					
18.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
19.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?			
23.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			
24.	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. STT - / ?			

Of the first set of options (**7f and 7g**) **7f** is likely to have a significant effect on job creation and economic growth in the tourist and visitor economy. **Option 7i** is also has the potential to have a positive effect on economic growth, the sense of place or identity within existing settlements and would also contribute towards retaining important historic and architectural features that are linked to the current and historic tourist and visitor economy of the District. However, without the criteria (**Option 7h**) that would allow alternative uses where existing facilities are vacant and not used there would potentially be adverse effects on townscape and a negative visual impact on visitor's and their perception of the District as a destination.

Policy to protect sites that are of importance to the visitor economy (**Option 7j**) are likely to have a positive effect, on job creation, economic growth and potentially the use of previously developed land. However, without this policy there would be a greater degree of uncertainty as to whether or not its effects would be positive or negative (**Option 7k**).

All options are likely to have uncertain effects. This is particularly because the options do not identify in any detail where development is likely to occur. This uncertainty can be addressed during the assessment of specific site allocations.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with **all Options** can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9.5 Language Schools

Issue 7 – Language Schools

Option 7l - Continue policy support for language schools subject to criteria (Policy T6 of Thanet Local Plan).

Option 7m - Remove policy support for language schools.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	7l – Continue policy support for language schools subject to criteria	7m – Remove policy support for language schools
1 to 4	N/A	
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
6.	N/A	
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
8..	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
17.	N/A	
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
23.	Permanent. Direct, Indirect. ST/LT -/?	
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?	

The sustainability effects of the two options are quite distinct with **Option 7l** more likely to result in positive effects, particularly in terms of job creation and supporting economic growth associated with language schools. The potentially negative or uncertain effects associated with **Option 7m** can be mitigated development management policies.

Removing the policy (**7m**) would avoid a lot of the potentially adverse effects associated with Option 7l. However, over the long term in particular it could have a negative effect on economy, if opportunities to increase the provision in this sector are lost.

All options are likely to have uncertain effects. This is particularly because the options do not identify in any detail where development is likely to occur. This uncertainty can be addressed during the assessment of specific site allocations.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with the Options can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9.6 Amusement uses

Issue 7 – Amusement uses

Option 7n Support amusement arcades only in certain areas of Margate and Ramsgate (Policy T7)

Option 7o Support amusement centres in town centres (policy T7)

Option 7p No specific amusement use policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Option 7n Support amusement arcades only in certain areas of Margate and Ramsgate	Option 7o Support amusement centres in town centres	Option 7p No specific amusement use policy
1 to 4	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?		
6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?		
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?
14.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?		
15.	N/A		
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
20 to 22	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?		
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT -/?		
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT -/?		

Options 7n and 7o are complementary and have the same effects. Both are likely to contribute towards the sense of place, minimise adverse impacts on townscape, landscape, tourism and the efficient use of land. This is because of their criteria and safeguarding characteristics.

However, Option 7p would not offer any protection or safeguards and could result in amusement use development occurring anywhere in the District, particularly at locations where they would have an adverse effect on nearby features of interest (e.g. listed buildings) or sensitive receptors (e.g. residential areas).

All options are likely to have uncertain effects. This is particularly because the options do not identify in any detail where development is likely to occur. This uncertainty can be addressed during the assessment of specific site allocations.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with all Options can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

9.7 Protection of beaches

Issue 7 – Protection of beaches

7q Continue existing policy protection of beaches – three zones of beaches – major holiday, intermediate and undeveloped

7r No policy protection

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	7q Continue existing policy protection of beaches	7r No policy protection for beaches
1 to 6	N/A	
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Temporary. Direct. ST/LT - -/?
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Temporary. Direct. ST/LT - -/?
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Temporary. Direct. ST/LT - -/?
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, ST/LT -/?
12.	N/A	
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Temporary. Direct. ST/LT - -/?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
15 & 16	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
17.	N/A	
18 to 20	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -
23. to 24	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	

Option 7q has the potential to result in significant positive effects for the District as a result of ensuring that development only occurs near beaches that is appropriate to the type of beach. As result the potential amenity, visual, landscape and ecological conflicts that might occur are avoided. Furthermore, **Option 7q** has the potential to indirectly support the character and sense of place associated with the different types of coastal area and beach environment.

Option 7r has been included as an option to compare the effects of **7q**. without the protection there would be significant adverse effects, some of which could not be mitigated or avoided without a safeguarding policy such as **Option 7q** or other policies in the (such as development management policies and the NPPF).

10 Issue 8: how many homes do we need to provide?

10.1 Demographics and housing growth

Issue 8 – Demographics

8a. Zero net migration – 3,714 homes

8b. Short term migration – 11,648 homes

Issue 8 – Housing growth

8c Baseline scenario

8d Strong growth in tourism and green sectors

8E Economy returns to recession

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	8a. Zero net migration – 3,714 homes	8b. Short term migration – 11,648 homes	8c. Baseline Scenario (past patterns); 3,100 jobs, 9,639 homes	8d. Strong growth in tourism and green sectors; 5,100 jobs, 11,791 homes	8e. Economy returns to recession; 1,200 jobs, 7,600 homes
1.	Permanent, direct LT +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
2.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?
3.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?
4.	Permanent, direct LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent direct LT +	
5.	Permanent, indirect LT -/?		Permanent, indirect LT -/?		
6.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct. ST/LT - -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?
7.	Unknown ?	Unknown ?	Unknown ?	Permanent, indirect ST ?	
8.	Permanent, direct LT +/-?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent direct LT +	
9.	Permanent, direct ST +/-?	Permanent, direct ST +/-?	Permanent. Direct. ST ++		
10	Unknown +/-?		Unknown ?	Permanent indirect ST +	Unknown ?

SA Objective	8a. Zero net migration – 3,714 homes	8b. Short term migration – 11,648 homes	8c. Baseline Scenario (past patterns); 3,100 jobs, 9,639 homes	8d. Strong growth in tourism and green sectors; 5,100 jobs, 11,791 homes	8e. Economy returns to recession; 1,200 jobs, 7,600 homes
11 to 14	Unknown ?		Unknown ?		
15.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?		Unknown ?		
16 & 17	Unknown		Unknown -/?	Permanent direct LT +/?	Unknown -/?
	Unknown		Unknown ?		
18.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT /?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -	Permanent direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -
19.	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT /?	Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT -/?
20	Unknown ?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		
21	Unknown ?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0	Permanent direct LT +/?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0
22	Unknown ?		Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		
23.	Permanent, direct ST - /?		Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent direct LT +/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?	Permanent direct LT +/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?

10.1.1 Demographics

All options will increase the supply of housing across Thanet with **Option 8b** resulting in a greater amount of house building and indirectly greater provision of affordable housing. It has been assumed that with increased housing (resulting from migration), there will be increased demand on key local facilities. As result the options that would generate large numbers of housing would potentially result in a significant adverse effect.

New housing stock will need to be tested for appropriateness at a strategic level, to ensure it matches the needs of the existing (and changing, according to migration level) population. This will be central to sustainability of the housing.

Comparison in terms of which option is most sustainable in terms of location is not possible at this stage. Given **Option 8b** contains more homes than **8a**, it has the potential to affect more land. This could potentially mean unsustainable development on undeveloped or greenfield land. Conversely however development of more homes could mean regeneration of previously developed land.

Further, the options are strategic in nature and do not factor in aspects such as:

- refurbishment potential of existing stock
- Impact on designated sites (however it is noted that with a greater resident population there is the potential for increased disturbance of sites)

- The effect on landscape and townscape and the potential effect on the tourist industry

Lack of information on these areas (though understandable at this stage) has led to a number of unknowns.

The positive effects on employment and GVA from spending on housing construction will obviously be greater for **8b**. Both options should consider apprentice schemes and targeted employment of “people on unemployment benefits” may be appropriate, particularly for larger schemes. The effects of **8b** have the potential to be larger due to this being a larger programme of house building.

