

## Appendix V: Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Issues and Strategic Options 2006

This appendix contains the SA undertaken of the Core Strategy Issues Paper in August 2005 ('A Postcard from the Future – Making Dartford a Good Place to Live'), and the SA of the Strategic Options in 2006. However, the options have since been revised, and a new appraisal undertaken. This new appraisal is provided in Appendix VII: SA of Core Strategy Issues and Strategic Options 2008.

**Table 1: Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Issues**

LDF Issue	Comments	Recommendations for Sustainability
<p><b>Regeneration and Transport</b></p>	<p>The Issues Paper sets out 'options' for regeneration – relating to Dartford Town Centre, other local centres, 'tired' parts of the Borough's physical fabric including the River Thames frontage, Swanscombe, as well as strategic sites for new development.</p> <p>From a sustainability perspective, it is important that these are not considered 'options' in as much as some will be progressed in the absence of others. To achieve regeneration to enhance quality of life in the Borough as a whole, all the 'options' comprise important components of a strategic package, and will need to be progressed in a coordinated manner, ensuring the interlinkages between each element of the regeneration are recognised.</p> <p>For example, it does not make sense to regenerate Dartford town centre whilst leaving the rest of the Borough to look after itself - the regeneration of the town centre is unlikely to be successful without enhancements to increase civic pride elsewhere.</p> <p>The strategic sites will play a very important part in the regeneration of the Borough, and Dartford should take full advantage of the very significant opportunities afforded by the extensive planned growth. Efforts must be made to ensure that benefits of development reach other parts of the</p>	<p>Ensure the LDF progresses all components of the regeneration of the Borough as a strategic package.</p> <p>In accommodating the strategic developments, the LDF must ensure integration with existing development and communities, and should seek to maximise benefits for the whole Borough</p>

LDF Issue	Comments	Recommendations for Sustainability
	<p>Borough, and are not confined to the development sites. Hence there is an essential need for integration between new and existing development. For example, the extensive development at Eastern Quarry, Ebbsfleet and Swanscombe Peninsula must complement the regeneration of the existing centre at Swanscombe, and the development at Swanscombe Peninsula should deliver benefits for the waterfront, potentially acting as a catalyst for wider waterfront regeneration.</p>	
<p><b>Lifelong Learning</b></p>	<p>The text setting the context for this Issue refers to the good existing network of sites for schools and other educational establishments, libraries and other important learning resources – such as the Dartford Museum and Beacon Wood Country Park's interpretation services.</p> <p>It is considered important for sustainability that additional learning facilities are provided to support the growing population within the Borough. Learning facilities should be incorporated within the strategic development sites. Sites and features with cultural significance should be safeguarded, and opportunities taken to enhance them as part of the Borough's learning resource and local distinctiveness.</p>	<p>Ensure the LDF helps deliver additional learning resources, including cultural sites and facilities accessible to all, to keep pace with growth</p>
<p><b>Jobs and Business</b></p>	<p>This Issue rightly recognises the importance of protecting a wide range of employment sites throughout the Borough, resisting the loss of existing employment areas. This will contribute to a wide range of employment opportunities, with existing sites complemented by the new (mainly office-based) employment associated with the strategic sites, especially Ebbsfleet.</p> <p>Retaining employment sites in a wide range of locations, including existing centres and the riverside, will help ensure employment opportunities in proximity to residents. The range of employment premises will assist in securing a flexible economic base, capable of evolving in response to changing circumstances.</p>	<p>The way in which this Issue is presented in the Issues Paper is considered to provide a strong context for the further development of relevant aspects of the LDF.</p>

<b>LDF Issue</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendations for Sustainability</b>
<b>The Environment</b>	<p>The Green Belt is appropriately recognised as an integral spatial planning mechanism for the protection and enhancement of the Borough's environment. It is extremely important from a sustainability perspective to resist inappropriate development within the Green Belt, not only to protect natural assets therein, but also to divert development pressure in order to encourage the regeneration of the area to the North.</p> <p>The Issues Paper usefully outlines the role of the Green Grid. It specifies that some areas can accommodate some degree of built development where other community objectives are being met. It is not exactly clear what is intended by this. Whilst there may be circumstances where built development can be accommodated within the Green Grid, the presumption should be to ensure no net loss of accessible open space. Even if the open space is not delivering significant benefits to the community now, there may well be potential to realise such benefits in the future.</p> <p>The Issue also refers to constraints arising from flood risk, and states that this need not preclude development if land raising can be undertaken. It is recognised that some land raising will be required for the strategic development sites, but there should be a presumption against reducing flood storage capacity where possible. There may be potential to incorporate flood storage within strategic sites as multifunctional open space with an occasional flood storage function.</p>	<p>The LDF should use Green Belt controls to help manage the strategic distribution of development, securing regeneration to the North of the Borough, and protecting and enhancing natural assets including the open nature of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The LDF should incorporate a presumption against development within the Green Grid, except where the development is of a nature that contributes to the accessibility and enjoyment of the space.</p>
<b>Health and Wellbeing</b>	<p>The context for this Issue recognises the potential to instil preventative healthcare objectives into the creation of communities, thereby helping to progress an integral component of proactive spatial planning for sustainability.</p> <p>Amongst other things, the Issue also refers to protecting the occupiers of new development from air or noise pollution. It is also important to consider ways</p>	<p>The LDF should consider both existing and new development when instilling preventative healthcare objectives</p>

LDF Issue	Comments	Recommendations for Sustainability
	of reducing air and noise pollution for existing residents.	
<b>Community Safety</b>	The potential is recognised to 'design out' crime early on in building developments by providing well-used and overlooked streets and spaces with natural surveillance. However, it is necessary to recognise the need to enhance safety in the public realm of existing built areas where the extent of new build is likely to be limited, especially within Dartford town centre.	The LDF should consider both existing and new development when instilling a safe, secure public realm
<b>Housing and the Built Environment</b>	<p>The opportunities and challenges associated with accommodating growth (15,500 new dwellings to 2021 to meet Structure Plan requirements) are acknowledged, and the Issue describes how the growth is to be accommodated on a small number of very large sites. The need for timely provision of infrastructure, and compact development with access to good public transport is recognised, as well as the need to deliver appropriately phased community 'hubs' (which have tended to lag behind residential development).</p> <p>From a sustainability perspective, the growth of community hubs in a timely manner is integral to the delivery of sustainable communities. A community hub or hubs must be provided from the outset, otherwise a precedent will be set for accessing community facilities elsewhere, and there will be less potential for development of 'social capital'. Sustainable construction in all new development should also be required.</p> <p>The focus of the Issue is on new development. However, the housing needs and housing quality of existing areas should not be neglected.</p>	<p>The LDF will need to help secure community hubs for new development from the outset.</p> <p>The LDF should require sustainable construction measures in all new build housing</p> <p>Whilst it is essential that the LDF actively progresses and addresses the opportunities and challenges associated with accommodating extensive growth on the strategic sites, the housing needs and quality in existing areas must also be dealt with.</p>

<b>LDF Issue</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendations for Sustainability</b>
<p><b>Leisure and Culture</b></p>	<p>This Issue rightly emphasises the importance of the leisure and cultural resource for the vitality and viability of the Borough. It identifies a need to enhance the availability of family oriented activities, and suggests that this can be progressed to the north of Dartford town centre at Mill Pond Road.</p> <p>It is also important that leisure and cultural potential is built into the strategic sites for growth, although this should be undertaken in a way which avoids over-programming leisure activity, with spaces and buildings available for activities to evolve and emerge informally.</p> <p>It is considered that the frontage with the River Thames also provides a very important potential for accommodating leisure and culture, as an integral part of the regeneration of the area.</p>	<p>The LDF should ensure that leisure and cultural opportunities are built into the strategic sites for growth.</p> <p>The LDF could play a key role in promoting the waterfront as a resource for leisure and culture</p>

**Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Strategic Options**

**Key:**

<b>DG</b>	Development actively encouraged as it would resolve an existing sustainability problem
<b>LG</b>	No Sustainability constraints and development acceptable
<b>B</b>	Neutral or unknown effect
<b>Y</b>	Potential sustainability issues; mitigation and /or negotiation possible
<b>O</b>	Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues ; mitigation or negotiation difficult and /or expensive
<b>R</b>	Absolute sustainability constraints to development

**Strategic Topic 1:**  
**How much growth is needed?**

SA objective		Option 1.1 Provide for a lower level of growth than the emerging Structure Plan specifies.	Option 1.2 Provide for a level of housing and employment growth that are balanced and are in line with the emerging Structure Plan.	Option 1.3 Provide for a higher level of housing growth.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	The SA objective on balanced communities could still be met if lower levels of growth were achieved, provided policies are in place to ensure mixed use and mixed tenure developments and that appropriate facilities are provided for.	<b>LG</b>	This option would assist in creating balanced communities as it would assist in redressing the existing high levels of out-commuting through providing for further employment growth within Dartford. To achieve balanced communities policies that ensure mixed use and mixed tenure developments need to be in place. Appropriate facilities should also be provided for.	<b>LG</b>	A higher level of housing growth would still enable the promotion of mixed use and mixed tenure communities, however, this option may lead to a net imbalance in employment as employment land may be used for residential development. It could also lead to increased levels of out-commuting.	<b>Y</b>
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	The sustainability impact on the integration of new communities with existing communities would be dependent upon the planning and design of those developments. Likely to have a lesser impact than Options 1.2 and 1.3, as fewer residents would be impacted upon by new development.	<b>B</b>	The sustainability impact on the integration of new communities with existing communities would be dependent upon the planning and design of those developments. Would have a greater impact on existing communities (i.e. the number of residents affected by new development would be greater) than Option 1.1, but a lesser impact than Option 1.3.	<b>B</b>	The sustainability impact on the integration of new communities with existing communities would be dependent upon the planning and design of those developments. Although, a higher level of growth may have a greater negative impact as the overall number of residents affected by new development may increase.	<b>B</b>

