Sites in Rural Settlements

Site Ref: IO2 **Date Survey Completed:27/09/2014**

Site Name: Parish Council Field and Doctor's Surgery field

Site Description:

This site is located along the main road through the village. It is currently a gap in the built frontage, and land to the rear of the village hall and doctors surgery. The site is currently in use as agricultural fields for grazing and crops. The site is divided into various parcels of fields which are separated by hedges, tree lines and fencing. It extends beyond the current built line of development.

There is housing opposite the site and adjacent, which is a mixture of large detached properties or semi detached 2 storey housing.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No. The site is within 500m of the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Hedgerows dividing the fields and along rear of fields including some large trees. Trees could be avoided.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Unlikely as site is open grassland at present, possibility that flood area at rear could be opened to managed access.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Village is characterised by open spaces between the more densely built up 'village' and more loosely developed	-1

		'heath'. Development of this site would cause a loss of one of these open spaces.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	If built development takes place on the frontage here the open space which is a characteristic of this part of the village would be removed. However, the site is well screened in most aspects and would not have a cumulative visual impact.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is in a Conservation Area. The site is of archaeological importance being the site of a Viking encampment.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	There is a grade ll listed building (Hallhouse Farm) opposite.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Unlikely to enhance character of village as character is partly defined by open spaces at this end of the village.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Yes western part of site liable to flooding zones 2 and 3. If site were to be developed, this area could be avoided.	-1
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Yes but only on the western margin. Less than 10% affected by one in 100 and 1 in 30 year flooding.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Yes. Subject to site investigation.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Whole site is 1.8 and would therefore qualify for affordable housing.	1

Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact on facilities.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes. The village post office and stores is within 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes. The doctor's surgery adjoins although it has limited opening hours and patients sometimes have to go to Hamstreet.	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No the village school has been closed and re developed for housing.	-2
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, recreation ground is almost opposite.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, the recreation ground is equipped with a play area.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, there is a pavement at this point in the village. Occupants can easily walk to the village shop from here.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	The development would result in the loss of open space. The open space is not publicly available although a PROW crosses the site.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No, although village hall is occasionally noisy.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Decile 5	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing	Yes, the site has frontage onto The Street,	1

	designated cycleway?	which is a sustrans route	
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	There is a bus route that passes the site but it is not an hourly service	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No this is a village site not reliant on large scale infrastructure	
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes Sandstone Tunbridge Wells Sand formation	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No it is on grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Although housing is the main proposal there is a suggestion that the existing doctor's surgery could be used to provide office accommodation for a business.	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not being promoted for business use	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0

12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes, easy walking distance to village shop and other services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No, although it could ultimately result in the loss of the doctor's surgery.	0
Conclusion: This site is located in the centre of the village and has excellent access to services. There are some constraints such as flooding and hedgerow removal, however, these could be designed around, especially if only the frontage of the site is developed. The site has good access, and offers employment and/or community gain through the village hall and doctors surgery and this is a benefit. Site is suitable for allocation in the Local Plan			**Total: 3**

Site Ref: IO22a **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: The Walnut Field

Site Description:

This site is a large area of open space which currently acts as a green buffer between the settlements of Appledore and Appledore Heath. The site is currently a field used for grazing and has two boundaries created by roads, both are key entrances to the village. There is a strong tree line on the north western boundary, and only small fencing and hedgerow along the remainder.

There is limited built development in the area, with the exception of intermittent detached houses in large curtilages and the large buildings and hardstanding on the northern boundary which houses a local coach company.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No the site is approximately 459m from SSSI	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, field is very open, existing hedge on northern boundary need not be affected.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No. The site forms an open area used for sheep grazing and which is characteristic of the landscape between the more built up part of the village and the part of the village known as 'The Heath'. There is	-1

		limited built development in this location.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	There would be a negative impact as the area is very open, along two roads, one being the main road through the village. Development here would be highly visible.	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site falls within site of Archaeological importance (Viking encampment)	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Data not available for this site	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Data not available for this site	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, the site is in an area of minor Ground Water Vulnerability	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact on facilities	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, the site is within 400m of the village shop.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes the site is close to the doctor's surgery	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No the nearest schools are in nearby villages	-2
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, recreation field close and numerous footpaths to surrounding countryside.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, recreation field includes equipped play area.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a footpath along the Tenterden Road frontage but no footpath along the Woodchurch Road frontage. PROW runs through site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of public open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Decile 5	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes, a Sustrans route runs past the site	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No, the site is on a bus route but the buses are infrequent	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			

9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No, site is greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes. Sandstone Tunbridge Wells sand formation	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No impact on business premises provision and job generation	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not being promoted for business	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	Does not include educational institutions	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	Would not promote sustainable tourism	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Appledore has a number of services such as GP, Shop and therefore is s district centre.	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No not applicable	N/A

13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is close to many of the services in the village and has suitable vehicle access. However, development of this site would lead to a loss of an important open space that currently separates the two settlement areas of the village. The site is extremely visible at all aspects from the two roads that adjoin it, and development here would be extremely visible in the landscape. Loss of this space would cause a long term detrimental effect on the character of the village and its setting, and would not be in keeping with its current surroundings. The site is not suitable for development.			**Total:** **2**

Site Ref: SS5 **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: Land between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane

Site Description:

The site is a large area of agricultural land, currently in an arable rotation. The field boundary is marked by thin hedging and fencing.

This site is located at the south eastern extent of the village of Aldington and marks a key entrance into the village from both Roman Road and Goldwell Lane. The site is located in close proximity to the village hall and school, which are on the opposing side of Goldwell Lane and Roman Road respectively. The western extent of the site is surrounded by linear housing development.

The topography of the site is significant, in that the site is located on the slope leading up towards the ridgeline, where the Roman Road and existing housing development are located. This makes the site predominant in the landscape when viewed from the northeasterly direction.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the	No, this site is located on a visually obtrusive entrance into the village, especially when viewed from the north.	-1

	landscape/ townscape?	This is because the site is located on the slope leading up towards the ridgeline and it would be extremely difficult to screen it, also the surrounding development is linear in character and the development being proposed is an 'estate' style.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Yes, because of the location of the site on the slope leading up towards the ridgeline, the site would be visually very prominent on the landscape and would be able to be viewed from long distances.	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Yes, the part of the site adjoining the Roman Road is located in an area of archaeology importance and the remainder of the site is located in an area of archaeology potential.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not in floodplain	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event or a 1 in 30 year event.	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1

Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes, this is a large site that, if all developed could provide a large number of affordable homes.	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The site is approximately 750m from the Post Office	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, there isn't a doctor's surgery in Aldington, the nearest surgery is in Sellinge.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, the site is opposite the local primary school	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, the Reynolds playing field is on the opposing side of Goldwell Lane	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, there is a large playpark in the Reynolds playing field and also outside adult gym equipment/	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	A PROW runs along the northern boundary of the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Decile 8	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			

8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes, direct access to the site can be achieved off of Goldwell Lane	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No, Aldington is serviced by an infrequent bus service.	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, Sellinge surgery is currently accepting new patients.	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No, greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes, the site is located on the Limestone Hythe formation, Kent	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	The site is Grade 2 agricultural land	-1
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	The site is being promoted as a mixed use scheme, which could provide for local employment and potentially retail provision. Further details would need to be obtained from the site promoters.	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Yes, although the site is currently a field and has no access to broadband, the	1

		adjoining uses have 16mb broadband	
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes, it is within the centre of Aldington	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	Not applicable	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site would be very visually intrusive in the landscape and would extend the village away from its central core. The area is very rural and the site can be seen in many locations. The access would need to be created on Goldwell Lane which is a key entrance to the village and footpaths provided to the village centre. Therefore, this site is not considered suitable for development.			**Total: 3**

Site Ref: BD4 **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: Land adjoining Gate House, Biddenden

Site Description:

This greenfield site sits to the east of the village of Biddenden at the end of Townland Close. The Weavers are located behind the southern site boundary. The site is flat and currently used as pasture, it can be accessed by a well surfaced track from Townland Close. The site is enclosed being surrounded by established trees and hedging.