The development of new homes will have no direct effect on the provision of public transport links. The increase in new homes will likely increase demand on public transport facilities indirectly by increasing the population of certain areas. The extent of the effect will depend on the provision of public transport facilities and the availability of public transport options for a given area. Gathering data on capacity of existing public transport facilities will be crucial in understanding the effects increased populations will have.

10.1.2 Housing growth

Areas of new build homes have the potential to create areas which may be perceived as being safer. This is often the case when brownfield or previously developed land is developed and brought back into active use. However, this was not factored into the option at this stage (given its strategic nature).

The development of new homes will have no direct effect on the provision of public transport links. The increase in new homes will likely increase demand on public transport facilities indirectly by increasing the population of certain areas. The extent of the effect will depend on the provision of public transport facilities and the availability of public transport options for a given area. Gathering data on capacity of existing public transport facilities will be crucial in understanding the effects increased populations will have. Growth in the green sectors scenario (8d) suggests growth in more sustainable sectors/industries, which could include sustainable transport systems. If this is the case, there will be positive effects felt on the Thanet public transport networks. Consequently, this might bring about a reduction in private vehicle use.

Larger scale developments, like those likely under 8c and 8d should be accompanied by full transport assessments to understand their effect on the local public transport network.

The options are strategic in nature and do not factor in aspects such as:

Lack of information on these areas (though understandable at this stage) has led to a number of unknowns.

11 Issue 9 - where should our new homes be provided

11.1 Emphasis on previously developed land

Issue 9

9a. Maximise development provisions within the existing built up areas of the towns and villages in order to minimise use of greenfield land.

9b. Focus on urban areas but with criteria (please state) for example to safeguard back gardens / family homes / sites that are not previously developed land.

9c. Focus provision on greenfield sites and aim to restrict housing sites in the urban area to those important for regeneration.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	9a. Maximise development provisions within the existing built up areas of the towns and villages in order to minimise use of greenfield land.	9b. Focus on urban areas but with criteria (please state) for example to safeguard back gardens / family homes / sites that are not previously developed land.	9c. Focus provision on greenfield sites and aim to restrict housing sites in the urban area to those important for regeneration.
1 to 3	Unknown +/-		
4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent, direct LT -
6.	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent, direct LT +
7.	Unknown ?		
8.	Permanent direct ST ++		
9.	Permanent direct ST ++		
10.	Permanent direct LT ++		Permanent, direct ST/LT -
11.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT ++	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT ++	Permanent, direct LT - -
12.	Permanent direct LT ++	Permanent direct LT ++	Permanent, direct LT -
13.	Unknown ?		
14.	Unknown ?		
15.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT 0		Permanent, indirect LT -/?
16.	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent direct LT +	Permanent, direct LT -
17.	Permanent indirect LT +	Permanent indirect LT +	Permanent, indirect LT -
18.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent, direct LT -?		
20.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT 0		
21.	Permanent direct LT +/-		Permanent, direct LT -/?
22.	N/A		
23.	Permanent, direct ST -/?		

SA Objective	9a. Maximise development provisions within the existing built up areas of the towns and villages in order to minimise use of greenfield land.	9b. Focus on urban areas but with criteria (please state) for example to safeguard back gardens / family homes / sites that are not previously developed land.	9c. Focus provision on greenfield sites and aim to restrict housing sites in the urban area to those important for regeneration.
24.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?		

Options 9a-9c would lead to new development in different areas. As such, there will be some effect on the housing market and the supply of different types of housing. However, the options do not outline the quantity, type or mix of development proposed, as such no assessment can be made. Unlike the options in Issue, 8 these options do have not been developed in line with targets (based on demand scenarios) which meet housing market demand and affordable housing need.

Increasing housing provision near healthcare and educational facilities will affect demand and capacity. This should be tested when locating new housing developments. It has not been possible to say here what the likely effects will be due to lack of information.

Locating new development in existing urban areas will mean it is more likely to be served by existing public transport links. Focussing provision on greenfield (9c) sites will make this less likely.

Assuming that key facilities are more likely to be concentrated within built up (urban) areas, locating new development in existing urban areas will mean they are more likely to be better served. Focussing provision on greenfield (9c) sites will make this less likely.

All of the identified options will result in development in different areas which will have some effect on existing and new communities. Given that these options are currently at the strategic level only, it is not possible to predict how communities will be impacted. This should be a consideration for detailed planning of individual developments.

All three options will lead to short term growth in construction employment and spending on housing development which will lead to a short term boost in GVA. This will be sustained as long as house building continues. There will be no direct effect on employment sites.

Focusing development on greenfield sites increases the likelihood that natural and semi natural assets will be affected.

9c will directly focus development onto greenfield land whereas 9a and 9b will aim to develop within existing built up areas. Assuming that key facilities are more likely to be concentrated within built up (urban) areas, locating new development in existing urban areas will mean they are more likely to be better served. Focussing provision on greenfield sites will make this less likely and may increase the need to travel.

All three options will result in development which will have the potential to alter landscape and/or townscape by introducing new buildings and potentially demolishing others. Negative impacts should be reduced and positive impacts increased through sensitive design and development location.

All options relate to house building. As such, both options will result in increased unavoidable short term demand for scarce resources. None of the options distinguishes itself as performing better in terms of sustainability (including resource use) and neither point towards a level of refurbishment of existing properties. Development of new housing will bring about construction (short term) and operational waste (long term). Promotion of best practice methods through local policy should help minimise waste streams. Similarly, all three options will bring about growth in housing development which will bring about long term increase greenhouse gas emissions from household activities such as heating, cooking and electricity consumption. Options will all perform better if they are developed with best practice design considered throughout.

9a and 9b are likely to result in positive effects as development is focused away from greenfield land. However, through the remaining options there will be a risk to existing urban habitats. Mitigation should ensure that protection measures are put in place for new development.

11.2 How greenfield element should be accommodated

Accommodating greenfield development

9d A single location

9e At a small number of locations

9f At dispersed sites

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	9d A single location	9e At a small number of locations	9f At dispersed sites
1.	Unknown +/-		
2 to 4	N/A		
5.	Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent, direct LT - -
6.	Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent, direct LT - -
7.	Unknown +/-		
8.	Permanent direct LT ++		
9.	Permanent direct LT ++		
10.	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT - -/?
11.	Permanent, direct LT - -		
12.	Permanent, direct LT - / ?		Permanent, direct LT -/?
13.	Permanent, direct LT - / ?		Permanent, direct LT -/?
14.	Unknown ?		
15.	Permanent, direct LT -/?		Permanent, direct LT -/?
16.	Permanent, direct LT -/?		Permanent, direct LT -/?
17.	Permanent, direct LT -/?		Permanent, direct LT - -/?

SA Objective	9d A single location	9e At a small number of locations	9f At dispersed sites
18.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?		
19.	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT -/?
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0		
21.	Permanent, direct LT -/?	Permanent, direct LT -/?	
22.	N/A		
23.	Permanent, direct ST -/?		
24.	Permanent, direct ST/LT -/?		

These options would lead to new development in different areas but all across greenfield land. This will have a number of positive and negative effects in terms of sustainability. Options leading to development across dispersed greenfield sites are likely to increase the risk of sprawling development and impact on natural and semi-natural resources. No information exists on development density, housing mix and/or re-use of derelict land.

There will be some effect on the housing market and the supply of different types of housing. However, the options do not outline the quantity, type or mix of development proposed, as such no assessment can be made. Development on greenfield will need to be justified through full demand and need analysis.

None of the options 9d-9f concern healthcare or educational facilities or accessibility to healthcare facilities. It is assumed however that there will be some effect on these facilities from housing development. This should be tested when any new development comes on line.

Assuming greenfield sites are less likely to be serviced by existing public transport services, building on them will either require investment in (or alterations to) public transport services and/or increased reliance on private vehicles. Building on dispersed greenfield sites is likely to require most service alteration or increased car use.