SA objective		Option 1.1 Provide for a lower level of growth than the emerging Structure Plan specifies.	Option 1.2 Provide for a level of housing and employment growth that are balanced and are in line with the emerging Structure Plan.	Option 1.3 Provide for a higher level of housing growth.			
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	Accessibility would be dependent on the location and design of individual developments, however a lower level of growth may not create the necessary critical mass to support more viable and frequent public transport services.	<b>Y</b>	Accessibility would be dependent on the location and design of individual developments. The aim of achieving balance between housing and employment growth is, however, supported, as it will assist in reducing the need to travel for employment.	<b>LG</b>	A higher level of growth would assist in creating the necessary critical mass to support more viable and frequent public transport services. However, an imbalance between residential and employment (creating a larger workforce than there are jobs available) may also increase the need for people to travel longer distances to work.	<b>Y</b>
4	<b>Public Health</b>	A lower population may have a positive effect on public health through minimising the impacts of development and population growth (e.g. air and noise pollution, potential loss of green space).	<b>LG</b>	A greater balance between work and employment opportunities may assist in improving quality of life through reducing the length of and need to commute. In addition, providing urban village style developments may provide more opportunities for walking to local services such as schools, shops and health centres.	<b>LG</b>	A higher population may assist in achieving a critical mass to support better provision of health and recreational facilities. However, if it were not met by requisite employment growth, it would increase the need to commute for employment. The impacts of development and population growth (e.g. air and noise pollution, potential loss of green space) would also be greater under this scenario.	<b>B</b>
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	A lower level of growth than that proposed in the Structure Plan would place less of a strain on existing infrastructure, and reduce the need for additional infrastructure.	<b>DG</b>	May place strain on existing infrastructure (e.g. roads, community services). Will require the planning of appropriate infrastructure. A particular concern is the provision of water, and whether the cumulative impact of redevelopment in the Thames Gateway will place additional stress on water resources.	<b>Y</b>	A higher level of growth will place greater strain on existing infrastructure and may require the provision of both strategic and community-level resources. Again, a particular concern is the provision of water, and that new development will contribute to the cumulative impact of redevelopment in the Thames Gateway- placing additional stress on water resources.	<b>Y</b>

SA objective		Option 1.1 Provide for a lower level of growth than the emerging Structure Plan specifies.	Option 1.2 Provide for a level of housing and employment growth that are balanced and are in line with the emerging Structure Plan.	Option 1.3 Provide for a higher level of housing growth.
6	<b>Housing</b>	A lower level of growth would be of less benefit as it would not afford as many opportunities to provide affordable and key worker housing. <b>Y</b>	This option is preferred to Option 1.1, however Option 1.3 provides the greatest opportunity to create affordable and key worker housing in pure numerical terms. <b>LG</b>	A higher level of housing growth would enable the provision of more affordable and key worker housing, and may better assist in meeting the Borough's housing needs. <b>DG</b>
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques. <b>B</b>	All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques. <b>B</b>	All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques. <b>B</b>
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	A lower population may have a positive effect on public health through minimising the impacts of development and population growth (e.g. air and noise pollution, potential loss of green space). <b>LG</b>	Cumulative impacts from a higher level of development can be of detriment to the provision of a healthy and safe environment. <b>Y</b>	The cumulative impacts from a higher level of development can be of detriment to the provision of a healthy and safe environment. This is the least preferred option from an environmental health perspective. <b>O</b>
9	<b>Employment</b>	In the long term, this option may lead to a shortage in the local workforce, forcing industry to recruit from outside the area. <b>Y</b>	This option is preferred as a balance of employment and workforce will assist in reducing out-commuting. <b>DG</b>	This option may exacerbate levels of out-commuting through increasing the workforce. It would need to be met by an appropriate level of job creation to avoid this. However, an increase in residential population would increase employment opportunities through the construction stage and through creating a greater need for services. <b>B</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b>	Any development would need to ensure landscape impacts were minimised. <b>Y</b>	Any development would need to ensure landscape impacts were minimised. <b>Y</b>	Any development would need to ensure landscape impacts were minimised. An increased level of growth may implicate loss of green spaces and areas of landscape importance. <b>Y</b>

SA objective		Option 1.1 Provide for a lower level of growth than the emerging Structure Plan specifies.	Option 1.2 Provide for a level of housing and employment growth that are balanced and are in line with the emerging Structure Plan.	Option 1.3 Provide for a higher level of housing growth.
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	Specific impacts on land and soil quality would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth. <b>LG</b>	Specific impacts on land and soil quality would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth, although clearly increased growth would place more pressure to develop scarce land resources. <b>Y</b>	Specific impacts on land and soil quality would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth, although clearly increased growth would place more pressure to develop scarce land resources. <b>Y</b>
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Impact on biodiversity would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth. <b>LG</b>	Impact on biodiversity would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth, although clearly increased growth would place more pressure on the development of areas of higher biodiversity, and would increase cumulative impacts that may affect biodiversity (e.g. noise, air and light pollution, loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation). <b>Y</b>	Impact on biodiversity would be dependent upon the location, rather than the scale of growth, although clearly increased growth would place more pressure on the development of areas of higher biodiversity, and would increase cumulative impacts that may affect biodiversity (e.g. noise, air and light pollution, loss of habitat and habitat fragmentation). <b>Y</b>
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	The impacts of development on cultural heritage would be dependent upon the location, more so than the overall scale of growth. <b>LG</b>	The impacts of development on cultural heritage would be dependent upon the location, more so than the scale of growth, although a higher level of growth may place more pressure on heritage resources. <b>Y</b>	The impacts of development on cultural heritage would be dependent upon the location, more so than the scale of growth, although a higher level of growth may place more pressure on cultural heritage resources. <b>Y</b>
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
15	<b>Energy</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources. <b>B</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources. <b>B</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources. <b>B</b>

SA objective		Option 1.1 Provide for a lower level of growth than the emerging Structure Plan specifies.	Option 1.2 Provide for a level of housing and employment growth that are balanced and are in line with the emerging Structure Plan.	Option 1.3 Provide for a higher level of housing growth.
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	This option likely to have the least impact on air quality, and is therefore supported from this perspective.	This option is likely to have a greater impact on air quality than Option 1.1, through increased development activities and an increase in vehicular travel resulting from development.	This option likely to have a greater impact on air quality than for Option 1.1 and Option 1.2, and is least preferred option from an Air Quality Management perspective.
17	<b>Waste</b>	Will lead to less waste production in the Borough than the other two options.	An increased population will produce increased waste, however this can be managed through ensuring minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste are incorporated into all developments.	Clearly an increased population will produce increased waste, however this can be managed through ensuring the minimisation, reuse and recycling of waste are incorporated into all developments.
18	<b>Water</b>	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources. This scenario is preferred from a water resource management perspective as it would place a lesser burden on water resources.	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that any new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources.	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that any new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources. Clearly, the greater the level of development, the greater the pressure placed on water resources.
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Due to the location of Dartford on the Thames Estuary, flood risk is a key issue, particularly given the predicted impacts due to Climate Change (e.g. sea level rise and increased rainfall). Any development will need to take account of this.	Due to the location of Dartford on the Thames Estuary, flood risk is a key issue, particularly given the predicted impacts due to Climate Change (e.g. sea level rise and increased rainfall). Any development will need to take account of this.	Due to the location of Dartford on the Thames Estuary, flood risk is a key issue, particularly given the predicted impacts due to Climate Change (e.g. sea level rise and increased rainfall). Any development will need to take account of this.

**Summary:** Option 1.1 performs better than options 1.2 or 1.3 on a range of objectives: infrastructure, environmental health, land and soil, biodiversity, cultural heritage, air quality, waste and water, as it advocates a lower level of growth, which would be preferable on environmental terms. However, in terms of overall sustainability, option 1.2 performs reasonably, and performs better than option 1.1 on accessibility, housing and health. Option 1.3, proposing a higher level of growth, performs well on housing affordability, but poorly on environmental objectives due to the pressures it would place on land and soil resources, water resources, waste and air quality, with water resources a particular concern.

From a sustainability perspective, the lowest growth option, Option 1.1 is preferred, however it is acknowledged that this option would not be in conformity with the Structure Plan requirements, nor overall housing targets for the Thames Gateway, and may not assist in meeting accessibility, housing and employment targets. Option 1.2 would require strong policy to ensure environmental concerns are addressed, in particular relating to air quality, waste, and water and energy usage.