(Townland close is a cul de sac of large detached properties, with a central green area enclosed by a loop road.)

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not within or near to a LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site is surrounded by mature trees and hedgerows, and there is a TPO tree to the south of the site.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site abuts The Weavers and Townland Close developments and it is felt that new development would not detract from the	0

		character of these existing areas.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is enclosed by mature trees and hedges. There are no far reaching views so development would have a minimal visual impact.	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is located 100m away from the Biddenden Conservation Area.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The nearest listed building is 100m away from the site, no impact.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect the character or setting of historic assets within Biddenden.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is located in Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Between 10% and 50% coverage of risk from the 1 in 100-year event; less that 10% coverage of risk from the 1 in 30 year event.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this location.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	0.9 ha and is being proposed for housing	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss	No impact on existing facilities	0

	or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?		
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	250m from Biddenden High Street	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	6km from nearest GP – Headcorn (3.7miles) Tenterden (3.86 miles) similar distances away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400m from Biddenden Primary School	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	450m from village recreation ground	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	450m from village recreation ground which includes an equipped play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Footways within adjoining Townland Close, PROW 30m north of site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss of open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to land uses which would have a detrimental impact on health and amenity	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Biddenden Ward is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access to Townland Close which is a public highway.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 High Weald Ride – Canterbury to Royal Tunbridge Wells is 2.47km from site.	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Route 12 Maidstone to Tenterden, via Biddenden, departs The Weavers	1

Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	o	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No impact	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Being promoted for housing	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	250m from Biddenden High Street	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0

13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is in a sustainable location being only 250m from Biddenden High Street, there are no environmental designations and it is not located within the village conservation area. However, the access to the site is via the existing development at Townland Close and the road is narrow and not suitable for additional development in this location. Also, the site is well screened having mature hedges / trees around the boundary, but concerns are raised that development would be visually intrusive when viewed from the east.			**Total:** **4**

* In accordance with the importance and weight encompassed in the NPPF, SA scoring could be overruled on sites that fall in the AONB, are in areas of highest flood risk, provide a substantial harm or total loss of a heritage asset or are found in a mineral safeguarding area.

Site Ref: **BD8** **Date Survey Completed:10/10/2014**

Site Name: **North Street, Biddenden**

Site Description: **A back land greenfield site made up of a number of fields currently down to pasture. The site includes two agricultural buildings located in the north of the site. Mansion House Close adjoins the site on the southern boundary and there is ribbon development of large detached dwellings along North Street to the east.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not within or near to a LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are no TPO trees on site, however there are a significant number of mature trees / hedgerows in the northern part of the site so there would likely be losses.	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This is a greenfield site in the countryside that adjoins a rural service centre and would result in a minor negative impact on the landscape setting as a relatively enclosed site with heavy screening from	-1

		both trees / hedgerows.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is relatively enclosed and so a minor negative impact would result from development.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is located 100 metres away from the Biddenden Conservation Area.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	A Grade II Listed Building (The Willow's) adjoins the site to the north, this is located at an access point and so there is likely to be a negative impact.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect the character or setting of historic assets within Biddenden.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is located in Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% coverage of risk from 1 in 30-yr event	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	3.2ha so site does reach threshold for affordable housing.	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss	No impact on existing facilities	0

	or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?		
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The site is located approximately 0.3km from facilities within Biddenden.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	6km from nearest GP – Headcorn (3.7miles) Tenterden (3.86 miles) similar distances away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	500m from Biddenden Primary School	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	120 metres Biddenden Recreation Ground	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	120 metres Biddenden Recreation Ground which includes an equipped play area.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	A popular PROW runs the length of the site along the southern boundary.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to land uses which would have a detrimental impact on health and amenity	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Biddenden Ward is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site includes an access point that links North Street by a track to the main part of the site.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 High Weald Ride – Canterbury to Royal Tunbridge Wells is 2.7km from site.	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more	Route 12 Maidstone to Tenterden, via Biddenden, departs The Weavers	1

	frequent bus service?		
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Yes, is being promoted for mixed use and therefore has the potential to being forward rural employment uses.	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Site not being promoted for business uses	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No, site is some distance from local primary school and so limited potential.	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	0.3km from Biddenden High Street	1

13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site scores well on sustainability grounds as it is close to Biddenden High Street and local facilities and services. Although development would have a negative impact in terms of visual amenity this would be fairly limited as the site is enclosed by mature trees / hedgerows. It is therefore felt that this site would be suitable for development.			**Total: 2**

Site Ref: **CH4** **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: **Northdowns Service Station**

Site Description:

This site is a Petrol Filling Station and forecourt at the northern end of Charing, located on the main A20 to Maidstone. The site sits within a large area of concrete hardstanding and sporadic linear development including the Swan Hotel restaurant, a oriental restaurant and an antiques barn, there are also a small number of detached properties. The rear of the site, behind the petrol station is formed of open grassland, which backs onto open countryside. There is an Electricity substation within the eastern boundary (36/2110) of the site area.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Minor at south of site	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential for greening of area	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	This site is not within the AONB, but does fall in its setting.	-1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Could improve northern part of site	2

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Potential view from west, but could be major improvement	1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	This site is on the outskirts of the village of Charing and would have no impact on the character and setting of the main village	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% for both	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes – number 3	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No; 10 proposed units but a site area of 1.37ha so could potential provide additional units	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Yes, development of the site will result in the loss of the petrol filling station	-1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Approx 550m to village centre. Currently a petrol station, so contains a small retail	0

		facility	
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Approx 600m to Charing Surgery	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Approx 575m to Charing Surgery	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	200m from informal open space at the Char 2 development (*Now called Poppy Fields*)	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No, approximately 800m to the play space on the Ashford Road	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not within or adjoining any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus route along Maidstone Road, opposite site	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0

9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, Charing surgery is accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Yes – northern section	2
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Southern sliver on sub-alluvial river terrace 3	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 2	-1
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Less	-1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not being promoted for business units	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No – approx. 650m	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	Yes – Petrol filling station	-1
Conclusion: This site is considered suitable for housing development as it provides the opportunity to integrate the sporadic linear development on the A20 Maidstone Road into a			**Total:**

more seamless entrance into the village and it would compliment the existing development site at Char 2 (*Poppy Fields*), as well as improve the setting of the AONB. Charing is seen as a sustainable location for development as the village has good facilities and transport links. Should this site come forward, additional pedestrian transport links to the village centre would need to be explored.	4

Site Ref: **CH6** **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: **Land at top of Charing Hill**

Site Description:

This site is located towards the top of Charing Hill, south of the small junction with Bowl Road. Development surrounding the site is residential linear development and on the opposing side of Bowl Road there a business and retail development. The site consists of a small flat wooded glade bounded in entirety by mature trees (esp. Maple). The site is completely bounded from road in several levels, the interior of the site has low density vegetation.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Yes – significant mature species; especially maple. The site also contains a vast amount of other smaller vegetation	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Yes, site within in Kent Downs AONB	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Would continue line of built development fronting main road, but would remove a green lung	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and	Would completely alter viewpoints from	-1

	cumulative visual impact from the development?	all directions	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No, site not neat the conservation area of Charing	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	No	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Number 3	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No, this site is too small to provide affordable housing	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, to north of site.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP	No – 1.4km	-1

	Surgery?		
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No 1.2km	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – across road from informal open space	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No – 1.2km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – main road. PROW along southern edge of site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – opposite bus stop	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1

Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-2
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is well-covered by numerous mature trees. Their loss would significantly negatively impact the locality. While there are certain local services nearby, the nearest basic health and education services are over 1km from the site and would necessitate use of private car. The site is wholly within the AONB, making any development very sensitive and			**Total: -2**

unacceptable when compared to alternatives	

Site Ref: CH9 **Date Survey Completed: 7/11/2014**

Site Name: Land adjoining Burleigh Bungalow

Site Description:

Allotment/horticultural smallholding hidden well down a private road. Subdivided with various sheds on different plots. Dotted with semi-mature native species. Slopes gently to north. Land on ridge, so potentially viewed from east and south. Access impossible from public highway.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Yes – significantly – 3TPOs beyond NE boundary	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No – existing landscape is allotment horticulture, and surrounding housing is large and rural. Potential for substantial adverse views from SW and change in character of locality.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and	Development would necessitate changes	-1

	cumulative visual impact from the development?	in road access and associated visuals	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Adjacent to conservation area at northern edge	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	This site is directly adjoining the conservation. But due to it being adjoined to the KCC Depot, it is unlikely to have an impact on the setting of this asset	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Data not available for this site	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Data not available for this site	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, this site is in an area of Major Groundwater vulnerability	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Loss of allotment and associated sheds	-1*
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – 400m	1

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes – 300m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – 410m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – 350m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – 350m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes – railway line to south	-1
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – rail	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	Yes – highway access	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting	Yes	1

	new patients?		
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	Derelict shed on site	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 2	-1
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes – 350m	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: While this site is in close proximity to a vibrant centre, with all basic services and transport links, its situation and context make the proposed development unsuitable for allocation. Its location at the end of a private road would necessitate substantial infrastructure			**Total: -1**

works to secure access, and the surrender of hedgerows and mature trees. The site is high and slopes downwards to the east, thus development would impact views from the east for a significant distance. Development of such density is not in keeping with the surrounding grain of development.	

Site Ref: CH14 **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: Land south of Arthur Baker Playing Field (allocation CHAR1)

Site Description: **Site is level grazing land, subdivided by fencing. Clear views of site from highway and public open space.** **Lightly bounded by mature trees.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Current landscape is pastoral fields marking edge of central area of Charing. Although fronting a main road and offering potential to mirror built form to the south, development would confirm a	-1

		suburban feel to the area.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Will extend built confines east along main road – ribbon. Changed views from highway and public park	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	1
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Data not available for this site	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Data not available for this site	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a	Yes – Charing village centre	1

	Local Centre/ Shop?		
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes – 420m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – 450m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – adjoins public park	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – approximately 100m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – pedestrian pavement; no PROW	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – main road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus immediately to south of site; rail nearby	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	1

9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Southern tip on sub-alluvial river terrace 3	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Upper part (NW) Grade 2; Lower part Grade 3	-1
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is an existing allocation in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD. It is suitable for reallocation in the Local plan as it will actively promote the use of the village recreation			**Total:**

ground immediately north of the site. In addition, development of this site could mirror the development on the opposing side of the and act as a natural boundary to development in this area of Charing.	**9**

Site Ref: **DN2** **Date Survey Completed: 08/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land at Harvest House, Branch Road, Chilham**

Site Description:

This site is made up of the residential curtilage of Harvest House and a building on the northern tip which is the doctors surgery and associated parking. The main part of the site is used as a garden, and has a small wire fence and hedge boundary along Branch Road. The site contains some scattered trees and a mature tree boundary along the western boundary which joins a small woodland. Opposite the site to the east is a small cul-de-sac of detached houses, the sports field, tennis courts, play area associated with the sports hall.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Yes - within	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Part of this site is developed and includes the doctors surgery, a dwelling and associated parking areas for both. There is a small cul-de-sac of housing to the east,	-1

		and the main built area of the village to the north. However, this area does have a rural character, as the southern part of the site joins open countryside, and the development to the south east is a sports hall.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development would be visible in this location, as it is adjacent to Doctors and Sports Hall, and therefore a busy road. It is visible from the A28 and in the wider setting from the downs.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is within the Chilham Conservation area, and is within 50m of the historical centre of Chilham which is a designated area of Archaeology associated with the Castle.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	It does not contain any listed buildings but is within 50m of some listed buildings, and 250m from the Historic Park and Garden of Chilham Castle.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Development of this site will not enhance the historical setting of this area, but the impact would be minimal as the development would be well screened from the Conservation area by the existing housing, and from the castle by the woodlands in between the sites.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Less than 10% coverage. Site adjoins floodzone to south.	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0

4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes -1.3ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No gain in facilities but may improve parking for GP surgery	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Within 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Within Site	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Within 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	50m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	50m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0

Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 runs south of Chilham village and some local routes around Chilham	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus stops in village with connections Canterbury and Ashford. Chilham has railway station.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	No. Chilham Surgery not currently accepting new patients. Nearest Surgery is Chartham	0
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Not the area proposed for development.	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Within mineral safeguarding area: of brickearth	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business	No	0

	uses, does it have access to broadband?		
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is located within the village of Chilham and is close to the services such as GP, School, Shops, park etc, and therefore scores well. The site is within the AONB and Conservation area and is within 50m of the Archaeological historic centre of the village. Development of this site could potentially be detrimental to these settings. The site is also visible from the A28 and in the wider landscape from the south. There are issues arising from the access to this site, which make it unsuitable for allocation in the Local Plan			**Total:** **3**

Site Ref: **DN12** **Date Survey Completed: 08/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land between Bagham Lane and Felborough Close, Chilham**

Site Description:

This site is located along the northern edge of Bagham Road, which is a tree lined entrance to the village of Chilham, also known as 'The Avenue'. The site is currently a vacant field. It is bounded by the A252 to the north and Bagham Lane to the South and east, with the residential close of Felborough to the west. The boundaries are hedges and this land is relatively flat. The area of Felborough Close that adjoins the site is a development of bungalows for the elderly, the land levels very in this close and drop down towards the site. However, it is well screened from the site by overgrown scrub and hedges.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially involve the loss of some of the mature trees on the road frontage that are within the Conservation area and form the 'Avenue' entrance to the village (these have now been TPO – 27/5/15)	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Yes - within	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The area is very rural in character and is an important part of the setting of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape in	-1

		this area, and there is very little built development.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is along a key entrance to the village and the northern section of the site is within the Conservation area, which contains a row of mature trees. Development of this site would change the views into the village significantly if not screened well.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The southern part of the site is within the Chilham Conservation area and there are Areas of Archaeological importance within 200m of the site.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No, but although the site is partly within the Conservation area, this is only the tree lined area. Development outside of this area may be acceptable.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Less than 10% coverage. Site adjoins floodzone to south.	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence. No survey for this site	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			