These options are strategic in nature; as such the effects on communities cannot be predicted at this stage. There will be some impact on existing and new communities as new homes and residents are introduced to areas, but this is likely to vary significantly according to where the development is, it's design and the effect on the surroundings.

All options will bring about house building which in turn will bring about construction employment and a positive effect on GVA.

Insufficient detail to ascertain the effect on specific areas or designated sites such as those designated for ecological or cultural purposes. It is assumed however that development on greenfield sites (all options) will increase the risk of negative impact on ecological assets across Thanet. Development across dispersed sites is likely to increase this risk. Design mitigation and decisions around locations will help reduce negative impacts.

All options bring about new housing development. Development of new housing will bring about construction (short term) and operational waste (long term).

Furthermore all three options will bring about growth in housing development which will bring about long term increase greenhouse gas emissions from household activities such as heating, cooking and electricity consumption.

All options relate to house building. As such, both options will result in increased unavoidable short term demand for scarce resources. None of the options distinguishes itself as performing better in terms of sustainability (including resource use) and neither point towards a level of refurbishment of existing properties.

Promotion of best practice methods through local policy should help minimise waste streams and operational CO₂ emissions.

11.3 Where greenfield element should be accommodated

Issue 9 Location of greenfield element					
9g Adjoining the urban area					
9h Adjoining the villages					
9i Freestanding countryside sites					
9j In the Green Wedges					
9k Housing in the form of a new settlement					

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	9g Adjoining the urban area	9h Adjoining the villages	9i Freestanding countryside sites	9j In the Green Wedges	9k Housing in the form of a new settlement
1.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +/-				
2.	N/A				
3.	N/A				
4.	N/A				
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -
6.	Permanent Direct ST/LT ++	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent Direct ST/LT -		
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?				
8.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +				
9.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +				
10.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -/?				
11.	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -				
12.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -
13.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -/?				

SA Objective	9g Adjoining the urban area	9h Adjoining the villages	9i Freestanding countryside sites	9j In the Green Wedges	9k Housing in the form of a new settlement
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?				
15.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?				
16.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -
17.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT - -
18.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -				
19.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -/?				
20.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT 0				
21.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -/?				
22.	N/A				
23.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -				
24.	Permanent Direct ST/LT -				

These options would lead to new development in different greenfield areas. As such, there will be an effect on the housing market and the supply of different types of housing. However, the options do not outline the quantity, type or mix of development proposed; as such no assessment can be made of the effect of the options in these areas.

New residents in standalone or isolated (former greenfield) settlements will potentially find it more difficult to access healthcare and educational facilities compared with those adjoining existing settlements (assuming none are developed within new developments). Assuming that such key facilities and transport links are more likely to be concentrated within (and in between) built up areas, locating new development adjacent to existing urban areas will mean they are more likely to be better served. 9g and (to a lesser extent) 9h will ensure that new development is served by existing transport links which already serve the adjacent settlements. 9i and k are less likely to be served by existing transport links. Better transport links will also mean less reliance on private vehicles. However, 9j is likely to provide greater opportunities to integrate new development with existing transport links and infrastructure because the greenwedges are long, and thin areas between existing developed areas that already have public transport and other links.

These options will result in development in new previously undeveloped areas. This will have some effect on existing and new communities. For those options where new development adjoins existing built up areas, the effects on existing communities will be greater than for the options where isolated development is considered. Given that these options are currently at the strategic level only, it is not possible to predict how communities will be impacted. This should be a consideration for detailed planning of individual developments.

All three options will lead to short term growth in construction employment. No option currently suggests more or less housing development (and therefore employment) compared with another. Similarly all options will bring about house

building which in turn will bring about capital spending, demand along the supply chain and construction employment. All things being equal, this will have a positive effect on GVA. No impacts on employment land are expected.

Development will alter landscape and/or townscape by introducing new buildings and potentially demolishing others. Details of the developments proposed under the current options are unavailable. It is assumed that development on greenfield sites will increase the risk of negative impact on ecological assets across Thanet. Development across dispersed sites is likely to increase this risk. Insufficient detail to ascertain the effect on specific areas or designated ecological and cultural sites.

12 Issue 10 – What types of new homes do we need to provide?

12.1 Proportions of market and affordable housing

Issue

10a Provide new market homes in line with the following guidelines

Singles	1 bed flat	20%
Couples no children/singles/needing support	2 bed flat	10%
Couples with children	2 bed house	25%
Couples with children	3 bed house	35%
Couples with children	4+ bed house	10%

10b Provide new affordable homes in line with the following guidelines

	Thanet
1 bed flats	27%
2 bed flats	13%
2 bed houses	15%
3 bed houses	34%
4+ bed houses	11%

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	Provide new market homes in line with the table in 10a above	Provide new affordable homes in line with the table in 10b above
1.	Permanent direct LT ++	Permanent direct LT ++
2.- 7	N/A	
8.	Unknown ?	
9.	Unknown ?	
10 to 18	N/A	
19.	Permanent direct LT +/-	
20 to 23	N/A	
24.	Permanent direct LT +/-	

Each option here lists recommendations for proportions of market and affordable housing. The effects of setting these targets will be fairly limited, affecting mainly the proportion of housing types in the local housing market. There are no targets for numbers of new build houses or how restoration of derelict and unfit housing will be considered. The options, which originate from the SHMA, should also include the SHMA’s recommendation around “de-converting” flatted properties where opportunities arise.

Ensuring that the size of housing matches the demand by future resident may reduce incidence of people/families living in oversized houses which may result in excessive energy use for heating and lighting.

12.2 Affordable housing

- 10c Set 30% as a future target element of affordable homes in new housing developments
- 10d Do not set specific target through policy
- 10e Affordable housing to apply to all residential development (no threshold)
- 10f Maintain 15 dwelling threshold
- 10g Allow for provision of affordable housing off site or through a financial contribution
- 10h Affordable homes to be 70% social rent and 30% intermediate
- 10i Allow release of land adjoining built up parts of rural villages to deliver affordable homes
- 10j No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	10c Set 30% as a future target element of affordable homes in new housing developments	10d Do not set specific target through policy	10e Affordable housing to apply to all residential development (no threshold)	10f Maintain 15 dwelling threshold	10g Allow for provision of affordable housing off site or through a financial contribution	10h Affordable homes to be 70% social rent and 30% intermediate	10i Allow release of land adjoining built up parts of rural villages to deliver affordable homes	10j No specific policy
1.	Neutral ?	Permanent LT - -/?	Unknown -/?	Neutral ?	Permanent LT -/?	Permanent LT ++	Permanent LT ++	Permanent LT -/?
2.	Permanent LT ?					N/A	Permanent LT -/?	Neutral ?
3.	Neutral. ?					N/A	Permanent LT ?	Neutral ?
4.	Neutral +/?	Permanent LT. -/?	N/A	Neutral +/?	Permanent LT -/?	N/A	Permanent LT -/?	Permanent LT -/?
5.	N/A				Neutral ?	N/A	Neutral ?	N/A
6.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT -	Unknown n ?	Permanent LT +/?	Neutral ?	Permanent L. ++	Neutral ?	Permanent LT - -
7.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT -	Unknown n ?	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - -	Permanent LT +.	Permanent LT -/?	Permanent LT -/?
8.	N/A		Unknown n ?	N/A		Permanent LT ++		
9.	N/A							
10.	Unknown ?						Permanent LT -/?	Unknown ?
11.	Permanent LT +/?	Permanent LT - -	Unknown n ?	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT +/?	Permanent LT +/	Permanent LT - -	
12.	Unknown ?						Permanent LT. -/?	Unknown ?
13.	Unknown ?						Permanent LT	Unknown ?
14.	Unknown ?							
15.	Unknown ?						Permanent LT -/?	Unknown ?
16 - 17	N/A							
18.	N/A		Unknown n -/?	N/A			Permanent ST/LT -/?	N/A

SA Objective	10c Set 30% as a future target element of affordable homes in new housing developments	10d Do not set specific target through policy	10e Affordable housing to apply to all residential development (no threshold)	10f Maintain 15 dwelling threshold	10g Allow for provision of affordable housing off site or through a financial contribution	10h Affordable homes to be 70% social rent and 30% intermediate	10i Allow release of land adjoining built up parts of rural villages to deliver affordable homes	10j No specific policy
19.	N/A		Unknown ?	N/A			Permanent ST/LT -/?	N/A
20.	N/A							
21.	N/A						Permanent LT -/?	N/A
22.	N/A							
23.	Unknown ?							
24.	Unknown ?							