**Strategic Topic 2:**

**Where will growth be located?**

SA Objective		Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	If appropriately planned, this option could assist in meeting the SA objective of promoting mixed tenure and mixed communities, however Option 2.2 is preferred as it would promote better accessibility to employment locations.	<b>Y</b>	This option is preferred as it provides the best opportunities for closing the gap between deprived areas and other areas through encouraging regeneration and increased facilities in deprived areas. It would also encourage better accessibility to employment locations through the integration of residential areas with existing and new employment sites and would better promote mixed use development.	<b>DG</b>	This market-led approach is considered least sustainable as it would lead to the creation of primarily residential areas (due to residential development being the strongest driver), and could result in new development being constructed without the requisite infrastructure in place.	<b>R</b>
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	Allowing development in the Green Belt would be a missed opportunity in terms of the chance to improve interaction	<b>Y</b>	Preferred option as it would, if appropriately managed, assist in strengthening existing communities, encouraging the regeneration and	<b>LG</b>	This market-led approach is considered least sustainable as there would be no requirement to consider the needs of existing communities.	<b>R</b>

SA Objective	Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.
	between new and existing communities, particularly in areas in need of regeneration.	enhancement of viable communities.	
3	<b>Accessibility</b> The development of the Green Belt would place people further away from jobs, services, and public transport networks, hence increasing reliance on the private vehicle for transportation.	<b>Y</b> This option is preferred as it would assist in enhancing public transport networks within existing communities, and would locate development close to jobs and community services.	<b>DG</b> This option is not considered sustainable from an accessibility perspective, as it makes no provision for the need to integrate transport and landuse, or the need for development to be located within easy access to jobs, services and public transport networks.
4	<b>Public Health</b> This option may provide better access to rural areas for recreation, but conversely, new development areas would be further from existing health and leisure facilities located in town centres.	<b>B</b> This option would place populations close to existing health and recreational services.	<b>LG</b> This option makes no requirement for development to be located within easy access to health and recreational services.
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b> The development of Greenfield land will create additional need for infrastructure, which would be	<b>O</b> This option encourages the development of areas where there is infrastructure capacity to serve	<b>Y</b> Makes no account for the need to phase appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs of existing and new

SA Objective	Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.
	of less benefit to existing communities compared with Option 2.	them. New development will, however, place strain on existing infrastructure in these areas, and this will need to be carefully planned for.	communities.
6	<b>Housing</b> The development of Greenfield sites in preference to previously developed sites is clearly in contradiction of PPS 3: Housing, which requires development to be linked to public transport, and the more efficient use of land.	O Preferred option as it links residential development to public transport, and is the most efficient option in terms of the use of land. Policies will need to ensure the appropriate provision of affordable and key worker housing.	LG A market-led approach to housing provision would likely not meet the objective in terms of providing affordable and key worker housing.
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b> This option fails to meet the SA objective on sustainable construction as it does not focus development on urban areas; however there would be opportunity to ensure sustainable development is incorporated into estate design.	O The preferred option in terms of sustainable construction, as it locates development in accordance with sustainability principles; close to urban areas. It would provide the opportunity for compact, transit-oriented development and the incorporation of energy efficiency principles into design.	DG A market-led approach to development would not be in the interests of meeting this objective. It would provide less opportunities for ensuring development is located in sustainable locations.

SA Objective		Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.			
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	Provided appropriate policies were put into place, there would be opportunity to ensure appropriate provision for green space, recreational facilities, and safe walking and cycling facilities in Greenfield development.	<b>B</b>	Provided appropriate policies were put into place, there would be opportunity to ensure appropriate provision for green space, recreational facilities, and safe walking and cycling facilities within Option 2.2	<b>B</b>	This option may lead to a situation where development was provided prior to appropriate health and recreational infrastructure being in place, and is therefore not supported.	<b>O</b>
9	<b>Employment</b>	Encroaching into the Green Belt would have little impact on local employment; however Option 2.2 is preferred as it may place populations closer to existing and future employment sources.	<b>B</b>	The location of housing development within the existing built-up areas would assist in ensuring accessible jobs were available to the incoming communities.	<b>LG</b>	This option may have a negative effect on employment as it could result in the loss of employment land to residential (if not adequately controlled), and there would not be a requirement to ensure housing land is released in accordance with employment land.	<b>O</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b>	Encroaching into the Green Belt may have a negative impact on the quality and diversity of the countryside, and would result in areas of designated Green Belt being lost (with irreversible consequences).	<b>R</b>	This option has the most benefit in terms of preserving the countryside; however, it also has the potential to negatively impact on historic and distinctive townscapes. Appropriate policies on conservation and design would ensure this impact is minimised.	<b>LG</b>	This option may result in inappropriate development in both rural and urban landscapes and townscapes. Strong controls would be required to mitigate this effect.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective	Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.
		Appropriately designed development can even serve to enhance the historic environment.	
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b> This option does not meet objective, as it allows the encroachment of development into Greenfield sites.	<b>R</b>	<b>DG</b> This option does not contain sufficient controls to manage the impacts of development on land and soil in the Borough.
12	<b>Biodiversity</b> Development in the countryside can have an adverse impact on biodiversity. Only proposals which have adequate mitigation or offer opportunities for enhancement should be allowed.	<b>B</b>	<b>B</b> Impacts on biodiversity would be dependent on the location of development sites.
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b> The impact of this option on cultural heritage would be dependent on the location of development.	<b>B</b>	<b>Y</b> The impact of this option on cultural heritage would be dependent on the location of development.

SA Objective		Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.
			Appropriately designed development can even serve to enhance the historic environment.	
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
15	<b>Energy</b>	Any new development will lead to an overall increase in energy usage. However, there is potential for incorporating energy efficient design and construction and whether this is implemented is dependant upon supporting development control policies in the forthcoming DPDs.	<b>Y</b> This option acknowledges that higher density development located close to public transport services would be preferable in terms of minimising overall energy usage.	<b>Y</b> Any new development will lead to an overall increase in energy usage. However, there is potential for incorporating energy efficient design and construction and whether this is implemented is dependant upon supporting development control policies in the forthcoming DPDs.
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Increased development close to the urban area could lead to a decrease in air quality due to pollution from construction, as well as an increase in vehicular movements created.	<b>O</b> Increased development in the urban area could lead to a decrease in air quality due to pollution from construction, as well as an increase in vehicular movements created.	<b>O</b> Depending on the location of development, Option 2.3 is also likely to have impacts on air quality. As it does not allow for the appropriate sequencing of development, this option affords less opportunity to control those impacts.
17	<b>Waste</b>	Any new development will lead to	<b>Y</b> Any new development will lead to	<b>Y</b> Any new development will lead to

SA Objective		Option 2.1 Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.	Option 2.2 Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.	Option 2.3 Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.	
		increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	
18	<b>Water</b>	Any new development will have a negative impact on water resources. The acknowledged shortage of water in the South East of England Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resource.	○	Any new development will have a negative impact on water resources. The acknowledged shortage of water in the South East of England Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resource.	○
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Any new development would need to take into account flooding potential, but impacts would be dependent upon the location of growth.	<b>B</b>	This option will have the same impacts as for 2.1. However, any new development in the town centre would need to take into account flooding potential due to the town centre's location within the tidal flood zone and partial location in the fluvial floodplain.	<b>B</b>

<p><b>SA Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Option 2.1</b>                  Allow development to encroach into the Green Belt.</p>	<p><b>Option 2.2</b>                  Encourage a sustainable pattern of development, reduce the need to travel and protect the Green Belt by firstly developing within Dartford town centre, urban areas, previously developed sites, riverfront, strategic sites and village envelopes where there is infrastructure capacity to serve them. Preference will be given to developing these sites prior to allowing the development of greenfield sites.</p>	<p><b>Option 2.3</b>                  Allow development to take place, with no preference for the location or sequence of development.</p>
<p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Option 2.2</u> is clearly preferred in sustainability terms, as it performs better than Options 2.1 or 2.3 on most sustainability indicators. In particular, it provides better opportunities to existing communities through sharing the benefits of growth; it integrates landuse and transport and supports sustainable design; and it makes better and more efficient use of land than Option 2.1, which utilises Green Belt land for new development. Option 2.3 advocates a market-led approach, and performs poorly on all indicators, due to the inability to control the impacts arising from such development. However, all growth will have negative impacts on air quality, levels of waste generated, and water and energy usage, and it is strongly recommended that stringent targets are set in place to cover all new development (residential, commercial, retail, industrial).</p>			

**Strategic Topic 3:**

**How can employment growth be balanced with housing growth?**

SA Objective		Option 3.1 Protect existing employment areas and prioritise further employment development at Ebbsfleet, The Bridge, Crossways as well as in mixed-use schemes such as the Northern Gateway. Where employment land is lost, re-provision is to be made.	Option 3.2 Allow the re-development of existing employment sites, in accordance with market needs, for new uses such as residential. (There are only 2 feasible/realistic options identified).
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	The promotion of mixed use schemes and retention of existing employment sites under this option is in accordance with the SA objective on balanced communities. It will assist in maintaining existing employment and creating new sites. Mixed use development will enhance accessibility to the workplace for new residents.	<b>LG</b> Allowing the redevelopment of existing employment sites would be contrary to the SA objective of promoting thriving and balanced communities, as it would lead to a loss of jobs, with the land use that can command the highest return being preferred (generally residential). Any redevelopment of employment sites would need to be offset by a gain in employment elsewhere, or the insistence of mixed used development with a high component of employment.
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	The promotion of mixed use development will promote a sense of community in new developments, ensuring more active and vibrant streets and spaces.	<b>LG</b> The loss of employment sites and their replacement with residential development is not considered a viable option as it may lead to the disintegration (through creating unemployment), rather than the integration of communities.
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	This option is preferred as it would locate jobs in areas of high public transport accessibility (particularly Ebbsfleet, a public transport hub). The promotion of mixed-use development would cause a greater integration of transport and land use in the Borough.	<b>LG</b> The redevelopment of existing employment sites may lead to an imbalance through creating higher levels of out-commuting to London and other employment areas.
4	<b>Public Health</b>	The promotion of mixed-use development should be a priority as it would increase opportunities for people to	<b>B</b> This option would not encourage mixed use development and is a lost opportunity in terms of encouraging people to

SA Objective	Option 3.1 Protect existing employment areas and prioritise further employment development at Ebbsfleet, The Bridge, Crossways as well as in mixed-use schemes such as the Northern Gateway. Where employment land is lost, re-provision is to be made.	Option 3.2 Allow the re-development of existing employment sites, in accordance with market needs, for new uses such as residential. (There are only 2 feasible/realistic options identified).
	walk and cycle to work.	engage in healthier forms of transport (walking and cycling).
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b> The development of new employment areas and mixed use redevelopment will require the early planning of appropriate infrastructure to ensure new communities are served by the facilities they require.	<b>B</b> This option may result in inadequate facilities for new communities, unless appropriately planned for.
6	<b>Housing</b> Mixed use development would assist in meeting housing requirements, provided an appropriate level of affordable and key worker housing is constructed.	<b>B</b> This option may assist in meeting housing requirements, provided an appropriate level of affordable and key worker housing is constructed.
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b> Preferred option as it would locate development in accordance with sustainability principles (close to existing urban areas, public transport hubs and services).	<b>LG</b> Option 3.1 preferred as it locates development in accordance with sustainability principles, however both options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques.
8	<b>Environmental Health</b> Both options provide opportunities for improving public space and providing a safe environment. Mixed-use development is preferred as it provides better opportunities to reduce air pollution through reducing vehicular travel.	<b>B</b> Both options provide opportunities for improving public space and providing a safe environment.
9	<b>Employment</b> This option would assist in providing a range of jobs accessible to local people, and will assist in creating local employment and reducing deprivation through ensuring existing communities are within close proximity to new jobs.	<b>DG</b> Allowing the redevelopment of existing employment sites would be contrary to this SA objective as it would lead to a loss of jobs, with the land use that can command the highest return being preferred (generally residential). Any redevelopment of employment sites would need to be offset by a gain in employment elsewhere, or the insistence of mixed used development with a high component of employment.
10	<b>Landscape</b> Any development would need to ensure landscape impacts were minimised.	<b>B</b> Any development would need to ensure landscape impacts were minimised.