5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes - 0.9ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Within 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Within 400m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Within 500m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Within 100m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Within 100m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Not at present. Site owner believes access can be created	0

8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 runs south of Chilham village and some local routes around Chilham	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus stops in village with connections Canterbury and Ashford. Chilham has railway station.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	No. Chilham Surgery not currently accepting new patients. Nearest Surgery is Chartham	0
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	This site is partly within the mineral safeguarding area of brick earth	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Ungraded	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0

12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is located within the village of Chilham and is close to the services such as School, Shops, park etc, and therefore scores well in these sections. The site should be considered in conjunction with DN13. **The site is within the AONB and partly within the Conservation area, which runs along Bagham Road, protecting the key entrance to the village and known as 'The Avenue'. Development of this site could have a detrimental impact on this important setting and the character of this village entrance, and it is unknown if the mature trees along this avenue would be protected if access is to be achieved. An access road at this point would also change the character of this Avenue.** **The northern part of the site would have less impact on the Avenue, but development would be visible from the A252 and Bagham Road and would require screening.**			**Total:** **1**

Site Ref: **DN13** **Date Survey Completed: 08/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land between Bagham Road, Arden Grange & recreation ground, Chilham**

Site Description:

This site is located along the southern edge of Bagham Road, which is a tree lined entrance to the village of Chilham, also known as 'The Avenue'. The site is currently a field, unused for grazing or agriculture. It is bounded on all sides by a small wire fence and also a line of mature trees on all edges with an exception on the southern boundary which allows views from the sports field to the south of the site. On the west of the site is a cul-de-sac of 5 detached properties 'Arden Grange' and a telephone exchange building which are well screened by trees.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially involve the loss of some of the mature trees on the road frontage that are within the Conservation and form the 'Avenue' entrance to the village (Now TPO – 27/5/15)	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Yes - within	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The area is very rural in character and is an important part of the setting of the village. Development would have a detrimental impact on the landscape in	-1

		this area, and there is very little built development.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is along a key entrance to the village and the northern section of the site is within the Conservation area, which contains a row of mature trees. Development of this site could change the views into the village significantly if not screened well.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The northern part of the site is within the Chilham Conservation area and there are Areas of Archaeological importance within 200m of the site.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No, but although the site is partly within the Conservation area, this is only the tree lined area. Development outside of this area may be acceptable.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Less than 10% coverage. Site adjoins floodzone to south.	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence. No survey for this site	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			

5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No - 0.4ha (although possibility to link with DN12?)	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Within 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Within 400m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Within 500m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Adjacent	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	50m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Not at present – access appears to be from Bagham Lane – across a field to the east. Site owner believes access can be	0

		created	
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 runs south of Chilham village and some local routes around Chilham	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus stops in village with connections Canterbury and Ashford. Chilham has railway station.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	No. Chilham Surgery not currently accepting new patients. Nearest Surgery is Chartham	0
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Site is within mineral safeguarding area of brickearth	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Ungraded	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0

12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is located within the village of Chilham and is close to the services such as School, Shops, park etc, and therefore scores well in these sections. This site alone would not provide affordable housing but could be joined with DN12 to create a larger scheme. The site is within the AONB and partly within the Conservation area, which runs along Bagham Road, protecting the key entrance to the village and known as 'The Avenue'. Development of this site could have a detrimental impact on this important setting and the character of this village entrance, and it is unknown if the mature trees along this avenue would be protected if access is to be achieved. An access road at this point would also change the character of this Avenue. Site not suitable for allocation in the Local Plan			**Total:** **0**

Site Ref: **WN2** **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: **NE of New Road, Egerton**

Site Description:

This site is located in the south eastern edge of Egerton village on New Road, opposite Harmers Way, a modern housing estate. The site is in agricultural use and is currently used for grazing. The site slopes from higher ground in the south and sloped down to the northern part of the site. There are clear views of the village church from the site. The site is bounded by a limited number of trees and hedgerows creating a natural buffer to the north-east and south-eastern boundary.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	None within the site but the boundary is prominent hedge/tree lined and some removal may be necessary to create access	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	There is development on the western side of New Road opposite the site that is 2 storey detached dwellings. This part of the village is very rural in character. Development of this green field will have a	-1

		negative impact on the character of this key entrance to the village.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Current key viewpoint of church from entry road could be affected	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No Impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% for 1 in 100.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Yes – permeability possible with site investigation	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes adjoins built development in south of Egerton.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – 2.97 miles away (Charing)	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – within 400m of play area and skate park in the recreation field	2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No pedestrian footway. PROW bisects two fields running SW-NE	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No – bus infrequent	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it	No	0

	deliverable?		
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Entirely located on limestone hythe formation Kentish ragstone	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Yes – grade 2	-2
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0

Conclusion: This site is close to the centre of the village and all the services it has to offer and therefore is in a sustainable location. However, the site does extend further south into the countryside than the built development on the opposite side of the road, and therefore only a smaller area of the site is deemed suitable for development. **This smaller site area would need to consider the landscape and setting in this part of the village, and the impact on the views of the church. However, as the land slopes down towards the church and is lower than the road, and there is housing on the opposite side of the road, the visual impact of development could be minimised.**	**Total:** **3**

Site Ref: **WS1** **Date Survey Completed: 14/11/2014**

Site Name: **Hamstreet Garden Centre, Marsh Road, Hamstreet**

Site Description:

The site lies on the outskirts of the village outside of the current built confines and is mainly surrounded by open countryside with and small dyke and then beyond this a high grass bank and the Royal Military Canal along its southern boundary. The site consists of a large retail unit used as a garden centre and a garden building show yard. The total floor area of existing buildings is 2.268sqm with a further 3190 sqm used for storage. The site also has a car park and an area north of the building that is disused greenhouses. There is a residential property on the south east corner of the car park 'The Farthings', which is screened by trees and hedges.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	The royal military canal LWS is adjacent, however as the site is already used the impact of development would be short term and minimal	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, as not in or adjoining	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the	This site lies on the main road through the village. The landscape is very rural as there	-1

	landscape/ townscape?	is no housing in this location at present. However, it is brownfield so impact would not be significant.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site can be viewed clearly from the road and from the Royal Military Canal footpath. However, as the site is already built out the visual impact may improve with redevelopment with good design and landscaping.	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site adjoining the Royal Military Canal Archaeological importance site	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site adjoining the Royal Military Canal which is a SM	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	The RMC is a historical asset, development may improve the setting of the area, but impacts are unknown.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	The site is partly within both flood zone 2 & 3	-2
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 3.5ha	1

Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Potentially could include leisure facilities	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	750m to nearest shop	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	780m to nearest GP	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	1.3km to Hamstreet Primary School	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes recreation field and royal military canal path	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	780m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Nearby PROW. No footpath	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	1.2km from Railway. 800m from Bus.	-1

Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Yes	1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	Buildings are used	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Increased and redeveloped employment space	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No - 700m from village centre and no footpath.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a

13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	Potential loss of Garden Centre	-1
Conclusion: The site is a brownfield site currently utilised as a garden centre. It is currently a retail site providing employment use, with one residential property on site. A large area of the site is within the flood zone, but this area is the part that is developed. The site would not be suitable for housing development due to its location away from the built confines of the village, but can be considered for redevelopment in the vacant areas on the north of the site that have potential for employment and/or leisure development.			**Total:** **-4**