The need for affordable housing is high in Thanet as such, provision is central to ensuring a sustainable supply of housing, where supply is based not just on 30% maximum returns but need. The requirement for 1,500 new affordable homes across Thanet per annum as outlined in the Housing Topic Paper, is only likely to be met with the 30% target if 5,000 new homes are delivered per annum.

Crucially, the 30% target has been shown in studies to not compromise viability of larger schemes. Therefore, removal of this target is not desirable in sustainability terms, assuming that developers will not necessarily provide this within new development. However, questions remain over how the 30% target would affect viability of smaller housing developments (i.e. under 10e). Negative effects will occur when the growth in supply of affordable is reduced by making this unviable.

Those policies which will lead to lower supply of affordable housing and/or create areas in which affordable housing is concentrated away from other developments may result in increased crime levels as the most vulnerable in society are concentrated in certain areas creating pockets of higher unemployment, deprivation and the associated socio-economic problems.

It has been assumed that if affordable housing was placed away from other new housing development, accessibility to educational and healthcare facilities would be considered in site selection, and that these affordable housing developments would not be placed in areas with poor provision of key facilities.

For transport and connectivity considerations, it is assumed there will be no significant effects unless areas of affordable housing are created away from new/existing developments (off site, or on the fringes). If this occurs, transport assessments will need to confirm that the housing is adequately served by public transport.

Sense of place is likely to be affected by design of individual developments. As such the amount and location of affordable housing is unlikely to affect this. Harmonious and mixed communities will be created when affordable housing is integrated with wider housing developments, not when segregated affordable housing communities are created.

With the exception of 10i, it is difficult to predict how these options will affect greenfield or previously developed land. It is not possible to ascertain the pattern of development for options 10c-10h and 10j. 10i will result in rural development potentially locating people away from more densely populated / better served areas.

Waste and carbon emissions will be likely during construction. The quantities can be minimised through best practice measures. For operation, design should include space for recycling bins to encourage users to recycle waste. Those options that will directly affect the viability of housing schemes will change the quantity of waste carbon emissions.

10i has been assessed as most likely to affect biodiversity because it leads to development in rural areas which are more likely to contain greenfield sites. This will increase the risk of impacts upon sensitive ecological areas.

12.3 HMO/Student accommodation

To be assessed at a later date once information becomes available.

Issue – 10 Houses in multiple occupancy and student accommodation

10k Retain criteria based policy for Homes in Multiple Occupation

10l Restrict Homes in Multiple Occupation in certain areas

10m Identifying a particular concentration of HMOs which would be unacceptable in an area and restrict through policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	10k Retain criteria based policy for Homes in Multiple Occupation	10l Restrict Homes in Multiple Occupation in certain areas	10m Identifying a particular concentration of HMOs which would be unacceptable in an area and restrict through policy
1.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
2.	Permanent, Direct LT/ ?		
3.	N/A		
4.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
5.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
6.	Permanent, Direct ST/LT ?		
7.	Permanent, Indirect ST/LT ?		
8.	N/A.		
9.	N/A.		

SA Objective	10k Retain criteria based policy for Homes in Multiple Occupation	10l Restrict Homes in Multiple Occupation in certain areas	10m Identifying a particular concentration of HMOs which would be unacceptable in an area and restrict through policy
10.	Permanent, direct LT ?		
11.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
12.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
13.	N/A		
14.	Permanent, direct LT ?		
15.	Permanent, direct LT ?		
16.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
17.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT +/- ?		
18.	Permanent, direct LT - / ?		
19.	Permanent, direct LT ?		
20.	N/A		
21.	N/A		
22.	N/A		
23.	Permanent, direct ST/LT +/- ?		
24.	Permanent, direct ST/LT +/- ?		

Thanet has the largest proportion of HMOs in Kent. Thanet already has policy in place relating to HMOs and the HMO topic states that this is “essentially appropriate in respect of both HMO’s in general and (although the policy does not currently refer to it specifically) in relation to HMO type student accommodation”. The options outlined in Issue 10 are strategic in nature. For this reason there are many unknowns in the appraisal. Understanding which areas are selected and the correct thresholds for any targets imposed will be crucial in understanding the effect of the options, particularly for Option 10m. Options 10k and 10l will both likely result continuation of the status quo with a potential to restrict growth in HMOs. This may have an impact on the supply of affordable and student housing.

As well as student housing, HMOs can provide a good standard of housing particularly for affordable housing. As such their development can contribute to the growth off supply. Problems can exist and persist in a number of areas when unsuitable properties or locations are selected, or if management standards are poor.

All options whether they restrict or concentrate HMO growth, should consider proximity to key facilities including healthcare. This should be a consideration in any policy. This is particularly the case for affordable housing and family homes which may house children or the elderly.

It is acknowledged that poorly managed HMOs can lead (and have led) to increased fear of crime (see topic paper). It is also acknowledged that this is often a result of poor management. Policies which encourage or concentrate growth in certain areas should be criteria-based to ensure good management.

Effects on public transport from increasing density within existing housing stock will have a marginal impact on any local public transport services. This will entirely depend on the provision in the local area. Private car use should be discouraged in high density areas from start and throughout lifetime.

All decisions around HMOs should include extensive criteria to ensure proper management so that deprivation and poor living conditions do not result from HMOs. Decisions on these policies can have long term effects in these areas therefore these considerations should be central to any policy.

Option 10m could potentially result in HMO integration in certain areas where it has not yet been located. If done correctly, this could result in some degree of integration and mixed communities. If managed correctly, this could have positive social effects. If managed incorrectly, communities could suffer. Data on the locations and long term management strategy are crucial to understanding the likely effect.

It is unlikely that these options will affect the tourist sector significantly. However, if HMOs are concentrated in tourist centres and they are poorly managed, there may be amenity and access effects which could have knock on effects on tourism.

It is assumed that HMO policy will be predominantly focussed on previously (or currently) developed areas and that greenfield land will not be affected. However, this is not made explicit in the options.

HMO development may increase waste generation in certain areas if density increases, but this will not increase on a household basis. Opportunities exist in HMOs for good management, best practice and behaviour change relating to waste.

12.4 Gypsies and travellers

Issue 10 - Gypsies and travellers

10n - Criteria used to consider potential sites to include impact on surrounding uses and access to facilities (e.g. schools, jobs, healthcare).

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	10n - Criteria used to consider potential sites to include impact on surrounding uses and access to facilities (e.g. schools, jobs, healthcare)
1.	Permanent, direct LT ?
2.	Permanent, direct LT + / ?
3.	Permanent, direct LT + / ?
4.	Permanent, direct LT ?
5.	Permanent, direct LT + / ?
6.	Permanent, direct LT - / ?
7.	Permanent, direct LT ?
8 & 9	N/A

SA Objective	10n - Criteria used to consider potential sites to include impact on surrounding uses and access to facilities (e.g. schools, jobs, healthcare)
10.	Permanent, direct LT ?
11.	Permanent, direct LT +
12.	Permanent, direct LT +
13.	Permanent, direct LT +
14.	N/A
15.	Permanent, direct LT -
16.	Permanent, direct LT +
17.	Permanent, direct LT +
18 & 19	N/A
20.	Permanent, direct LT ?
21 to 24	N/A

The policy Option for Gypsies and Travels seeks to employ a criteria based approach for proposed sites. The Option does not affect housing supply directly. The option does not represent a strategic approach to site selection, which may result in misplaced sites. However it does allow councils to respond to demand, when it arises, reducing the risk of over or under allocation of sites.