SA Objective		Option 3.1 Protect existing employment areas and prioritise further employment development at Ebbsfleet, The Bridge, Crossways as well as in mixed-use schemes such as the Northern Gateway. Where employment land is lost, re-provision is to be made.	Option 3.2 Allow the re-development of existing employment sites, in accordance with market needs, for new uses such as residential. (There are only 2 feasible/realistic options identified).
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	The use of previously developed sites and damaged land over Greenfield sites is supported.	<b>LG</b> This option may lead to a requirement for the use of Greenfield land for new employment areas, which would not be supported.
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Biodiversity is an important consideration for the redevelopment of previously used sites and damaged land, and would need to be considered in any proposals.	<b>B</b> Biodiversity is an important consideration for the redevelopment of previously used sites and damaged land, and would need to be considered in any proposals.
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	Cultural heritage impacts would be dependent on site-specific circumstances.	<b>B</b> Cultural heritage impacts would be dependent on site-specific circumstances; however the redevelopment of traditional employment sites may contribute to the loss of the 'working heritage' of the area unless specifically provided for in strong policy terms.
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
15	<b>Energy</b>	This option will assist in promoting energy efficiency through locating development such that the need to travel by private car is reduced.	<b>LG</b> The redevelopment of existing employment sites may lead to an increase in trips required by private vehicle (hence higher energy usage) as residents may need to travel further for employment.
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Through encouraging a better integration of transport and landuse, will reduce the requirement to travel by private vehicle, assisting in reducing vehicular-based air pollution.	<b>LG</b> This option would likely lead to an increase in trips required by private vehicle and therefore higher levels of air pollution.
17	<b>Waste</b>	Any new development will lead to increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b> Any new development will lead to increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.

SA Objective		Option 3.1 Protect existing employment areas and prioritise further employment development at Ebbsfleet, The Bridge, Crossways as well as in mixed-use schemes such as the Northern Gateway. Where employment land is lost, re-provision is to be made.	Option 3.2 Allow the re-development of existing employment sites, in accordance with market needs, for new uses such as residential. (There are only 2 feasible/realistic options identified).
18	<b>Water</b>	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that any new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources.	<b>B</b>
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Due to the location of Dartford on the Thames Estuary, flood risk is a key issue, particularly given the predicted impacts due to Climate Change (e.g. sea level rise and increased rainfall). Any development will need to take account of this.	<b>B</b>
<p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Option 3.1 is preferred in sustainability terms</u>, and performs particularly well with regard to retaining existing and creating new employment; integrating transport and land use and reducing the need for vehicular travel. Ensuring mixed-use components (rather than single landuse employment areas) would further assist in meeting these objectives. Option 3.2 would lead to a loss of local employment and create a further need for people to commute to London and other areas for work.</p>			

Strategic Topic 4:

**What type of housing is needed?**

SA Objective		Option 4.1 Ensure a range of housing types are provided, but with a focus on family housing and other forms of housing, as identified within the housing market assessment. Require 30% affordable housing in urban areas and 50% in rural areas (until updated by a new Housing Needs Study), with a focus on helping residents into eventual independence in the housing market.	Option 4.2 Have a flat rate of 30% affordable housing across the Borough, in both urban and rural areas.	Option 4.3 Secure a mix of housing without favouring one type or tenure against another.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	This option will assist in promoting social inclusion through ensuring the adequate provision of affordable housing, including a mix of housing types. It recognises the particular needs of rural communities and affordable housing.	<b>LG</b>	This option would also assist in promoting social inclusion through ensuring affordable housing to meet urban housing needs. However, there is a clear need for a higher level of affordable housing in rural areas, and Option 4.1 better accounts for this.	<b>Y</b>	This option does not make provision for the housing needs of specific groups, such as family groups. Option 4.1's approach in promoting a move towards eventual home ownership is preferred as it will have a more positive long term impact on social inclusion.	<b>O</b>
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	This option is the most likely to assist in strengthening communities, particularly rural communities, through ensuring their housing needs are met.	<b>LG</b>	This option would assist in strengthening communities through aiming to meet housing needs; however Option 4.1 is preferred as it requires a higher level of affordable housing in rural areas, where it is more difficult to provide.	<b>Y</b>	By not meeting the requirements of specific groups, this option will contribute less to strengthening communities, and may leave some groups disadvantaged (e.g. families).	<b>Y</b>
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	Accessibility is an important	<b>B</b>	Accessibility is an important	<b>B</b>	Accessibility is an important	<b>B</b>

SA Objective		Option 4.1 Ensure a range of housing types are provided, but with a focus on family housing and other forms of housing, as identified within the housing market assessment. Require 30% affordable housing in urban areas and 50% in rural areas (until updated by a new Housing Needs Study), with a focus on helping residents into eventual independence in the housing market.	Option 4.2 Have a flat rate of 30% affordable housing across the Borough, in both urban and rural areas.	Option 4.3 Secure a mix of housing without favouring one type or tenure against another.	
		consideration when delivering affordable housing, as occupants are likely to have a lesser degree of access to private transport. Affordable housing allocations, particularly in rural areas should ensure good levels of access to public transport services.		consideration when delivering affordable housing, as occupants are likely to have a lesser degree of access to private transport. Affordable housing allocations, particularly in rural areas should ensure good levels of access to public transport services.	
4	<b>Public Health</b>	Not applicable	<b>B</b>	Not applicable	<b>B</b>
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	All options would need to account for appropriate and timely provision of the infrastructure required to create sustainable and balanced communities.	<b>B</b>	All options would need to account for appropriate and timely provision of the infrastructure required to create sustainable and balanced communities.	<b>B</b>
6	<b>Housing</b>	This option is preferred as it recognises the need to tailor the provision of affordable housing to community needs. In particular, it makes provision for a higher level of affordable housing in rural areas, and meets the specific need for	<b>LG</b>	This option meets the minimum requirements for affordable housing in the Borough, but makes no provision for the needs of specific groups (e.g. families) or the pressing need for affordable housing in rural areas.	<b>Y</b>
				This option makes no provision for the housing needs of specific groups (e.g. families) or the pressing need for affordable housing in rural areas.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective	Option 4.1 Ensure a range of housing types are provided, but with a focus on family housing and other forms of housing, as identified within the housing market assessment. Require 30% affordable housing in urban areas and 50% in rural areas (until updated by a new Housing Needs Study), with a focus on helping residents into eventual independence in the housing market.	Option 4.2 Have a flat rate of 30% affordable housing across the Borough, in both urban and rural areas.	Option 4.3 Secure a mix of housing without favouring one type or tenure against another.
	affordable housing in rural areas and for family housing.		
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b> All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques.	<b>B</b>	<b>B</b>
8	<b>Environmental Health</b> Not applicable		
9	<b>Employment</b> Through ensuring an adequate supply of affordable housing in rural areas, this option may assist in supporting employment opportunities in those areas (for example requirements for manual labour or supporting local shops).	<b>LG</b>	<b>Y</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b> Not applicable		
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b> Not applicable		
12	<b>Biodiversity</b> Not applicable		
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b> Not applicable		
14	<b>Minerals</b> Not applicable		

SA Objective		Option 4.1 Ensure a range of housing types are provided, but with a focus on family housing and other forms of housing, as identified within the housing market assessment. Require 30% affordable housing in urban areas and 50% in rural areas (until updated by a new Housing Needs Study), with a focus on helping residents into eventual independence in the housing market.	Option 4.2 Have a flat rate of 30% affordable housing across the Borough, in both urban and rural areas.	Option 4.3 Secure a mix of housing without favouring one type or tenure against another.
15	<b>Energy</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
17	<b>Waste</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
18	<b>Water</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
<p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Option 4.1</u> will provide a range of housing types, with a focus on family housing and other particularly needs as identified in the housing assessment. It also makes provision for a higher level of housing in rural areas to take account of the specific affordability issues facing rural communities. It is considered the most comprehensive of the three options tested. (note: The policy was not tested against SA Objectives 8 and 10-19, as it specifically deals with the affordability of housing, not it's location or design.</p>				

Strategic Topic 5:

**How much land is required?**

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	A prescriptive approach would likely have a negative impact as it would be difficult to take into account the needs of individual communities.	O	This option is preferred as it would have a positive impact on social inclusion and accessibility, and would ensure development is appropriate to its location and context.	LG	This option likely to have a negative effect on social inclusion and community ownership as it may cause inappropriately high density development in areas of poor accessibility.	O
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	This option is unlikely to further regeneration aims, as development should be tailored to specific circumstances of each site/area.	O	Positive impact through ensuring that there is enough flexibility to allow for development that is appropriate to individual communities.	LG	Promoting high density in inappropriate locations fails to consider the individual circumstances of each area (in architectural, social and environmental terms) and such development is likely to alienate existing communities.	O
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	Impact on accessibility would be dependent on the standards	Y	This option is preferred from an accessibility perspective, as it	DG	This option pays no regard to the need to plan communities and provide	O

