

**Sustainability Appraisal – Schedule of Comments (NB: Due to changes to Statutory Regulations introduced by SI 2009 No.401 and coming into force on 6 April 2009, which removed the requirement to produce a Sustainability Appraisal for SPD's, no further changes were made to the Sustainability Appraisal for the Sittingbourne Town Centre and Milton Creek SPD).**

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	Title	Number	Consultee Comment	Officers Response	ID
Miss	Rachael	Bust	The Coal Authority	Sittingbourne Town Centre and Milton Creek SPD Sustainability Appraisal		<p>Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving your emerging planning policy related documents; preferably in an electronic format. For your information, we can receive documents via our generic email address <a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a>, on a CD/DVD, or a simple hyperlink which is emailed to our generic email address and links to the document on your website.</p> <p>Alternatively, please mark all paper consultation documents and correspondence for the attention of the Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department.</p> <p>Should you require any assistance please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority on our departmental direct line.</p>	Noted.	SA3
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	1.2.5	Page 4 Section 1.2.5 Design Point 4 should be amended to read "4. To respect and enhance the natural and historic environment and qualities of Milton Creek."	Agreed.	SA7
Mr	G	Randall	Conservative Association	Paragraph	1.2.10	In Sustainability Appraisal Report section 1.2.10 "In all Options units in the town centre would	The use of 2500 apartments was for the purposes of	SA5

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	Title	Number	Consultee Comment	Officers Response	ID
						primarily be apartments with some townhouses." I believe that this is wrong. I do not accept that 2500 "mostly apartments" is what Sittingbourne needs. In general, developers have been trying to convince the entire country that what everyone wants is lots of 1-bedroom flats with no parking. They have been completely wrong, since most people actually want family sized houses with parking. This greed by developers has led to some of them having to give away their 1-bedroom flats in "buy one get one free" offers. I strongly believe that the development should be mostly family-sized houses with parking sufficient for families with grown-up children. I object to "apartment led" housing developments.	testing a 'worse case'. No actual configuration of dwelling number on the ground has been agreed. No change.	
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	4.3.1	Page 18 Section 4.3.1 - The towns of Sittingbourne and Milton Regis are included in the Kent Historic Towns survey which formed the basis of SPG3 in the Kent & Medway Structure Plan. This guidance should be taken account of in the Context Review and baseline.	Agreed.	SA8
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	4.3.5	Page 19 Para 4.3.5 - There is no evidence that Milton was the Roman administrative centre for the area. It was an important Saxon centre.	Agreed.	SA9
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	4.3.10	Page 19 Para 4.3.10 - add in that "Milton Creek was a focus of maritime activities since prehistoric times".	Agreed.	SA10
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	4.3.12	Page 19 Para 4.3.12 - should include wider historic environment features such as the S&KLR, Milton Creek and the remains of the barge, brick and paper industries.	Agreed.	SA11
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County	Paragraph	4.3.14	Page 20 - Appraisal findings - What are the effects	Point 1 - These are	SA12

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	Title	Number	Consultee Comment	Officers Response	ID
			Council			<p>on the buried archaeological resource and upon historic features that are not part of the Conservation Area or Listed?</p> <p>Page 20- Appraisal findings - Has the effect on the historic High Street of the refocusing of the town centre to the north been appraised?</p>	<p>considered to be covered by the appraisal findings. No change.</p> <p>Point 2 - It is agreed that this could have been more explicitly highlighted. The proposals for mixed use development within the town centre are considered to have a potential beneficial effect as they provide potential new uses and life for the centre as its focus shifts northwards. No further changes to the SPD are considered necessary.</p>	
Mr	Richard	Feasey	Kent County Council	Paragraph	4.3.19	Page 21 4.3.19 - Can mitigation measures be identified for the enhancement of the historic environment especially in the areas of Milton Creek and the streetscape of the High Street; the careful integration of development into and connecting with the historic High Street and Milton Creek; the creation of the cultural/museum area and the Paper Trail; the mitigation of archaeological impacts?	It is agreed that these can measures could be referred to in the final SPD. Change agreed.	SA13
Mr	G	Randall	Conservative Association	Water	4.8	Developers should be required to raise the level of the land at higher risk of flooding before building houses/flats. For an example, see the Medway riverside redevelopment in Rochester.	If land at risk of flooding cannot be avoided then developers will be required to put in place mitigation measures to minimise risk, this might include land raising. This will be	SA6

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	Title	Number	Consultee Comment	Officers Response	ID
							considered at the planning application stage. No change.	
Mr	G	Randall	Conservative Association	Waste	4.10	<p>Please find below my consultation feedback on the "Sittingbourne Town Centre and Milton Creek Supplementary Planning Document - Sustainability Appraisal Report"</p> <p>If any of these items are not applicable to this particular consultation document but are to another, then please consider them as comments on the other(s).</p> <p>Points are numbered below:</p> <p>1. We must make sure that each individual dwelling built has sufficient storage space for two full-size wheelie bins (i.e. green and blue) in order that housing developers don't undermine this borough's exception recycling successes.</p>	Noted, however this is a too detailed comment for the SPD, but will be considered at the planning application stage.	SA4
Mr	Ronald	Mortimer		Paragraph	6.5.17	Train times to London are at present 60 minutes not 70. The high speed trains have to travel to Ebsfleet before they become high speed trains. St Pancras is the wrong terminal for a lot of commuters.	Noted.	SA2
Mr	Nigel	Jennings	Natural England	Appendix 2 – Appraisal Matrices	10	<p>Landscape and Public Realm</p> <p>The sustainability appraisal confirms our view that the effects on wildlife around the creek are uncertain. Given that this area may be utilised by SPA birds it is important that this is investigated to ensure that there will be no likely significant effects</p>	Noted, these matters will be considered further as part of the Appropriate Assessment.	SA14

Title	Given Name	Family Name	Company / Organisation	Title	Number	Consultee Comment	Officers Response	ID
						<p>(see comments on the Habitats Regulations Assessment in Appendix 3).</p> <p>Milton Creek</p> <p>The issue of flood risk is raised in view of the fact that part of the area is within flood zone 3. "<i>Development in the area is likely to have an adverse effect on managing and reducing the risk of flooding.</i>" In which case would it be more appropriate to set aside a larger area as natural greenspace. This would help alleviate flood risk, enhance biodiversity, form part of the green infrastructure of the town and potentially mitigate effects of development on SPA birds.</p> <p>Green Charter</p> <p>We support the views expressed concerning the green charter.</p>		
Mr	Nigel	Jennings	Natural England	Appendix 3 – Compatibility Appraisal	11	<p>Most uncertainty appears to be with SPD objective 11 (Planning 5 - To redevelop brownfield sites and inappropriate uses around Milton Creek). This area is our main concern with the immediate development with the effects on the actual creek habitats and the birds using them.</p>	<p>These matters are being further considered as part of the Appropriate Assessment.</p>	SA15