It has been assumed that once allocated, sites would not be developed. As such, in the event that greenfield or other sensitive sites are chosen, no development would take place.

Effects on crime and perception of crime would be affected by firstly, inappropriate site location and secondly, the operational management of the allocated site. Community tensions may result if sites are located in areas with significant opposition to gypsy and traveller sites or if information is not properly relayed to all stakeholders through consultation.

Allocating based on set site criteria allow the sites to be selected according to nearby facilities such as healthcare, education facilities and public transport links. It is assumed that site selection criteria would examine issues such as biodiversity, tourism and access, and sites which might cause harm in these (and other) areas would be rejected. For example, if sites are allocated near to or within AQMAs there may be congestion or traffic and transport impacts. Understanding and managing these types of issues will be crucial in ensuring sustainable site selection.

13 Issue 11 How do we maintain a physical separation of open countryside between the Thanet Towns and prevent urban sprawl (Green Wedges and Countryside)

Issue 11 – Green wedges

11a Maintain protection of the open character of the areas between Thanet’s main towns currently identified as Green Wedges

11b Maintain protection of the rural and open character of the areas between Thanet’s villages

11c Afford no policy protection to the countryside and green wedges

11d Encourage alternative uses in the Green Wedges which many include leisure, provision of open space, creation of new wildlife habitats

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	11a Maintain protection of the open character of the areas between Thanet’s main towns currently identified as Green Wedges	11b Maintain protection of the rural and open character of the areas between Thanet’s villages	11c Afford no policy protection to the countryside and green wedges	11d Encourage alternative uses in the Green Wedges which many include leisure, provision of open space, creation of new wildlife habitats
1.	Permanent, Indirect LT -/?		Permanent direct LT ?	Permanent, indirect LT -/?
2 to 4	N/A			
5.	N/A		Permanent, indirect LT -/?	
6 & 7	N/A			
8.	N/A		Permanent direct LT +	Permanent direct LT +
9.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, indirect LT -	Permanent direct LT ++
10.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent direct LT ++
11.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent direct LT +
12.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent direct LT +
13.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, direct LT -	Permanent direct LT + / ?
14.	N/A		Permanent indirect LT + / ?	N/A
15.	Permanent direct LT +/-?		Permanent, indirect / direct LT -	Permanent direct LT + / ?
16.	Permanent direct LT		Permanent, indirect / direct LT -	Permanent direct LT ?
17.	Permanent direct LT		Permanent, indirect / direct LT -	Permanent direct LT ?
18 to 20	N/A			
21.	Permanent direct LT +		Permanent, direct LT - -	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?

22.	N/A
23.	N/A
24.	N/A

Protection and enhancement of green wedges and countryside would occur under policies 11a-11b. Under 11c there would be no protection to countryside areas which could potentially lead to alterations from development or change of use.

Those options which maintain the protection of green wedges or space between settlements and/or restrict development by encouraging leisure use will restrict potential development in these areas. This could have a detrimental effect on the housing market by restricting potential supply. However, this maintaining of the status quo may push development towards previously developed land; this will have a number of positive effects. Affording no protection policy (11c) may result in development on this land and away from built up areas and which is therefore better served by key facilities and public transport links (thus encouraging private car use marginally).

The options will not affect access to healthcare or educational facilities. Similarly, the effect on crime levels and/or the perception of crime will remain unaffected. These options will not affect the access vulnerable people have to key services.

The majority of these options will not impact on the public transport network or private car use. Options which potentially lead to development in green wedges or countryside areas (i.e. 11c) will lead to development which is not served as well as development within built up areas.

Maintaining protection of green areas will have no direct effect on employment. However, option 11c, removal of policy protection to the green wedges could result in development which in turn could result in construction employment. Similarly, 11d, encouraging the development of leisure uses in the Green Wedges might support employment in the leisure and tourist sectors. Following on from this, where employment and development spending increase, positive marginal effects on GVA will follow.

With regards to Thanet's important tourist industry; maintaining protection for Green Wedges and countryside will ensure the status quo for tourism and leisure uses in these areas. Encouraging the development of leisure and tourist areas (11d) will boost the sector. Affording no protection policy to green areas (11c) may result in development which could be detrimental to the tourism sector.

The majority of the options will have no effect on listed buildings or conservation areas. Removing the protection to the countryside could have an indirect effect on these resources by encouraging development in new areas out of towns.

It has not been considered likely that these options will affect waste generation and/or disposal; greenhouse gas emissions or renewables.

For biodiversity resources; 11d actively enhances and develops new open space and wildlife habitats, this is deemed a positive impact. 11a and 11b will protect these areas whereas 11c will remove current protection and potentially result in damage to these areas.

14 Issue 12 – How do we ensure that new development respects Thanet’s important and valued views and landscapes?

14.1 Emphasis on previously developed land

Issue 15 Landscape and visual

12a Retain policy protection for identified Landscape Character Areas (CC2 of Thanet Local Plan 2006)

12b No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	12a Retain policy protection for identified Landscape Character Areas	12b No specific policy
1 to 6	N/A	
7.	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT - -
8 & 9	N/A	
10.	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0	Permanent ST/LT -
11.& 12	N/A	
13.	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT - -
14.	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent, direct ST/LT - -
15 to 20	N/A	
21.	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0	Permanent ST/LT -
22 to 24	N/A	

Issue 12’s impacts have less reach across the SA objectives compared with other issues and options. It is not considered likely that there will be effects on:

- housing supply
- access to key facilities.
- supply or access to healthcare or educational facilities.
- the public transport network
- numbers of people living in deprivation
- employment and wider economic performance
- sustainable patterns of development
- waste generation or greenhouse gas emissions
- flood risk or water quality

Sense of place is linked to the unique landscapes protected under policy CC2. Continuing their protection will be positive, whereas having no specific policy increases risk to the resource. Continuing to protect the landscapes should ensure that tourism remains constant. Removal of protection policy could bring about changes to the landscapes which may negatively affect tourism.

Some of the protected landscapes include historic elements (conservation areas, listed buildings/structure) within them, or surrounding them. These landscapes relate and contribute to the historic or cultural value. Removal of protection policy will put them at risk from development.

Maintaining protection of landscape will help protect any biodiversity features/assets within them.

15 Issue 13: How do we protect, maintain and enhance the District’s Green Infrastructure to better support wildlife and human health

Protect green infrastructure, wildlife and human health

- 13a Policy support to protect and enhance existing areas of public open space
- 13b No specific policy protecting open spaces
- 13c Policy requirement for new development to provide effective green infrastructure
- 13d Policy requirement for new development to provide a net gain in biodiversity
- 13e Policy requirement for new development to provide new accessible open space
- 13f Policy requirement for mitigation against any loss of farmland bird habitat
- 13g Policy support for enhancement of the green wedges

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	13a Policy support to protect and enhance existing areas of public open space	13b No specific policy protecting open spaces	13c Policy requirement for new development to provide effective green infrastructure	13d Policy requirement for new development to provide a net gain in biodiversity	13e Policy requirement for new development to provide new accessible open space	13f Policy requirement for mitigation against any loss of farmland bird habitat	13g Policy support for enhancement of the green wedges
1	N/A		Neutral - / ?				N/A
2. to 6	N/A						
7.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT -	Permanent LT +			N/A	Permanent LT +

SA Objective	13a Policy support to protect and enhance existing areas of public open space	13b No specific policy protecting open spaces	13c Policy requirement for new development to provide effective green infrastructure	13d Policy requirement for new development to provide a net gain in biodiversity	13e Policy requirement for new development to provide new accessible open space	13f Policy requirement for mitigation against any loss of farmland bird habitat	13g Policy support for enhancement of the green wedges
8.	N/A						
9.	N/A						
10.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - / ?	Permanent LT +		Permanent LT +	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT +
11.	N/A						
12.	N/A						
13.	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent LT -	Permanent LT +		Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent LT +	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?
14.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - / ?	N/A				
15.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - / ?	Permanent LT +			Permanent LT +	Permanent LT +
16 to 19	N/A						
20.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - -	Permanent LT +	N/A	Permanent LT +	N/A	Permanent LT +
21.	Permanent LT +	Permanent LT - / ?	Permanent LT +	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent LT +	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?	Permanent LT +
22.to 24	N/A						

The options outlined under option 13 concern the supply of green infrastructure across the Thanet area and implications for wildlife and wellbeing. The effects will have less reach across the SA objectives compared with other issues and options as they are unlikely to affect public transport; access to key facilities; reuse of previously developed land (or development of greenfield land) or sustainability in construction or operation.