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.					
		to be adopted; however more flexible, design-led policies could lead to better outcomes for accessibility.							
4	<b>Public Health</b>	This option could assist in ensuring residents are provided with adequate green space (through applying minimum standards per resident).	<b>LG</b>	More likely to encourage active lifestyles through reducing the need to travel by car.	<b>LG</b>	May free-up more space for green and open spaces, however the lack of focus on accessibility would encourage more trips to be made by car, rather than by sustainable transport means.	<b>Y</b>		
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	A prescriptive approach could include mechanisms to ensure appropriate infrastructure is provided with new development. It would need to include consideration of cumulative demand.	<b>LG</b>	This option makes good use of existing transport infrastructure, and may reduce the pressure on existing road infrastructure. May benefit from a more prescriptive approach to aid negotiations on developer contributions.	<b>Y</b>	Likely negative impact on infrastructure, as makes no consideration for existing infrastructure capacity.	<b>R</b>		
6	<b>Housing</b>	This option could be used to ensure housing needs are met	<b>Y</b>	This design-led approach would assist in providing for an	<b>LG</b>	Could assist in meeting key worker and affordable housing requirements	<b>Y</b>		

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.			
		through requiring a certain level of affordable and key worker housing, but it does not take account of location-specific circumstances.	appropriate mix of dwelling size, type, density and phasing on appropriate sites.	through reducing construction costs; however it may place such housing in inappropriate locations (e.g. areas of poor accessibility).			
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	This approach could be used to insist on high standards for eco-efficiency, but could result in development that is not in keeping with local environmental and character.	O	Consistent with this objective, as it ensures new development is located with sustainable principles, and would assist in ensuring development is of a high quality and is locally specific, with respect for local character. It is recommended that some prescriptive policies (e.g. BREEAM standards) is adopted to ensure the highest environmental standards possible from new development.	LG	This option would result in development that is not in keeping with the local environment and character. Whilst high density is a more sustainable form of development, it needs to be tailored to the local character and environment.	O
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	Provides opportunities for stringent standards on open spaces, pollution control and crime prevention through environmental design, but	Y	Provides opportunities for the development of site-specific solutions to open space provision, pollution control and crime prevention through environmental	LG	May impact negatively (e.g. visual-intrusion and overcrowding) on existing open spaces.	O

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.	
		needs to be flexible to take into account location-specific circumstances.		design, but DBC could consider minimum standards for some of these matters.	
9	<b>Employment</b>	Uncertain, but probably minimal difference between the 3 options in relation to employment	<b>B</b>	Uncertain, but probably minimal difference between the 3 options in relation to employment	<b>B</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b>	It would be difficult to apply prescriptive standards to landscape and townscape character. A flexible approach would take better account of the character and value of individual areas.	<b>O</b>	This option is preferred from a landscape perspective- as it allows for the consideration of the diversity of landscapes and townscapes in the Borough and the need to tailor development to this.	<b>LG</b>
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	A prescriptive approach could assist in promoting the re-use of previously developed land and protection of land and soil resources, but difficult to assess appropriateness (for example, developing criteria that	<b>Y</b>	Will assist in ensuring previously-developed land is developed over Greenfield land through supporting development in areas of enhanced accessibility.	<b>LG</b>

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.	
		determines appropriate locations for high density development).			
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Could afford opportunities for stringent policies requiring protection of biodiversity, although more difficult to be prescriptive about enhancing biodiversity.	<b>Y</b>	Biodiversity impacts would be dependent on individual locations for development, although care must be taken with previously used sites, as these can provide valuable habitat.	<b>B</b>
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	It would be difficult to apply entirely prescriptive standards to cultural heritage. A flexible approach would take better account of the character and value of individual areas, sites, buildings and landscapes /townscapes.	<b>Y</b>	If combined with appropriate conservation policies, this option would assist in ensuring development is of a high quality and is locally specific, with respect for local character, including cultural heritage.	<b>LG</b>
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.	
15	<b>Energy</b>	This option could be used to	<b>Y</b>	Promotes compact development	<b>LG</b>
				Promotes compact development, but	<b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.			
		insist on high standards for eco-efficiency in design and construction, although it could also function to restrict innovation and site-specific solutions to energy efficiency.		and a better integration of landuse with transport, which will reduce energy consumption from private car travel.		fails to integrate landuse with transport.	
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Standards can be used to reduce impact on air quality, however they can also stifle creative and innovative solutions (i.e. they don't encourage out-of-the-box thinking).	<b>Y</b>	Will assist in reducing the number of trips made by private car, which will assist in improving local air quality. May encourage further innovation.	<b>LG</b>	Whilst compact development is supported, without gains in accessibility, air quality will not improve.	<b>Y</b>
17	<b>Waste</b>	A more prescriptive approach could encourage higher standards in waste management, but may stifle innovation.	<b>Y</b>	It is recommended that minimum standards for sustainable waste management be applied to new development (see also commentary on Option 5.1)	<b>Y</b>	It is recommended that minimum standards for sustainable waste management be applied to new development.	<b>Y</b>
18	<b>Water</b>	Standards could afford the opportunity for more sustainable water usage and management	<b>LG</b>	It is recommended that standards for sustainable water management be applied to new development,	<b>Y</b>	It is recommended that standards for sustainable water management be applied to new development,	<b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 5.1 New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.	Option 5.2 Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.	Option 5.3 Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.			
		of water resources.		regardless of location.			
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Standards could be used to require stringent controls on flood management, although they can act against innovation (eg. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems can fail to meet traditional engineering standards. Such systems need to be tailored to site-specific circumstances, thus a prescriptive approach may work against this).	<b>Y</b>	This option affords the opportunity to develop site-specific sustainable urban drainage systems for flood mitigation.	<b>LG</b>	This option does not take into account flood potential, nor means to mitigate against floods.	<b>O</b>
<p><b>Summary:</b> Option 5.2 is preferred as it performs best on the majority of SA Objectives, including balanced and integrated communities, accessibility, sustainable design, landscape and energy. However, it is noted that a standard-based approach (Option 5.1) can have a positive impact on ensuring eco-efficiency through prescribing minimum standards on sustainable energy, waste and water management, and it is recommended that a combination of approaches is used. Caution is required to ensure that standards retain flexibility and allow for innovation and site-specific solutions. For example Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems can fail to meet traditional engineering standards, and need to be tailored to site-specific circumstances, thus a prescriptive approach may work against these systems.</p> <p>Whilst high density development is supported, the high densities proposed in Option 5.3 would not be acceptable to many communities, and unless coupled with accessibility and design requirements (as proposed in Option 5.2), it could not be supported.</p>							

<p><b>SA Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Option 5.1</b>  <b>New development is based on a prescriptive, standards-based approach to be applied uniformly across the Borough.</b></p>	<p><b>Option 5.2</b>  <b>Ensure the form of new development is determined in line with design criteria to provide a quality living environment, with most new homes being built at a density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare. Densities may be increased in locations of exceptional accessibility such as in the town centre or near railway stations and the level of car parking will be determined on a site by site basis, depending upon accessibility to facilities and availability of other modes of transport.</b></p>	<p><b>Option 5.3</b>  <b>Focus all new development in higher density schemes above 50 dwellings per hectare, regardless of location and accessibility and apply car parking standards uniformly throughout the Borough.</b></p>

Strategic Topic 6:

**How can sustainable communities develop?**

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	This option would not enhance accessibility nor assist in promoting social inclusion or community ownership.	<b>R</b>	This option is preferred as it encourages improvements to accessibility and connectivity. Improvements to the public transport network will benefit all residents and people working in the Borough.	<b>LG</b>	This option would be likely to promote more active streets and public spaces, as it would encourage more people to walk and cycle, creating more vibrant places.	<b>LG</b>
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	This option would lead to degradation of existing areas due to traffic intrusion and	<b>R</b>	The promotion of better connectivity and accessibility will assist in integrating communities.	<b>LG</b>	This option may disadvantage residents in the more rural areas of the Borough, where it is difficult to support	<b>B</b>

<b>SA Objective</b>		<b>Option 6.1</b> Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	<b>Option 6.2</b> Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	<b>Option 6.3</b> Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
		increased pollution from traffic and development.		This option will strengthen existing communities through the provision of better resources.		viable public transport services.	
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	This option is in direct contrast to the aims of the accessibility objective as it would lead to increased vehicular travel.	<b>R</b>	This option is preferred in accessibility terms as it promotes a more holistic approach to transportation and supports the development of a local public transport network.	<b>DG</b>	This option would have mixed benefits in terms of accessibility. It would encourage improved quality, capacity and integration of public transport, but may disadvantage residents who are not well located in terms of public transport access (particularly those on the more rural parts of the Borough).	<b>B</b>
4	<b>Public Health</b>	This option would lead to a long	<b>R</b>	This option would have positive	<b>LG</b>	This option would have positive	<b>DG</b>