Site Ref: **WS30** **Date Survey Updated: 16/11/2015**

Site Name: **Land North of St. Mary's Close, Hamstreet**

Site Description:

The site is located at one of the main entrances to the village, opposite the Primary School. It acts as a green buffer between the A2070 and the built up area of the village. The site is used for agriculture and has recently been cut for hay. The site is on a hill and slopes upwards to the west and NW, however it slopes back downwards the further NW it spreads. The site is very open to the north west with longs views of the rolling countryside, but is bounded by trees alongside the road into the village and there is dense woodland to the North. There is a small close of housing to the south of the site, St Mary's Close which are clearly visible from the site and beyond that the Railway station, which cannot be seen. There is also another row of woodland along the North eastern boundary.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	The site is within 200m of the Hamstreet Woods SSSI and National Nature Reserve but would have no known impacts.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	The site lies within 500m of Orlestone Forest LWS but no known impacts	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site contains a number of trees and hedgerows along its boundaries, which may need to be removed for access to be created. There is an ancient woodland within the site, along the road boundary and this could be impacted on depending on size of development. There are ancient woodlands to the north and south boundaries which may also be impacted by development.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	None proposed	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	n/a	0
Objective 2: Landscape			

2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site lies on the main entrance to the village and the character of the landscape at this point is very rural. As the site lies higher than the village, development here would be prominent on the landscape.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	As the site lies on the ridgeline of the hill, higher than the village, the visual impact would be great. It may be able to be screened by trees, but the access to the development, would create a change to the visual landscape and could have a detrimental impact on this tree lined street setting and entrance to village.	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No – Conservation area is 320m away	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event and 1 in 30-year event, but at a less than 10% risk.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	0

Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes – 8.2ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	500m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	700m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	100m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Lancaster Close Play area and open space 460m (Site has potential to provide open space within it)	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	As above	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a public footpath through the site to the north east.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	The development could create a gain of local open space	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Currently a farm access gate opposite school entrance – Visibility splays to be	1

		assessed	
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	200m from railway station and bus stop	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No - Greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?		n/a
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0

12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Hamstreet Village	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site proposal is a large area and is very open to the north, with no obvious natural boundaries to restrict growth in the northern direction. Development here could change this key entrance to the village significantly and the site currently lies on the edge of the built confines. However, a smaller site size is considered suitable to reduce the impact on this countryside setting. **The site is however close to the railway station and in walking distance of all the facilities in this large village. It is also opposite Hamstreet Primary School, and has potential to provide an area of open/leisure space in this area of the village.** **The access to the site must be assessed in greater detail. The local road network has capacity, but there are existing parking issues at school times and an access here should not increase this problem. Ways of mitigating the traffic concerns should be investigated such as traffic calming, crossing points, footpaths and/or road widening.**			**Total:** **3**

Site Ref: **WS37** **Date Survey Completed: 15/07/2014**

Site Name: **Land at Parker Farm, Hamstreet**

Site Description: **This site is located to the south of the development of Orlestone view, which consists of mainly terraced 3 storey housing. It consists of vacant agricultural buildings and associated land. It is adjacent to open countryside to the south of the village, and the sports field. It has a private access road that also served 3 detached properties.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development here would have minimal impact on the existing character as it is already in use as large barns and agricultural buildings and sits behind the high density development in Orlestone	-1

		View.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of this site would change the views into the area from beyond, however there are no key views in or out of the site, and screening could minimise the impact.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No. Conservation area is over 100m away	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Yes, part of the site is in flood zone 2 and 3	-2
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Yes, contained to small strip along northern boundary.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Not in ground water protection zone, but ground water vulnerability	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 1.6ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss	No	0

	or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?		
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	200m using PROW, 500m using footpath	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	700m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	800m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Pound Leas Recreation Field	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Village Hall Play area 700m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, both	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Access to this site can be obtained through the widening of the existing access	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	620m from Railway. 400m Bus – not hourly though.	0

Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No but there are agricultural buildings	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	N/A	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford	N/A	0

	town centre?		
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The site is currently allocated as HAM2 in the Tenterden and Rural sites DPD. It was restricted to be developed after 2016 and because the topography of the surrounding countryside means that development will only have a limited impact on the landscape setting and neighbouring occupiers, the site is still considered suitable for housing development in the Local Plan. However, since the allocation as HAM2 was adopted, the flood risk data in this part of Hamstreet has changed, meaning that a larger proportion of the site now falls within the floodzone. Therefore, a Local Plan allocation should ensure that the indicative housing numbers for the site are reduced to ensure that development is kept away from the area at flood risk.			**Total:** **2**

Site Ref: **WC12** **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land at Hope House, High Halden**

Site Description: **This site is located to the west of High Halden adjoining the Millfield residential estate along the eastern boundary of the site, with frontage along the A28. Currently pasture with mature hedging and limited mature trees surrounding the site on three sides, the northern boundary has an open aspect fronting the A28. The site slopes down from south to the north and is relatively open in character.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not within or near to LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are no TPO trees on site, the site boundary features mature hedgerows / trees and development could come forward without losses.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is surrounded by existing residential development to the north and east.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the	The site slopes down from south to north with no far reaching views into the	0

	development?	countryside so limited development could be achieved without significant negative impact on the landscape.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site located approximately 280m west of the conservation area	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Hope House a Grade II Listed Building adjoins the site in the north west. A minor negative impact would result from development.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	There are listed buildings to the north west so development would have a minor negative impact on their setting.	-1
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Site not in flood zone	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Not at risk from Surface Water Flooding from either the 1 in 100-year event and/or the 1 in 30-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site submission proposes 50 dwellings and covers the area of approx. 2.2ha so would meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Proposing public open space and commercial/community facilities within site submission.	1

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Site is approx. 500m west along the A28 from the local store	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Ivy Court, Tenterden is the nearest GP Surgery located approx. 4.1km away.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	About 550m away from High Halden Primary School	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	Public open space approx. 70m Hookstead Play Area to the west and 80m from the recreation ground off Hookstead and Hope Grove to the north.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Public play area located within open space 80m north of the site	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a pedestrian pavement along the A28 opposite the site entrance	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Site submission includes public open space.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Weald Central is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access onto Ashford Road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 High Weald Ride is located approx. 866m east of the site	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Service 2 Ashford – Tenterden leaves outside The Chequers, High Halden (approx. 500m east) and is a frequent bus service.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			

9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Site is greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No buildings on site	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Site is being promoted for mixed use, commercial / communal facilities.	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	N/A promoted for housing development	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	The site proposal includes communal facilities, however it is unclear at this stage what form this may take, i.e. educational component	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Adjoins built confines of High Halden	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford	No	0

	town centre?		
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is in a favourable location close to local amenities and services. The site has good access onto the A28 and slopes down from north to south so the site is not so exposed to the surrounding countryside as there are no far reaching views. There are a number of listed buildings adjacent to the site, and one adjoining however these are offset against post-war style housing to the east and north of the site so a minor negative effect should result. This is considered a suitable site for development.			**Total:** **9**

Site Ref:DW6 **Date Survey Completed: 16/10/2014**

Site Name: Station Road, Coach Drive, Hothfield

Site Description:

This site is an agricultural field (currently in arable rotation) located on the north eastern extent of the village of Hothfield. It is currently detached from the main built area of the village, as it is separated by a thick band of TPO woodland. The quality of this woodland would need further assessment, as it is evident that the area suffers considerable recreational pressure. This woodland strip provides ideal screening, making any potential development not visually intrusive.