Those options requiring new development to contribute to green infrastructure will have neutral effect on housing supply with a slight risk that there could be implications on the viability of smaller developments'.

Those areas which enhance the local environment will improve sense of place by creating greener areas where people may be more satisfied with their surroundings. Options which remove restrictions such as 13b may have a detrimental effect in this area.

Improving public areas and the green areas will increase the likelihood of tourism. Removing protection may have the opposite effect.

Options 13a,e and f concern enhancement and/or protection of open space – employing these options will have a major positive effect on open space provision.

Those options which concern biodiversity and/or green infrastructure will have neutral effects with slight positive effects. Where open space is within conservation areas, removal of protection may have detrimental effects on the setting or listed structures and/or conservation areas.

Policy support for green infrastructure and opens space can have positive effects on air quality. Certain types of green infrastructure and green space can also provide protection from flooding; encouraging their development and/or protection will have positive effects through flood attenuation. Removing protection may have the opposite effect, to varying degrees depending on location / baseline environment.

16 Issue 14 – How can we adapt to, and mitigate against the effects of Climate Change

16.1 Climate Change Adaptation

Issue 16 – Climate Change Adaptation

- 14a Requirement for new development to include water efficiency measures
- 14b Requirement for conversions of buildings to include retrofitting to adapt to climate change
- 14c Restriction of development along the coast where it may be affected by coastal change
- 14d Requirement for any development proposed in Flood Risk areas to comply with the requirements in the NPPF
- 14e Requirements for the use of SUDS in new developments

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	14a Requirement for new development to include water efficiency measures	14b Requirement for conversions of buildings to include retrofitting to adapt to climate change	14c Restriction of development along the coast where it may be affected by coastal change	14d Requirement for any development proposed in Flood Risk areas to comply with the requirements in the NPPF	14e Requirements for the use of SUDS in new developments
1.	Permanent, direct LT 0	Permanent, direct LT -		Permanent, direct LT 0	Permanent, direct LT 0
2 to 7	N/A				
8.	N/A	Permanent Direct LT +	N/A		
9 to 11	N/A				
12.	N/A		Permanent Direct LT +	Permanent Direct LT +	N/A
13.	N/A				
14.	N/A	Permanent, direct LT -	N/A		
15 to 19	N/A				
20.	N/A	Permanent, direct LT +			
21 to 24	N/A				

These options relate predominantly to climate change adaptation measures. There is a risk that such measures, if deemed expensive, could affect the viability of smaller housing schemes. Although, there may be an effect on the saleable value

of new housing which is climate change resilient, compared with that which is not.

The options are not likely to affect public transport; access to key facilities; reuse of previously developed land (or development of greenfield land) or sustainability in construction or operation.

Under options 14c and 14d new development will be placed in sustainable locations away from flood risk (accounting for climate change). This will contribute to a sustainable pattern of development.

There may be some positive economic effects and job creation through the retrofitting programme outlined in 14b. With this option though, there may be risk to historic/cultural assets such as listed buildings or conservation areas. If these assets undergo refurbishment to make them climate change resilient, works will need to be sensitive to design and the building fabric.

16.2 Climate Change Mitigation

Issue – 16 Climate Change Mitigation

- 14f Requirement for new development to meet a specific Code for Sustainable Homes level
- 14g Requirement for new development to incorporate design principles including landscaping and layout which minimise use of resources
- 14h Requirement for new development to obtain an element of its energy from renewable or low carbon sources
- 14i Support for District Heating Systems in suitable and viable locations
- 14j Requirement for new developments to incorporate measures to reduce use of private car
- 14k Support for development of solar farms subject to criteria
- 14l Support for other forms of renewable energy developments in appropriate locations
- 14m Allocation of specific sites which would be suitable for large scale renewable energy development

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	14f Requirement for new development to meet a specific Code for Sustainable Homes level	14g Requirement for new development to incorporate design principles including landscaping and layout which minimise use of resources	14h Requirement for new development to obtain an element of its energy from renewable or low carbon sources	14i Support for District Heating Systems in suitable and viable locations	14j Requirement for new developments to incorporate measures to reduce use of private car	14k Support for development of solar farms subject to criteria	14l Support for other forms of renewable energy developments in appropriate locations	14m Allocation of specific sites which would be suitable for large scale renewable energy development
1.	Permanent, direct LT -			Permanent, indirect +	Unknown -	Permanent, indirect +		
2 to 4	N/A							
5.	Permanent, direct LT +	N/A			Permanent, direct LT +	N/A		
6 & 7	N/A							
8 & 9	N/A					Permanent, direct LT +		
10.	N/A							
11.	N/A			Permanent, direct LT +	N/A		Permanent, direct LT +	
12.	Permanent, direct LT +	N/A		Permanent, direct LT +	N/A		Permanent direct LT +	
13.	N/A				Permanent, direct ?			
14.	N/A							
15 to 17	N/A				Permanent, direct LT +	N/A		
18.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +		N/A					
19.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +							
20 to 22	N/A							
23.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +							
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT + +							

These options relate predominantly to climate change mitigation measures. Broadly speaking there are two types of measure – those for households and buildings (**14f,g,h,j**), and those for renewables at different scales (**14i,k,l,m**).

For the building options there is a risk that such measures, if expensive, could affect the viability of housing schemes, particularly for smaller developments. Although, there may be an effect on the final saleable value of new housing which incorporates these measures, as they will be more environmentally friendly, and could be cheaper to run.

The options are not likely to affect public transport; access to key facilities; reuse of previously developed land (or development of greenfield land) or sustainability in construction or operation. However, it acknowledged that option **14f** covers Code for Sustainable Homes, which covers a plethora of sustainability indicators which may indirectly impact on these objectives.

It is not clear what measures for deterring use of private cars will entail, but these will likely affect the public transport network, if successful. There are also potential positive impacts on air quality.

Development of renewable energy options might encourage house building in their proximity as developers seek to use the energy produced (particularly if option **14h** is also implemented).

Support for development of renewables may bring about some employment generation through support of this new industry. This will have further reaching economic / supply chain effects which will boost in GVA across Thanet. Support for renewables may also result in regeneration of derelict land; depending on the wording of policy and the land's suitability.

Assuming that (as **14j-14m all state**) suitable/appropriate locations are chosen with minimal landscape impact; there should be a neutral effect from renewables development. This will present problems in terms of defining suitable/appropriate, particularly with regard to wind farm development.

17 Issue 15 - Maintain a safe and healthy environment

17.1 Control Polluting Development

Issue 15 – Control Polluting Development

15a – Policy to control polluting development 17b Support for designation of new conservation areas

15b – No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	15a – Policy to control polluting development	15b – No specific policy
1 - 20	N/A	N/A
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?	
22.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	
23 - 24	NA	NA

Both options have positive and negative effects. However, **Option 15a** is more likely to result in neutral and beneficial effects than **Option 15b** because, by the use of criteria, it would allow the District to control polluting development through the planning system.

17.2 Development on contaminated land

Issue 15 – Development on contaminated land

15c Policy to control and mitigate development on contaminated land

15d – No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	15c Policy to control and mitigate development on contaminated land	15d – No specific policy
1.	N/A	N/A
2.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent ST/LT -/?
3 - 10	N/A	N/A
11.	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?
12 - 24	N/A	N/A

Option 15c could have indirect health benefits (removing potential pollutant pathways that could adversely affect people's health) and without the policy there might be greater risks to health. Whereas option 15d might have an adverse effect on people's health, particularly if source-pathway-receptor linkages are created.