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
		term decline in health through resulting in increased air and noise pollution.		benefits in terms of encouraging more people to walk and cycle to their destinations, promoting healthier lifestyles.		benefits in terms of encouraging more people to walk and cycle to their destinations, promoting healthier lifestyles, more so than either of the other 2 options.	
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	This option makes no provision for infrastructure required to support new development.	<b>R</b>	This option will require a significant injection in public transport funding to ensure the objectives of improving accessibility are met.	<b>Y</b>	The limiting of car parking would require a significant injection in public transport funding to ensure access to services and employment.	<b>Y</b>
6	<b>Housing</b>	Not applicable		Not applicable		Not applicable	
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	This option does not promote compact development, nor use of public transport.	<b>R</b>	This option is in support of this objective through ensuring a sustainable pattern of settlements, including a focus on accessibility and connectivity.	<b>LG</b>	This option could be developed further to include a more holistic approach to sustainable design and the creation of urban villages that facilitate a modal shift from private travel to other forms.	<b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	Will lead to increased car travel and does not therefore support vibrant, pedestrian-friendly streets.	<b>R</b>	Would assist in creating safer conditions for walking and cycling and more vibrant places and active streets, although Option 6.3 would better meet this objective.	<b>LG</b>	Would assist in creating safer conditions for walking and cycling and more vibrant places and active streets.	<b>DG</b>
9	<b>Employment</b>	In the short-term, may benefit business through unrestricted parking, but in the long-term could lead to economic decline through creating an unpleasant and congested Borough .	<b>O</b>	This option is preferred to Option 6.3, as it would have less of an impact on local businesses, and would not discourage employers from moving to the Borough (through stringent parking requirements).	<b>LG</b>	Stringent parking requirements are likely to discourage new businesses from locating in the Borough and would have a negative impact on existing businesses that are reliant upon car-based travel for the collection of goods.	<b>O</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b>	This option will likely lead to the degradation of landscapes and townscapes through increased pollution and traffic intrusion.	<b>R</b>	This option would assist in the long term preservation of landscapes and townscapes through reducing the negative impacts of traffic.	<b>LG</b>	This option would assist in the long term preservation of landscapes and townscapes through reducing the negative impacts of traffic.	<b>LG</b>

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	This option is contrary to this objective, as it would likely lead to dispersed, car-based development and development of the Green Belt.	<b>R</b>	This option is in support of the integration of transport and access, compact development and use of previously developed land, and therefore is consistent with the SA objective.	<b>LG</b>	This option could be developed further to consider the integration of transport and access, compact development and use of previously developed land.	<b>Y</b>
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Without adequate protection, would lead to the loss of biodiversity through destruction of habitat.	<b>R</b>	More sustainable development patterns, including the use of green infrastructure would benefit biodiversity.	<b>LG</b>	Through limiting car-based transport and focusing on walking and cycling, this option could provide further opportunities for green infrastructure, hence benefiting biodiversity.	<b>LG</b>
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	Unchecked development and the impacts of traffic intrusion would have a negative impact on cultural heritage resources.	<b>R</b>	Option 6.2 preferred to 6.1, as likely to have less of an impact on cultural heritage (e.g. through less traffic intrusion).	<b>LG</b>	Option 6.2 preferred to 6.3, although the impacts from both options will be similar.	<b>LG</b>

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable			
15	<b>Energy</b>	This option is contrary to objective as it would lead to an increase in energy usage through encouraging car use and urban sprawl.	<b>R</b>	This option encourages the use of renewable energy schemes and will reduce overall energy consumption through reducing car-based travel.	<b>LG</b>	This option would assist in reducing energy consumption through promoting a modal shift from car-based traffic to more sustainable forms.	<b>LG</b>
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	This option would lead to a significant decline in air quality and increased greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>R</b>	Through encouraging use of renewable energy, sustainable development patterns and the use of minimum environmental standards, will assist in meeting air quality targets.	<b>LG</b>	Air quality would improve through the discouragement of private vehicular travel and provision of better public transport services.	<b>LG</b>
17	<b>Waste</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable		Not applicable	
18	<b>Water</b>	This option would increase pressure on already-limited	<b>R</b>	Preferred to Option 6.1, as not likely to place any additional stress on	<b>LG</b>	Preferred to Option 6.1, as not likely to place any additional stress on water	<b>LG</b>

SA Objective		Option 6.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the environment or the amount of traffic it generates, and promote unrestricted car access.	Option 6.2 Encourage new development that minimises its impact on the environment and reduces the need to travel by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ meeting the minimum requirements of environmental standards;</li> <li>▪ encouraging the use of renewable energy schemes;</li> <li>▪ creating a sustainable pattern of settlements, which improves accessibility and connectivity to existing areas and a range of facilities;</li> <li>▪ supporting the development of a local public transport network;</li> <li>▪ reducing car parking only in locations with excellent public transport accessibility.</li> </ul>	Option 6.3 Seek a wholesale shift to public transport and limit car parking at both destination and source.			
		water resources.	<b>R</b>	water resources.		resources.	
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Due to the location of Dartford on the Thames Estuary, flood risk is a key issue, and unchecked development would not take account of this.	<b>R</b>	Preferred to Option 6.1, as flood risk would be considered in the promotion of sustainable development, as advocated in Option 6.2	<b>LG</b>	No particular impacts identified, but preferred to the 'unchecked development' approach advocated in Option 6.1	<b>LG</b>
<p><b>Summary:</b> Option 6.1 is clearly rejected from a sustainability viewpoint. Both Option 6.2 and 6.3 perform well against the framework, however <u>Option 6.2 is preferred</u> as it provides a more holistic approach to sustainable development, and performs better on the sustainable design, employment, accessibility, land and soil quality and integrated communities objectives.</p>							

Strategic Topic 7:

**What type of community and retail facilities are needed to allow local communities to flourish?**

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	Through channelling money from new development into improving facilities in existing areas, this may assist in closing the gap between deprived areas and other areas. However, in the long term, it will have a negative effect on new communities.	○	This option may lead to further deprivation, as it promotes new facilities in new strategic sites only, and would therefore not contribute to regeneration objectives.	○	This option aims to strengthen the viability of local centres, which would assist in closing the gap between deprived areas (that may be suffering a decline in retailing and other services) and other areas. The option is in line with the Government's key objectives for town	LG	Allowing town centre facilities to decline in favour of residential development, without adequate land use controls could result in inadequate facilities and services being provided. The option may not succeed in meeting the SA objective of promoting thriving and balanced	○

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
						centres, as detailed in PPS6: Town Centres. Encouraging diversity and distinctiveness would assist in achieving a sense of community ownership.		communities, as there is no requirement to ensure mixed use and tenure, employment sites, or facilities for the elderly or those with disabilities.	
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	Whilst positive for existing communities, this approach would not assist in encouraging a sense of community in new development areas.	○	The establishment of facilities in new development areas would assist in developing a sense of community in those areas, but there would be a negative impact on existing areas (in particular, those south of the A2).	○	This option would assist in the regeneration and enhancement of existing communities.	<b>LG</b>	The loss of retail floorspace may lead to some communities being disadvantaged through a lack of essential shops and services. Once primary retail floorspace was lost to housing redevelopment, this option would have long term and irreversible impacts on communities.	○

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	Negative impact, as residents in new development areas would be forced to travel to access facilities.	○	This option would disadvantage existing residents, particularly those south of the A2. A focus on cultural development at Ebbsfleet would maximise opportunities for using public transport, but would disadvantage residents living in and close to the town centre.	○	Through ensuring the vitality of existing centres, this policy would have a positive impact on accessibility for existing residents (encouraging less travel and locating services within existing communities). This option supports government policy (PPG 13: Transport) on integrating land use and transport for existing services.	DG	A reduction in retail floorspace in Dartford Town Centre and other local centres may have negative consequences on accessibility, with residents having to travel further for comparison and other goods. This option does not allow for improved access to services and facilities in currently underserved communities.	○
4	<b>Public Health</b>	This option may negatively impact on the health needs of	○	This option may negatively impact on the health needs of residents	○	This option supported as it will promote informal recreation through	LG	This option may impact negatively on the provision of health care	Y

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
		residents in new development areas, through a lack of services.		in existing areas, as new services are located in new development areas.		ensuring facilities are provided within the communities they serve- both existing and new communities. Will assist in encouraging development and participation in culture, sport and the arts.		services and facilities, unless appropriate facilities provided.	
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	Does not take into account the need to provide new infrastructure for new communities.	<b>O</b>	Whilst this would have a positive impact on ensuring the appropriate provision of new infrastructure for new communities, it would leave the town centre lacking in supporting infrastructure.	<b>Y</b>	Considered the best option as it provides for the appropriate phasing of infrastructure for both new and existing communities.	<b>LG</b>	Unlikely to lead to development of appropriate infrastructure required by incoming and existing community. May lead to the loss of existing social and community facilities.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.
6	<b>Housing</b>	Impact would be dependent on the types of controls to be imposed (e.g. level of affordable housing, tenure, mix and density). <b>B</b>	Impact would be dependent on the types of controls to be imposed (e.g. level of affordable housing, tenure, mix and density). <b>B</b>	Impact would be dependent on the types of controls to be imposed (e.g. level of affordable housing, tenure, mix and density). <b>B</b>	Impact would be dependent on the types of controls to be imposed (e.g. level of affordable housing, tenure, mix and density). <b>B</b>
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	This option unlikely to meet the sustainable design objective as it fails to focus development on the new urban areas. <b>Y</b>	This option is generally consistent with the objective, but option 7.3 is preferred, as it takes into account the needs of existing communities. <b>B</b>	Of the 4 options, this option is most likely to meet the objective for sustainable design through ensuring development is located in accordance with sustainable principles. <b>LG</b>	It is unclear how this option would meet this objective; it would be dependent on the controls placed on development. Unlikely to meet requirement for respect for local character and the surrounding environment. <b>Y</b>
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	This option would likely <b>Y</b>	Through promoting <b>Y</b>	This option would assist <b>LG</b>	Uncertain impact on <b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
		lead to the inadequate provision of open spaces to meet the needs of new communities.	Y	Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development, this option may lead to further decline of the town centre, and would not contribute to improving safety in the town centre.	B	in contributing to a safe and secure environment through increasing activity in the town centres and other areas.	LG	crime and safety, as it would increase surveillance of frontages, but could lead to a decreased footfall through loss of retail and other town centre facilities.	Y
9	<b>Employment</b>	This option would result in new development areas containing few opportunities in retail or community service employment.	Y	This option would not contribute to employment in the town centre, but would assist in creating jobs at Ebbsfleet.	B	This option will increase employment opportunities in a range of locations, delivering economic development in areas where it is needed.	LG	This option would lead to job losses as retail and services may close and be replaced by residential development.	O
10	<b>Landscape</b>	This option may provide more opportunities for	LG	This option provides fewer opportunities (than	Y	This option likely to have the most positive effect	LG	May impact upon historic streetscapes	Y