The site slopes down from the A20 towards the existing development of Hothfield and a tall bank raises the site from School Road on its western boundary. This creates a bowl shape for the site, where development could nestle in and be unobtrusive.

The challenges for any development for this site would be to ensure connectivity between any new houses and the old estate, without extensively damaging the band of TPO trees.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Yes, within 100m. Proposals for the site include provision of a visitors centre, to enable managed access and information on the site. This overtime is likely to increase species and the quality of the environment.	2
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Yes, to enable connectivity of the site to the main village. There is also ancient woodland (Tott Hill Wood) within close proximity to the eastern boundary of the site.	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Yes, proposals for the site could include a visitor centre/café which would compliment the draw of the nearby Hothfield Common, thus creating a green linkage between the existing settlement	2

		and the important wildlife site and promoting managed access	
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes, the topography of the site is a bowl shape, so any development would not be visually intrusive. Development of the site could in fact have a positive impact on the landscape setting as it would help to provide a more cohesive setting for the existing social housing and the setting of the village as a whole.	1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	No, because the site is naturally well screened (see above) there would be no visual impact from the development. There would be a positive impact from the 'hard edge' of the settlement currently created by the social housing estate.	1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not in floodzone	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at	0

	Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	risk from the 1 in 100-year event or 1 in 30 year coverage.	
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration -Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes, large site with potential	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	The scheme being proposed could potentially be the catalyst for delivering a new visitor centre/café to complement the draw of nearby Hothfield Common	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, the existing village shop is only 400m from the site.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, the nearest doctors surgery is in Charing, the nearest main district centre.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No, the nearest primary school is in Charing, the nearest main district centre.	-2
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, there is an area of open space in front of the former village school. This is less than 100m from the site.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, there is play equipment available on the open space in front of the former school	1

7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a footway available on Coach Drive and informal public rights of way bordering the site. There is also a public byway 400m to the south of the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Decile 3	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Although, there is currently no direct access to the public highway, an access route could easily be achieved.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	There is an hourly bus service (10x between Ashford and Maidstone) which stops at School Road, Hothfield	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, the nearest doctors surgery is in Charing and it is accepting new patients.	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No the site is a green field site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral	Yes, the site is a Mineral Safeguarding	-1

	reserves?*	Area for Silica/Construction Sand. Sandstone – Folkestone formation	
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Site is located on Grade 3 agricultural land.	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not applicable	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	The site is within 400m of the centre of Hothfield. However, other than a village shop the services in the centre are very limited. The site is some way from Charing, the nearest main district centre.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	Not applicable	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: There are a number of local issues in Hothfield village – These include the concentration of social housing in the central area and the poor physical integration between the social housing in the central core area and the remainder of the village, the closure of the primary school and village pub and concerns about the future of the remaining one village shop. The Council has set up a Hothfield Regeneration Task Group to **consider how the slow decline of the village can be reversed with the intention of creating a more cohesive community and the catalyst project of delivering a new visitor centre/café to complement the draw of nearby Hothfield Common is progressing well. It is considered that the DW6 could be a suitable site to deliver these proposals due to its high score in this**			**Total:** **11**

Sustainability Appraisal process	

Site Ref: WS4 **Date Survey Completed: 08/09/2014**
Site Name: Briars, Church Hill, Kingsnorth

Site Description:
The site is located to the rear of a residential property 'The Briars' along Church Hill. The site is mostly grass with temporary outbuildings. The site inclines west to east.
Northern boundary border – residential (detached, linear with large gardens). Western boundary border - Forge Car service Garage and fields. Southern boundary border - ungrazed pasture. Eastern boundary border - grazed pasture. The existing property of the Briars would have to be removed to gain a suitable access to the site

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site contains a number of trees and hedgerows along its boundaries and one within the centre of the site, but these are not protected and could be retained	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	None proposed	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Not within or near green corridor	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would be backland development, and would not be in keeping with the linear from here. However, on the opposite side of the road there are 2 cul-de-sacs located behind the linear row of housing.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site would not be seen from the road, but could be visible in the wider landscape from PROW across the countryside	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No – Conservation area is 1m away	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0

3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No – 0.45ha	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	There is no local shop in the village. Park Farm Tesco is nearest shop – less than 800m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	625m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	190m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Recreation field within 200m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Within 200m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has access from the highway, but the property would need to be	1

		demolished to access rest of site.	
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes – there is a local route from Church Hill through to Park Farm and beyond	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus stops located along the main road through village and at Tesco	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Kingsnorth Medical Practice	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No - Greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	N/A	n/a
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	N/A	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site proposal is a large area which would form a back land development of the properties on Church Hill, Kingsnorth. The site is very open when viewed from the southern direction, with no obvious natural boundaries to restrict growth, it would form development beyond the built confines of the village of Kingsnorth. This site is not suitable for allocation in the Local Plan**			**Total:** **5**

Site Ref: **WE39** **Date Survey Completed: 15/1/2015**

Site Name: **Land rear of village hall, Mersham**

Site Description:

This site is currently an enclosed field (and part of an adjacent field that joins Blind Lane). It is relatively flat grassed area, possibly used for grazing. It has a hedgerow and tree boundary on all edges which means it is well screened in the wider landscape in the north. The site is very visible from Blind Lane though. The village hall and car park is to the east of the site, in addition to 3 detached bungalows that wrap around the southern boundary. The Farriers arms PH and an agricultural business site is located on the road to east. The roads in the area are mainly hedge and tree lined and typical housing is detached.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within 100m of a nationally designated site? (SSSI, National Nature Reserve, Special Area of Conservation)	No	0
1.2	Is the site located within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of trees/hedgerows?	Minor loss of trees / hedgerows would result to achieve proposed access point onto Blind Lane.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or green linkages?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or adjoining an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development here would change the rural setting and landscape, particularly from Blind Lane side.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here could negatively impact on the views of the neighbouring properties in Blind Lane. The site can be	-1

		seen from this location, but is well screened from the north and east.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Not within archaeological importance area but there is some archaeological potential.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No but there is a number of listed buildings in close proximity (Goodrich Cottage to the NE).	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Yes (less than 10% coverage)	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes (0.6ha but includes total site boundary including access point and extension to village hall area).	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Gain of services – proposal includes extension to village hall and car park.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Over 400m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP	1.9miles away – Willesborough Health	-2

	Surgery?	Centre	
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, recreation ground	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – over 1km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes (less than 400m)	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to land use/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No – bus infrequent	0
8.4	Is the site located in an Air Quality Management Area	No	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0

9.2	Does the local road network have suitable capacity to provide for the site?	Yes	1
9.3	Is there adequate capacity in the local sewer network to provide for the site?	Yes	1
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
9.5	Is there adequate primary school place provision at the nearest primary school to the site (see 6.4)?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No – although southern edge of site is within draft Mineral Area 2014 (Alluvium).	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	1
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1

13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site – although some distance from many of the village services, is still in walking distance, making it a sustainable location. Development of this site would change the landscape and setting in this area of the village from Blind Lane, a very rural narrow road. The site is visible from this location and screening would be required, particularly as much of the current tree boundary on this edge would need to be removed to create an access here. **The development of this site offers a community gain in the form of village hall extension and additional parking for the village hall, and is well screened form the main road through the village. It is suitable for development.**			**Total:** **4**