Similarly, both options could potentially deter the development or regeneration of previously developed land, particularly if a developer can build on a greenfield site that will be cheaper and quicker to construct.

17.3 Development on unstable and derelict land

Issue 15 – Development on unstable and derelict land

15e - Policy to control development on unstable and derelict land

15f – No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	15e - Policy to control development on unstable and derelict land	15f– No specific policy
1 - 10	N/A	N/A
11.	Permanent, Indirect ST/ +	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0
12 - 24	N/A	N/A

These options are only likely to affect the use / development of previously developed land. A beneficial effect is predicted for **15e** because this will ensure that developers have better understanding of the potential structural and design issues they will have to address during construction. As result this could help to make development of PDL more viable and less risky for developers and give others the confidence that potential instability issues have been considered. This particularly important in area with a dynamic coastline.

17.4 Air quality

Issue 15 – Air Quality

15g- Policy support for improving air quality

15h– No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	15g - Policy to support improvement to air quality	15h– No specific policy
1.	N/A	N/A
2.	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?
3 - 14	N/A	N/A
15.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT ?
16 -18	N/A	N/A
19.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT ?

SA Objective	15g - Policy to support improvement to air quality	15h- No specific policy
20 - 24	N/A	N/A

Option 15g is more likely to result in beneficial effects than Option 15h because, by the use of criteria, it would allow the District to control development in AQMAs and therefore improve air quality and indirectly contribute towards improving the health of residents within the AQMAs.

17.5 Noise

Issue 15 – Noise

15i - Policy to control and mitigate against unacceptable noise.

15j – No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	15i - Policy to control and mitigate against unacceptable noise.	15j – No specific policy
1.	N/A	N/A
2.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
3 - 6	N/A	N/A
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
8 - 24	N/A	N/A

Indirectly **Option 15i** could potentially result in a positive effect by helping reduce the stress and adverse effects noise can have on quality of life. However noise legislation existing to control noise levels and this would result in the same positive effect in **Option 15j**.

17.6 Light pollution

Issue 15 – Light pollution

15k - Policy support for controlling light pollution

15l - No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	15k - Policy support for controlling light pollution	15l- No specific policy
1 -6	N/A	N/A
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
8 - 12	N/A	N/A
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0

SA Objective	15k - Policy support for controlling light pollution	15l- No specific policy
14.-20	N/A	N/A
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0
22 to 24	NA	NA

Option 15i could potentially result in a positive effects on how satisfied people with where they live (by reducing the level of nuisance that light pollution can cause. It could also have visual and landscape impact benefits and could also help to reduce light pollution effects on protected species. **Option 15j** would not result in any of these potential benefits.

17.7 Groundwater

Issue 15 – Groundwater

15m - Policy restricting development that would detrimentally impact groundwater

15n - No specific policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	15m - Policy restricting development that would detrimentally impact groundwater	15n – No specific policy
1 to 20	N/A	N/A
21.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0
22 to 24	NA	NA

Option 15m could potentially help to protect ground water resources, and ground water protection zones in particular of which there are a number around the district, and due to underlying geology is particularly susceptible to contamination.

Option 15n does not provide any protection for ground water. However ground water quality is protected by other legislation.

18 Issue 16 - How can we provide high quality homes and neighbourhoods? (Quality Development)

18.1 Amenity value and character

Issue 16 – Amenity value and character

16a - consideration of impact of development on residential amenity value

16b - consideration of impact of new development on the character and appearance of surrounding area

16c - consideration of impact of new development on the compatibility with and impact on neighbouring buildings

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16a consideration of impact of development on residential amenity value	16b consideration of impact of new development on the character and appearance of surrounding area	16c consideration of impact of new development on the compatibility with and impact on neighbouring buildings
1 to 6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		
8.	N/A		
9.	N/A		
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		
11.	N/A		
12.	N/A		
13.	Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?		
14.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		
15 to 24.	N/A		

All three options have the potential to have a number of positive effects. These include indirect effects on a sense of place and the desire people have to live at certain location or in a given settlement, supporting the visitor economy by working with and enhancing the built environment and by requiring development to take into account and work with their setting including heritage areas and features. However the most significant effect of all three options is the requirement for development to take into account their surroundings, residential amenity and neighbouring buildings and the positive effect this can have on landscape and townscape.

However, the specific policy criteria and mechanism for achieving these outcomes will require further development and assessment in subsequent stages of the development of the Local Plan.

18.2 Movement and access in new development

Issue 16 – Movement and access in new development

16d - provision of pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle movement in new development

16e - provision for disabled access

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16d provision of pedestrian/cyclist/vehicle movement in new development	16e provision for disabled access
1 to 4.	N/A	
5.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	NA
6.	Permanent, Indirect ST/0	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +
7.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +
8 to 15	N/A	
16.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	Permanent, Indirect ST/0
17.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +	Permanent, Indirect ST/0
18.	N/A	
19.	Permanent, Direct, ST/LT +/-?	Permanent, Indirect ST/0
20 to 24.	N/A	

None of the options are likely to have an adverse effect and both have the potential to have positive effects. **16d** will help to support people living and using new developments to choose alternatives to private car use by ensuring that infrastructure and facilities are integrated into the design.

16e will have a positive effect, particularly in improving access to new developments for vulnerable groups and will also help to make new developments somewhere people of all abilities are happy to live.

18.3 Open space and greenspace

Issue 16 – Open space and greenspace

16f provision of open spaces and gaps in development

16g provision of landscaping and planting, green infrastructure

16h provision of wildlife habitats and corridors

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16f provision of open spaces and gaps in development	16g provision of landscaping and planting, green infrastructure	16h provision of wildlife habitats and corridors
--------------	--	---	--

SA Objective	16f provision of open spaces and gaps in development	16g provision of landscaping and planting, green infrastructure	16h provision of wildlife habitats and corridors
1.	N/A		
2.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +		Permanent, Indirect ST/ 0
3 to 6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		
8.	N/A		
9.	N/A		
10.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		
11.	N/A		
12.	N/A		
13.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		
14 to 20	N/A		
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +		Permanent direct ST/LT ++/?
22 to 24	NA		

All of the effects associated with the options are likely to have positive effects, particularly on the sense of place, the quality of the natural and semi-natural environment for tourism and local landscape and townscape character. Indirectly, **Options 16f and 16g** have the potential to provide local health benefits by providing opportunities for people to exercise more and live healthier lifestyles. **Option 16h** is likely to have a significant positive effect on biodiversity by promoting habitat creation and enhancing the connectivity between isolated habitats through the creation of wildlife corridors.

18.4 Crime prevention and contributing towards public art

Issue 16 – Crime prevention and contributing towards public art

16i - Measures to prevent crime and disorder

16j - Integration of public art

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16i Measures to prevent crime and disorder	16j Integration of public art
1 to 3.	N/A	
4.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	NA
5.	N/A	
6.	N/A	

SA Objective	16i Measures to prevent crime and disorder	16j Integration of public art
7.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	
8 to 24	N/A	

Option 16i is likely to have a positive effect on helping to reduce crime or the perception of there being a risk of crime in new development. However this is only likely to benefit new development so a minor beneficial effect is predicted.

Both options are likely to have a significant effect on sense of place and people’s satisfaction with where they live, work and visit.

18.5 Other policy issues

Issue 16 – Other policy issues

16k - provision for clothes drying facilities and refuse disposal/dustbin storage

16l - incorporation of sustainable drainage systems

16m - Appropriate design and location of advertisements

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16k provision for clothes drying facilities and refuse disposal/dustbin storage	16l incorporation of sustainable drainage systems	16m Appropriate design and location of advertisements
1- 9	N/A		
10.	N/A		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
11.	N/A		
12.	N/A		
13.	N/A		Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +
14 to 17.	N/A		
18.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	NA	NA
19.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	NA
20.	NA	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	NA
21.	NA	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	NA
22 to 24	NA		

Option 16m is likely to have a positive effect on the streetscape, townscape and visual amenity of District which in turn has potentially indirect benefits for the visitor and tourist economy. Option 16k has the potential to contribute towards reducing greenhouse gas emission and energy consumption by providing people with alternatives to using energy intensive tumble dryers. Finally **Option 16l** is likely to contribute towards reducing flood risk, climate change adaptation and

indirectly contribute towards habitat creation where the SUDs are in the form of ponds or waterbodies.