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
		the enhancement of townscape character in existing areas.		Option 7.3) for the enhancement of townscapes in the Town Centre.		in terms of providing opportunities for the enhancement of townscape character.		through loss of shop fronts. Loss of historic role of town centres and local centres.	
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable	
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable	
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	May lead to adaptive re-use of heritage buildings (for cultural facilities, for example), in a range of locations, including the historic town centre.	<b>LG</b>	Through favouring cultural development at Ebbsfleet over Dartford town centre, this option is a missed opportunity in terms of the adaptive re-use of heritage buildings in Dartford town centre and other built up areas.	<b>Y</b>	May lead to adaptive re-use of heritage buildings (for cultural facilities, for example), in a range of locations, including the historic town centre.	<b>LG</b>	May impact upon cultural heritage through loss of function of heritage buildings and would lead to the loss of the historic role of town centres and local centres.	<b>Y</b>
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable	

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.		
15	<b>Energy</b>	Any new development, residential, employment or social has the potential for energy efficient design and construction and whether this is implemented is dependant upon supporting development control policies in the forthcoming DPDs.	<b>B</b>	Any new development, residential, employment or social has the potential for energy efficient design and construction and whether this is implemented is dependant upon supporting development control policies in the forthcoming DPDs.	<b>B</b>	Any new development, residential, employment or social has the potential for energy efficient design and construction and whether this is implemented is dependant upon supporting development control policies in the forthcoming DPDs.	<b>B</b>
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Would require residents in new development	<b>Y</b>	Uncertain impact on air quality, as it is unclear	<b>B</b>	Uncertain impact on air quality, as it is unclear	<b>B</b>

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.				
		areas to travel further to access services and facilities, hence increasing vehicular emissions.	how this approach would impact on trip generation.	how this approach would impact on trip generation.	partially depend on transport and traffic management policies adopted.				
17	<b>Waste</b>	Any new development should have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b>	Any new development should have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b>	Any new development should have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b>		
18	<b>Water</b>	All development would need to be water efficient to ensure that it does not place additional stress on the water environment and	<b>B</b>	All development would need to be water efficient to ensure that it does not place additional stress on the water environment and resource.	<b>B</b>	All development would need to be water efficient to ensure that it does not place additional stress on the water environment and	<b>B</b>	Potential impacts on water quality of River Darent through new development. However, if appropriately managed and impacts	<b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 7.1 Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.	Option 7.2 Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.	Option 7.3 Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.	Option 7.4 Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.		
		resource.		resource.	mitigated, new development could enhance the riverine environment (through replacing potentially polluting industry close to the river with residential development).		
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Any new development will need to take into account flooding potential.	<b>B</b>	Any new development will need to take into account flooding potential.	<b>B</b>	Any new development in the town centre will need to take into account flooding potential due to the town centre's location within the tidal flood zone and partial location in the fluvial floodplain.	<b>B</b>

<p><b>SA Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Option 7.1</b>                  Restrict new facilities in strategic sites in favour of enhancing existing facilities elsewhere.</p>	<p><b>Option 7.2</b>                  Focus new community, retail, sport, leisure and cultural facilities within strategic sites only. Promote Ebbsfleet as a leisure destination at the detriment of town centre leisure development.</p>	<p><b>Option 7.3</b>                  Allow integration between new and existing developments by allowing appropriately scaled development of new facilities (community, culture, leisure, sport, recreation, education and retail) primarily in Dartford Town Centre but also at Ebbsfleet and Bluewater, existing local centres, villages, educational establishments, sports hubs and parks. New facilities will also be allowed at other strategic sites where it is of a scale that meets local residents' needs and will not impact on the vitality or viability of existing centres.</p>	<p><b>Option 7.4</b>                  Allow Dartford town centre, local centre and village facilities to decline or be downsized where there is no demand for facilities, to make way for residential development.</p>
<p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Option 7.3 is preferred</u> as it would have more positive impacts relating to balanced and integrated communities, and performs well on a range of other objectives, including accessibility, public and environmental health and employment. This option delivers the most benefit to both existing and new communities in terms of the provision of community services and retail facilities.</p>				

**Strategic Topic 8:**

**How can better use of the riverfront be achieved?**

SA Objective		Option 8.1 Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.	Option 8.2 Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.	Option 8.3 Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.			
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	This option may assist in closing gaps between deprived communities and others through enhancing opportunities for regeneration through mixed-use development.	LG	This option does not offer the same opportunities as option 1 does in relation to regenerating deprived areas. Does not promote mixed use development.	O	This option may lead to a net imbalance in employment, as employment sites are redeveloped to residential, unless lost employment is replaced. This would have negative effects on community cohesion through increasing unemployment levels.	O
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	This option may assist in closing gaps between deprived communities and others through enhancing opportunities for regeneration.	LG	Provides fewer opportunities for regeneration and enhancement, when compared with Option 8.1.	Y	The promotion of mixed-use development, as advocated in Option 8.1 would better meet this objective.	O
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	This option delivers more in accessibility terms as it will encourage a mix of development and a better integration of land use and transport through mixed use development.	LG	Riverfront locations would need to be well connected to the town centre and other locations. This option focuses only on improving accessibility along the riverfront.	Y	A mix of land uses (rather than purely residential use) would provide a better integration of land use and transport and reduce trip-generation.	O

SA Objective		Option 8.1 Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.	Option 8.2 Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.	Option 8.3 Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.
4	<b>Public Health</b>	This option should be better integrated with green infrastructure (Green Grid) proposals to increase benefits to public health. <b>Y</b>	Would provide some recreational opportunities, but better connectivity with other areas would improve health benefits. <b>Y</b>	This option should be better integrated with green infrastructure (Green Grid) proposals to increase benefits to public health. <b>Y</b>
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	Appropriately-phased infrastructure would be required. <b>B</b>	Appropriately-phased infrastructure would be required. <b>B</b>	Appropriately-phased infrastructure would be required. <b>B</b>
6	<b>Housing</b>	Option would increase opportunities for affordable and key worker housing (through providing more housing overall), if appropriate policies were set in place. <b>LG</b>	May limit opportunities to provide affordable and key worker housing. <b>O</b>	Option would increase opportunities for affordable and key worker housing (through providing more housing overall), if appropriate policies were set in place. <b>LG</b>
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	This option is most consistent with the SA objective, as it provides for a mix of uses and is consistent with sustainable design principles. <b>LG</b>	All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques. <b>Y</b>	All options provide the opportunity for employing sustainable design and construction techniques. <b>Y</b>
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	This option would need to ensure adequate policy in place to minimise land use conflicts (e.g. between residential uses located close to industrial uses). <b>B</b>	Continued industrial and port uses may impact on environmental health, although mitigation is possible. <b>B</b>	A focus on residential land uses is likely to have the greatest long-term environmental health benefit. <b>LG</b>

SA Objective		Option 8.1 Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.	Option 8.2 Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.	Option 8.3 Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.
9	<b>Employment</b>	This option may lead to job losses in traditional port industry but would also facilitate new jobs in recreation and leisure industries. <b>B</b>	This option would assist in maintaining employment in the traditional port and industrial industries. <b>LG</b>	This option may lead to job losses in traditional port industries, and makes no provision for new employment areas. <b>O</b>
10	<b>Landscape</b>	All options provide opportunities for enhancing the landscape. This option may better provide for retaining and enhancing important landscapes and townscapes. <b>LG</b>	This option would maintain traditional industrial townscapes, but leaves few options for enhancement. <b>B</b>	This option provides opportunities for landscape enhancements, but would lead to a significant change in townscapes (less diverse, more heterogeneous). Could lead to bland and uninteresting streetscapes. <b>Y</b>
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	This option is supported as it would encourage the reuse of previously-developed land and reduce pressure on Green Belt land. <b>LG</b>	This option may place pressure on Green Belt land to be developed, as less previously-developed land would be available to meet growth requirements. <b>O</b>	This option would facilitate the return of contaminated land to productive use, enabling it's remediation to the standard required for residential development. It may, however, create a requirement for the use of Greenfield land for displaced employment. <b>Y</b>
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Biodiversity is an important consideration for the redevelopment of previously used sites, and would need to be considered in any mixed use proposals. This option provides <b>Y</b>	This option may have the greatest benefit for biodiversity, as previously developed sites (e.g. old industrial sites) can provide valuable habitat. <b>LG</b>	Biodiversity is an important consideration for the redevelopment of previously used sites, and would need to be considered in any residential development proposals. This option may have the greatest <b>Y</b>

SA Objective		Option 8.1 Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.	Option 8.2 Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.	Option 8.3 Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.			
		opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.		impact, although it also provides opportunities for enhancement.			
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	This option may assist in preserving and enhancing cultural heritage as it may provide opportunities for a range of adaptive reuse schemes within mixed use development.	<b>LG</b>	This option may assist in preserving the area's industrial working heritage.	<b>LG</b>	This option would lead to the loss of the area's working heritage, although it may provide some opportunities for the reuse of buildings for residential use.	<b>Y</b>
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.		Not applicable.	
15	<b>Energy</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources. This option may save energy through encouraging mixed use development and reducing the need to travel.	<b>LG</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources.	<b>B</b>	All options provide the opportunity for encouraging energy efficiency, including the promotion of renewable resources.	<b>B</b>
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Mixed use schemes can reduce the overall level of emissions through reducing the need to travel.	<b>LG</b>	This option provides less opportunities to improve air quality, through encouraging the continued use of polluting industries (although mitigation possible) and continued single-use development which contributes to a higher level of vehicular travel than mixed use.	<b>O</b>	The loss of industrial and port uses, and replacement with residential may lead to better air quality in the long term, although this may be negated through increased vehicular traffic.	<b>B</b>