Site Ref: WC14 **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: Land on the north east side of Smarden Road, Pluckley

Site Description:

This site is rectangular is shape and is sited to the west of Smarden Road at the top of a ridge line with views of rolling countryside to the west. It is currently in agricultural use although overgrown. A mature hedge runs the length of the site along the eastern boundary.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, however there is a LWS 'Pasture & Orchard, Pluckley' 126metres to the west.	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, this is an open site and could be developed without significant loss to trees or hedgerows, however there is ancient woodland located 140metres west of the site.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This area has been identified as an important open aspect within the village within the Pluckley Parish Design Statement, development here would be prominent in the landscape resulting in a negative impact.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This is an open site at the top of a ridge line with attractive country views to the west, development would have a significant	-1

		negative impact on the surrounding landscape.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is 388metres from the village conservation area to the north of the village.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Luckhurst House is a Grade II Listed Buildings that is located opposite side of Smarden Road and is set back from the road frontage.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is located in Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Not at risk from surface water flooding	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this location.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	1.5 ha proposal for 37 dwellings so site would meet the threshold for affordable housing.	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact on existing facilities	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	550m from Pluckley Post Office	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Charing Surgery, 4.4km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary	550m from Pluckley Primary School	0

	school?		
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	140m from public open space	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	680m from village recreation ground which includes an equipped play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW adjoins the site along the western boundary	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss of open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to land uses which would have a detrimental impact on health and amenity	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Weald Central is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access to Smarden Road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Pluckley Railway Station is 1.4km away, the nearest bus stop is opposite the Black Horse, Smarden Road 566m away but there is no hourly bus service.	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0

Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Being promoted for housing	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not applicable	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Pluckley is a dispersed village however the local shop provides an indicator of the village centre which is 550m away	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Although this site is relatively close to services and facilities the site is in a prominent open aspect location within the village and development would have a significant visual impact on the surrounding landscape. It is therefore considered unsuitable for development.			**Total:** 2

Site Ref: WC15 **Date Survey Completed:09/19/2014**

Site Name: Land to the west of Smarden Road, Pluckley

Site Description:

This site forms part of an important open aspect within the village of Pluckley at the top of a ridgeline along Smarden Road. It is currently pasture and there are good views to the west. The sites northern boundary adjoins the village conservation area and a large detached residence 'Ardaraich House' is to the south.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not within or near LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, this is an open site and could be developed without significant loss to trees or hedgerows	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This is an open site at the top of a ridge line with far reaching views to the west, development would have a significant negative impact on the surrounding landscape.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	There would be a negative visual impact on an open green aspect within the village.	-2

Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site adjoins the village conservation area to the north	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Forge Hill (Grade II Listed Building) is 80m to the north (not adjoining).	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is located in Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% risk of flooding from surface water from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this location.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	1.3ha and being promoted for 15 (affordable) dwellings so would meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing.	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact on existing facilities	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	200m from Pluckley Post Office	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Charing Surgery, 4.4km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	130m from Pluckley Primary School	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			

7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	270m from public open space	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	270m from village recreation ground which includes an equipped play area	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW located 130m from site to north and 230m to the south	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss of open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to land uses which would have a detrimental impact on health and amenity	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Weald Central is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access to Forge Hill	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Pluckley Railway Station is 1.7km away, the nearest bus stop is opposite the Black Horse, Smarden Road 200m away but there is no hourly bus service.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			

11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Being promoted for housing	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not applicable	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Pluckley is a dispersed village however the local shop provides an indicator of the village centre which is 200m away	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Although this site scores well in terms of its location close to local amenities and facilities, the site sits at the top of a prominent ridgeline within the village that is also an important open aspect and as such development here would have a significant negative visual impact on the surrounding area. It is therefore considered an unsuitable location for development.			**Total:** 4

Site Ref: WC16 **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: Former Pluckley Brickworks, Pluckley

Site Description:

This is a substantial brownfield site made up of pockets of different areas. The northern part of the site is roughly square in shape made up of shrub land which is overgrown and well screened by mature hedging and trees. The south western area of the site includes a well made track leading to the former brickworks with derelict chimney and buildings, a pond and scrub woodland. The eastern part of the site includes an area of scrubland, and a garage and repair workshop which are currently in use.

Update 2016 - This site has since been granted planning

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not within or near to LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Development may result in loss of minor trees and / hedgerows that are currently located in belts throughout the site. There are TPO trees along the access road.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site submission proposes country park which would provide managed access to natural areas.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is well screened from the surrounding countryside, and there are no far reaching views into or out of the site.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative	Although a large site, it is well screened and	0

	visual impact from the development?	visual impact would be limited.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Pluckley Station Conservation Area is within the eastern edge of the site.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The Dering Arms Inn (Grade II Listed) adjoins the site to the east, however the commercial garage which forms part of the site submission currently detracts from the character of the conservation area, development provides an opportunity to improve this setting.	1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	As above	1
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is within Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Risk of surface water flooding of between 10% and 50% coverage from the 1 in 30-year event.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Not in a groundwater source protection zone, however mapping suggests the area is in the lowest category of risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	This site is 13ha and is proposing 51 dwellings so will meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing.	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Proposing a country park, car parking for Pluckley Station and employment uses.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local	Site is located 1.7km from Pluckley post office	-2

	Centre/ Shop?	/ village store.	
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Charing Surgery, approx. 4.4km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Site is approximately 1.6km away from Pluckley Primary School	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	The site is located approx. 1km away from public open space at Thorne Estate	-1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	The site is located approx. 1.8km away from public open space that includes a play area	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There are no PROW through the site, although paths adjoin the site to the north and east.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential to gain public open space in the form of a country park	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Mapping indicates that the western part of the site is landfill	-1
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Weald Central is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access onto Station Road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Pluckley Railway Station sits opposite the site to the east	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Development would bring the brownfield site with previous potentially contaminant activities back into use.	2
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	Although there are derelict buildings on site, site submission indicates that these could not be reused.	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	Yes	-1
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Being promoted for housing, car parking, employment and country park	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?		?
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Pluckley is a dispersed village however the local shop provides an indicator of the village centre which is 1.7km away	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This is a brownfield site, and although it scores poorly in terms of distance from local services / facilities being approximately 1.7km away from the main hub of the village it is well screened and there would be limited visual impact on the surrounding landscape. The site submission also proposes to bring forward			**Total:** 1

new community, employment activities and there is potential to improve the setting of this part of the village conservation area through some limited development as well as the re-use of a derelict potentially contaminated brownfield site.	