18.6 Areas of High Townscape Value

Areas of High Townscape Value

16n Continued existing policy protection for Areas of High Townscape Value (D7 in Thanet Local Plan 2006).

16o Removal of policy protection

16p Identify areas that are of high townscape value and protect and enhance through policy

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16n Continued existing policy protection for Areas of High Townscape Value	16o Removal of policy protection	16p Identify areas that are of high townscape value and protect and enhance through policy
1 to 6	N/A		
7.	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +
8. & 9	N/A		
10.	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +
11 & 12	N/A		
13.	Permanent Direct ST/LT ++	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?	Permanent Direct ST/LT ++
14.	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +	Permanent, indirect ST/LT -/?	Permanent, Indirect, ST/LT +
15 to 24	N/A		

Options 16n and 16p are both predicted as being likely to have positive effects on townscape and indirectly the role that areas of high value townscape has on the sense of place, people's satisfaction with where they live and cultural heritage features within those areas.

However, without policy protection of any sort (**Option 16o**) there is the potential for adverse effects on the sense of identity of towns with areas of high townscape value, it could potentially harm the visitor economy and result in adverse visual, townscape and heritage effects.

18.7 Housing Density

Issue 16 – Housing Density

16q Housing densities set in zones

16r Housing density decided by density of surroundings of application site

16s Continue density requirement H1 in Thanet Local Plan 2006

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16q Housing densities set in zones	16r Housing density decided by density of surroundings of application site	16s Continue density requirement H1 in Thanet Local Plan 2006
1 to 4.	N/A		
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +
6.	N/A		
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
8 to 11	N/A		
12.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
14.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +/-?
15 to 24	N/A		

All of the options have the potential to have a positive effect on sense of place, townscape, heritage features and the sustainable use of land resources (i.e. by allowing higher densities of dwellings in locations where it is appropriate and can be accommodated). Furthermore, by allowing different densities of development the options have indirect benefits for sustainable transport by increasing the numbers of people living close to town centres where public transport links can be accessed more easily.

18.8 Garden Land Development

Issue 16 – Garden Land Development

16t Policy restriction on development on garden land

16u No restriction.

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Findings

SA Objective	16t Policy restriction on development on garden land	16u No restriction
1 to 10	N/A	
11.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT -?
12 to 20	N/A	
21.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct ST/LT -?
22 to 24	N/A	

Options 16t has the potential to promote the use of previously developed land by putting in place safeguards that require garden land development as last resort. This option also contributes indirectly towards biodiversity by helping to retain gardens and thereby the role they play as important areas of habitat within urban areas and towns. Without these restrictions potentially adverse effects are predicted (**Option 16u**)

20 Issue 17 – How do we protect and enhance Thanet’s Heritage Assets and their setting?

20.1 Designated heritage assets

For the ease of assessment the 12 options developed to address this issue have been split into two groups. The first group is listed below.

Issue 17 – Designated and locally listed heritage assets and their setting

17a Support for preservation and enhancement of existing Conservation Areas

17b Support for designation of new conservation areas

17c Support for protection and enhancement of listed buildings,

17d Support for protection and enhancement of historic parks and gardens

17e Support for protection and enhancement of scheduled monuments

17f Support for protection and enhancement of buildings of local interest and other heritage assets, through development of a local list

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	17a Support for preservation and enhancement of existing Conservation Areas	17b Support for designation of new conservation areas	17c Support for protection and enhancement of listed buildings,	17d Support for protection and enhancement of historic parks and gardens	17e Support for protection and enhancement of scheduled monuments	17f Support for protection and enhancement of buildings of local interest and other heritage assets, through development of a local list
1 to 6	N/A					
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					
8.	N/A					
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?					
12.	N/A					
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++					
15 to 22	N/A					
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?					

Although the 6 options assessed related to different heritage features the significance of their effects are the same because they all have the same direct and indirect effects on the character and sense of place of settlements, help to support

the economy and visitor economy in particularly as visitor attractions in their own right and contribute to character of townscape.

Only one significant effect was predicted on SA objective 14 (To preserve and enhance sites, features and areas of historic archaeological or architectural importance, and their settings). However, it should be noted that for these effects to be realised all 6 options would require implementation.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with the Options can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

20.2 Protecting assets and criteria based policies

The second group of heritage related options are listed below.

Issue 17 – Designated and locally listed heritage assets and their setting

17g Support for identification and, where appropriate, protection of archaeological heritage

17h Support towards positive action in relation to Heritage at Risk

17i Criteria based policy for determining applications for buildings which are locally listed

17j Criteria based policy for dealing with renewable energy in the historic environment

17k Site specific policies for significant heritage assets with development potential

17l No specific heritage policies

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	17g Support for identification and, where appropriate, protection of archaeological heritage	17h Support towards positive action in relation to Heritage at Risk	17i Criteria based policy for determining applications for buildings which are locally listed	17j Criteria based policy for dealing with renewable energy in the historic environment	17k Site specific policies for significant heritage assets with development potential	17l No specific heritage policies
1 to 6	N/A					
7.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
8.	N/A					
9.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
10.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
11.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?					
12.	N/A					
13.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					Permanent.

SA Objective	17g Support for identification and, where appropriate, protection of archaeological heritage	17h Support towards positive action in relation to Heritage at Risk	17i Criteria based policy for determining applications for buildings which are locally listed	17j Criteria based policy for dealing with renewable energy in the historic environment	17k Site specific policies for significant heritage assets with development potential	17l No specific heritage policies
						Indirect. ST/LT ?
14.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ++					Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT ?
15 to 22	N/A					
23.	Permanent. Indirect. ST/LT +					Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?
24.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?					

Of the options assessed and described here the significance of the effects from options 17g to 17k are the same because they all have the same direct and indirect effects on the character and sense of place of settlements, help to support the economy and visitor economy in particularly as visitor attractions in their own right and contribute to character of townscape.

Only one significant effect was predicted on SA objective 14 (To preserve and enhance sites, features and areas of historic archaeological or architectural importance, and their settings). However, it should be noted that for these effects to be realised all 6 options would require implementation.

The effects of Option 17l are uncertain because without specific policies in the Local Plan it is not certain to what extent the NPPF on its own would protect heritage assets given the specific recommendations in the NPPF regarding how plans should address heritage issues.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with the Options can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.

21 Issue 18 Communities

21.1 Communities

The second group of heritage related options are listed below.

Issue 18 –Communities

18a Policy support for protecting existing community facilities

18b No specific policy for protecting existing community facilities

18c Policy support for new community facilities to be developed

18d No specific policy for new community facilities to be developed

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal findings

SA Objective	18a Policy support for protecting existing community facilities	18b No specific policy for protecting existing community facilities	18c Policy support for new community facilities to be developed	18d No specific policy for new community facilities to be developed
1.	N/A			
2.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, LT -/?
3.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, LT -/?
4.	N/A			
5.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, LT -/?
6.	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT ?	Permanent. Direct. ST/LT +	Permanent. Direct, LT -/?
7 to 24	N/A			

Of the options assessed and described here the significance of the effects from **Options 17a and 17b** are the same because they both contribute towards supporting existing facilities and promoting the development of new facilities to address current and future shortages.

The effects of **Option 18b** is uncertain because it might or might not affect the availability of facilities because this will be governed by other factors such as population growth, housing numbers and the needs of the population over the life of the plan. The effects of **Option 18d** are adverse because they would over the long term would not allow the capacity of facilities to be increased.

All of the other remaining negative and uncertain effects associated with the Options can potentially be mitigated either by development management policies or the NPPF requirements.