SA Objective		Option 8.1 Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.	Option 8.2 Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.	Option 8.3 Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.	
17	<b>Waste</b>	Any new development will lead to increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b>	Any new development will lead to increased waste production in the Borough, and should therefore have regard to the 'waste hierarchy' of minimisation, re-use and recovery, during development construction and operation.	<b>B</b>
18	<b>Water</b>	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that any new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources.	<b>B</b>	The acknowledged shortage of water in the Region means that strong policy will be required to ensure that any new developments do not place additional stress on the water environment and resources.	<b>B</b>
19	<b>Flooding</b>	The area under consideration is located in the indicative floodplains and flood risk may need to be assessed. Sustainable drainage systems should be required due to the riverfront location.	<b>B</b>	The area under consideration is located in the indicative floodplains and flood risk may need to be assessed. Sustainable drainage systems should be required due to the riverfront location.	<b>B</b>
<p><b>Summary:</b> <u>Option 8.1 is the preferred option</u>, performing better on a range of objectives. The mixed-use development advocated in this option will assist in meeting the accessibility objectives through better integrating transport and landuse, with flow-on effects for energy efficiency and air quality. Some caution</p>					

<p><b>SA Objective</b></p>	<p><b>Option 8.1</b>                  Make more of riverfront destinations by encouraging marine, recreational and residential development in appropriate riverfront locations whilst protecting important port uses where there is a proven need.</p>	<p><b>Option 8.2</b>                  Focus on safeguarding riverside industrial and port uses and limit recreational access to riverfront locations.</p>	<p><b>Option 8.3</b>                  Allow all riverfront locations to be redeveloped for residential uses.</p>
<p>will need to be taken to reduce potential conflicts between residential development and industry (e.g. from air and noise pollution).</p>			

Strategic Topic 9:

**How can the Borough's assets and residents' health be protected?**

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
1	<b>Balanced Communities</b>	This option would not promote social inclusion or community ownership, and could lead to a lack of resources and services for local residents.	<b>R</b>	This option would promote a better sense of community ownership through promoting and improving the Boroughs assets. It would allow better provision for services and facilities.	<b>LG</b>	If inadequately controlled, this option may lead to a degradation of community assets, such as the Dartford Marshes.	<b>Y</b>	This option would place pressure on existing resources, and would lead to the inadequate provision of infrastructure for incoming communities.	<b>O</b>

<b>SA Objective</b>		<b>Option 9.1</b> Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	<b>Option 9.2</b> Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	<b>Option 9.3</b> Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	<b>Option 9.4</b> Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
2	<b>Integrated Communities</b>	This option would not assist in regenerating and enhancing existing communities, and could contribute to greater inequalities in the Borough, particularly between new and existing residents.	<b>R</b>	Through improving existing assets and minimising the negative impacts of new development, this option provides the best opportunity for the integration of new and existing communities.	<b>LG</b>	If inadequately controlled, this option may lead to a degradation of community assets, such as the Dartford Marshes.	<b>Y</b>	New development should be required to meet its own needs, and where possible enhance the existing environment to ensure that existing residents are not disadvantaged.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
3	<b>Accessibility</b>	This option makes no provision for the improvement of transportation services or the integration of transport with land use.	<b>R</b>	The enhancement of the Dartford Town Centre through redevelopment and improvements of the existing built environment will assist in creating a more pedestrian friendly environment and increase the viability of transport services. The Green Grid will assist in encouraging more people to walk and cycle.	<b>LG</b>	This option may assist in improving access to recreation sites.	<b>LG</b>	New development will create a need for new public transport services, and walking and cycle paths, and should therefore be required to fund such improvements.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
4	<b>Public Health</b>	This option would have a negative long term effect on public health as it makes no provision for concerns such as poor air quality and noise intrusion to be addressed and provides no new facilities to encourage recreational activities.	<b>R</b>	This option ensures public health concerns (e.g. from poor air quality and noise intrusion) are addressed and provides increased opportunity for healthy recreational activities through support of the Green Grid.	<b>DG</b>	This option may assist in improving recreational opportunities.	<b>Y</b>	This option would be a lost opportunity in terms of improving the health and wellbeing of new and existing communities through encouraging more outdoor activity.	<b>Y</b>
5	<b>Phasing of Supporting Infrastructure</b>	This option makes no provision for the enhancement or creation of green infrastructure. New development should be required to meet its infrastructure needs.	<b>R</b>	This option makes provision for green infrastructure (the Green Grid) and promotes the sustainable use and enhancement of existing resources.	<b>DG</b>	This option should enhance existing infrastructure, rather than placing pressure on biodiversity and green resources.	<b>O</b>	This option makes no provision for the enhancement or creation of green infrastructure. New development should be required to meet its infrastructure needs.	<b>R</b>

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
6	<b>Housing</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable				
7	<b>Sustainable Design and Construction</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable				
8	<b>Environmental Health</b>	This option makes no provision for better public spaces or walking and cycling facilities.	<b>R</b>	This option will contribute to a safer town centre environment and allows provision for better facilities for walking and cycling and green spaces.	<b>LG</b>	Allowing open recreational facilities on Dartford Marshes may lead to increased air and noise pollution from recreational vehicles.	<b>O</b>	This option would be a lost opportunity in terms of requiring new development to fund facilities that would lead to improvements in public health.	<b>O</b>
9	<b>Employment</b>	This option is not likely to contribute to increased employment opportunities.	<b>O</b>	This option will most likely contribute to increased employment opportunities through enhanced town centre and recreational opportunities.	<b>DG</b>	This option may lead to increased employment opportunities in the recreational industry.	<b>LG</b>	This option is not likely to contribute to increased employment opportunities in recreation.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
10	<b>Landscape</b>	Unchecked development likely to have a negative impact on distinctive townscapes and landscapes.	<b>R</b>	This option most likely to contribute to the preservation and enhancement of landscape and townscapes.	<b>LG</b>	This option likely to lead to the degradation of environmental assets, in particular the Dartford Marshes.	<b>R</b>	This option makes no provision for the enhancement of landscape and townscapes.	<b>Y</b>
11	<b>Land and Soil Quality</b>	May have a negative impact on land and soil resources through inadequate controls on development.	<b>O</b>	This option supported as it will assist in protecting soil quality; encourage the remediation of contaminated land, and the enhancement of the countryside.	<b>DG</b>	This option likely to lead to the degradation of environmental assets, in particular the Dartford Marshes.	<b>R</b>	This option makes no provision for the enhancement of land or soil.	<b>O</b>

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.				
12	<b>Biodiversity</b>	Unchecked development may lead to negative impacts on biodiversity.	O	This option has the potential to support and enhance biodiversity through reversing habitat fragmentation (through creation of a Green Grid) and allowing protection of habitat and species through 'enhancing biodiversity assets.'	DG	This option unlikely to provide adequate protection for the biodiversity assets of the Dartford Marshes.	O	This option makes no provision for the enhancement of biodiversity or provision of greenspace.	O
13	<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	Unchecked development may have a negative impact on cultural heritage resources.	B	Provides an opportunity to enhance cultural heritage assets.	LG	Depending on scale and location, activities may place more pressure on cultural heritage resources.	B	Makes no provision for the enhancement of cultural heritage resources.	Y
14	<b>Minerals</b>	Not applicable		Not applicable		Not applicable		Not applicable	

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.
15	<b>Energy</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
16	<b>Air Quality</b>	Unchecked development would lead to a decrease in air quality due to pollution from construction, as well as an increase in vehicular movements created.	Provides opportunities for improved air quality and off-setting greenhouse gases through increased opportunities for tree-planting. This will assist in mitigating greenhouse gas emissions.	Depending on scale of activities, may lead to a localised decrease in air quality.	Makes no provision for improving air quality or off-setting greenhouse gases.
17	<b>Waste</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
18	<b>Water</b>	Makes no provision for the protection of water resources.	Protects against water pollution which will assist in protecting water resources.	May lead to further pollution of water resources.	A lost opportunity in terms of improving management of water resources.

SA Objective		Option 9.1 Allow development to be built regardless of its impact on the Borough's assets or residents' quality of life.	Option 9.2 Protect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ against flood risk, air and water pollution, noise and vibration intrusion, landfill gas and contaminated land,</li> <li>▪ and improve the Boroughs best assets including Dartford town centre, the openness of the Green Belt, the countryside in general, the Green Grid, Dartford Marshes, biodiversity and heritage assets.</li> </ul>	Option 9.3 Relaxing the controls for some of the Borough's assets, such as allowing Dartford Marshes to be used for open recreational uses.	Option 9.4 Focus enhancements on existing assets with no requirement for new development to enhance ecological value or contribute to the Green Grid.					
19	<b>Flooding</b>	Makes no provision for flood mitigation.	<b>O</b>	Additional green space will assist in mitigating flooding impacts through reducing run-off. Option specifically requires protection against flooding and is therefore supported.	<b>DG</b>	Increased recreational development in flood plains may lead to higher risk in the case of floods.	<b>O</b>	Makes no provision for protection against flooding.	<b>O</b>	
<p><b>Summary:</b> Option 9.2 is clearly preferred from a sustainability perspective, as it best protects the health of residents through providing protection against pollution, contamination and flooding impacts. It is the option that best preserves and enhances the existing assets of the Borough. The creation of a Green Grid and protection of biodiversity and the Dartford Marshes will assist in mitigating against the impacts of Climate Change. It is recommended that the policy wording includes acknowledgement of climate change impacts and includes provision for predicted effects, such as sea level rise, habitat loss and increased flooding events. The creation of a Green Grid provides opportunities for adapting to these impacts.</p>										