Site Ref: WC62 **Date Survey Completed:19/09/2014**

Site Name: Land adjacent to Little Farm, Pluckley

Site Description:

This is a flat site adjoining Smarden Road to the west. The site includes two agricultural storage barns and the field boundaries consist of fencing and hedges. The southern tip of the site incorporates part of open space allocated under the saved LE11 policy.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site is not within or near to internationally / nationally designated site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site located 260m north east of LWS called pasture and orchard, Pluckley	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, this is an open site and could be developed without significant loss to trees or hedgerows	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No – within rural Ashford	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site has an open aspect onto Smarden Road which is currently characterised by large detached dwellings on one side, development in this location would erode this character which has been identified within the village	-1

		design statement.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Although the site has an open aspect along Smarden Road, it is relatively enclosed to the east and there are not far reaching views so a minor negative impact would result.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site not within or adjoining village conservation area	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Luckhurst House (Grade II Listed) adjoins the site to the west.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	This site is within Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Not at risk from Surface Water Flooding from the 1 in 30, or 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	The site is 3ha in size and would meet the threshold for affordable housing provision	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Proposing a mix of uses for housing and community facilities.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Approximately 566m from village post office / shop	0

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Charing GP surgery is 4.4km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	530m from village primary school	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	The site adjoins public open space	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Site located 650m from public open space which includes a play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs through site crossing in a north east to south west direction	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss of open space	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to land uses which would have a detrimental impact on health and amenity	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Weald Central is not within most deprived 20% nationally.	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site has direct access onto Smarden Road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Pluckley Railway Station is 1.4km away, the nearest bus stop is opposite the Black Horse, Smarden Road 566m away but there is no hourly bus service.	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield site	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No, site submission refers to two agricultural buildings within the site needing to be rebuilt for residential development.	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Being promoted for housing and community uses	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not applicable	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	Although the site submission provide the option for a primary school and parking there is already a primary school within the village.	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Pluckley is a dispersed village however the local shop provides an indicator of the village centre which is 566m away	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Although this site scores relatively well in terms of access to local facilities and services being approximately 500m away from 'The Street', it is located along Smarden Road which is dominated by large			**Total:** 2

detached dwellings along the southern side and provides an open aspect in this part of the village. Therefore development in this location would erode the green gap in this part of the village and change the character of the village as well as having a minor negative visual impact. It is therefore considered unsuitable for development.	

Site Ref: **WN4** **Date Survey Completed: 15/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land adjacent to Village Hall, Smarden**

Site Description: **This site is currently under arable cultivation. There are 2 storey detached dwellings on either side; the village hall is on the southern boundary of the site; to the north is road frontage with dwellings in Glebe Close opposite. To the south of the site is open countryside and farmland.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are trees along the boundaries but these could be retained	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would extend the built form of the village into the countryside beyond. However, there is high density development opposite the site which development here could mirror.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and	Development of this site would be very	1

	cumulative visual impact from the development?	visible in the wider landscape and from around the village. However, as there is housing on the opposite side of the road and to the south west, it would not be any more visually intrusive on the landscape than this.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site joins an area of potential on its western boundary. It does not join or within the conservation area	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	There are some listed buildings within 100m of boundary.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Smarden contains many historic buildings within its centre. This site is located on the edge of the conservation area and therefore will have minor negative impact on the heritage assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 3.5ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			

6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The PO and general store is approximately 400m away	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Headcorn	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Designated open space within 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	To the south is a sewage works will may effect the residents of new properties	-1
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – current farm access and access to village hall	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No designated national or local routes within 1.6km	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop. Route 123 between Biddenden and Ashford runs every 2 hours. There are railway stations in nearby villages of Headcorn and Pluckley	0

Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes - Headcorn	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Southern section in river terrace deposits 2	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	A large part of the site along the road (northern area) is ungraded, the remainder is Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	yes	1

13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is located close to the services within the village and does not have any environmental constraints. However, a large development in this location would impact on the landscape and views of the countryside in this area and therefore only a small part of the site would be suitable for development. In addition, a smaller site area would ensure development would be in keeping with the cul-de-sac developments along the opposite side of the road. **The area immediately adjoining the village hall would need careful consideration as part of any development proposals, potentially by providing a buffer strip, as new residential development directly adjoining this community building, would be overbearing to its amenity.**			**Total:** **4**

Site Ref: **WN6** **Date Survey Completed: 15/09/2014**

Site Name: **Ware Field, Land at Copper Lodge Farm, Smarden**

Site Description:

This site is an open field used for farming. To the south of the site is sewage works and cemetery with a river beyond. To the North is Water Lane, with residential properties along the other side. These consist of mainly 2 storey semi detached houses in ribbon and cul de sac form. to the West are two residential properties/farms with associated land and buildings and open countryside and farmland. There is a transformer in NE corner of the site.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are trees along the boundaries but these could be retained	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would extend the built form of the village into the countryside beyond. However, there is high density development opposite the	-1

		site which development here could mirror.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of this site would be very visible in the wider landscape and from around the village. However, as there is housing on the opposite side of the road, it would not be any more visually intrusive on the landscape than this.	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site joins an area of potential on its southern boundary. It also adjoins the conservation area	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	There are some listed buildings in close proximity, namely THE CLOTH HALL to the east.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Smarden contains many historic buildings within its centre. This site is located on the edge of the conservation area and therefore will have minor negative impact on the heritage assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Southern edge of the site within FZ2 Between 10% and 50% coverage	-1
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in	Site is 2.5ha	1

	excess of 0.5 ha)		
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The PO and general store is 300m away	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Headcorn	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Designated open space within 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – current farm access	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No designated national or local routes within 1.6km	0

8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop. Route 123 between Biddenden and Ashford runs every 2 hours. There are railway stations in nearby villages of Headcorn and Pluckley	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes - Headcorn	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes – River terrace deposit 2	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district	Smarden is a small village with some	0

	centre?	services and shops. The nearest district centre would be Biddenden.	
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site is located close to the services within the village and it does not have any environmental constraints. However, it does score less than other reasonable alternatives through this Sustainability Appraisal exercise, making it unsuitable for allocation in the Local Plan.** **Development in this location would change the landscape and views of the countryside in this area, and there is a listed building and conservation area adjoining, all of which would be impacted on if the development was to come forward. In addition, there are concerns that a suitable site access could be achieved from a highway safety point of view.**			**Total:** **1**

Site Ref: **SS7** **Date Survey Completed: 27/10/2014**

Site Name: **Land at Church Road, Smeeth**

Site Description:

This site lies on Church Road, one of the main entrances to the village. It is currently a flat, overgrown field unused for agriculture or grazing and is separated from site SS54 by a small wooden fence. The field is a gap in the built development and to the east is a large detached property 'Peelers' and to the west is two residential properties and Walnut Tree Farm, which are visible from the site in most areas with the exception of a few mature trees along the boundary. The site is well screened from the road at present by a large hedgerow. There is one farm access gap in this frontage, and a PROW along the western boundary that is not well used. The site is opposite the recreation field, play area and scout hut. The area is very rural in character and the road narrows to a single lane at points close to this site with high hedges along the road either side.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially. There are mature trees and hedges on the site.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0

2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The area is very rural in character with limited housing in the area. The housing here is linear, mainly detached 2 storey housing. Development of this site would not be in keeping with this rural landscape and linear low density housing.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site lies on one of the main roads through the village and therefore any development here will be viewed from here and the recreation ground opposite. At present the area has a very rural character of narrow roads, high hedges and few houses.	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Small area of archaeological importance 150m to the east	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			

5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 0.8ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – 700m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Sellindge	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	The sports field is located at the opposite the site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	100m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – PROW along site and footpath	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes - farm access	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing	No	0

	designated cycleway?		
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	150m from Bus stops. 10A runs every 35 minutes to Town between 9.30 and 3.30	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Sellindge Surgery and Willesborough Health Centre accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	ungraded	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			

13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes. The site is in Smeeth and Brabourne Lees which offer a variety of services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is on the edge of the confines of a settlement that offers a variety of services and therefore is sustainable. It is close to the school and the recreation and play facilities. There is limited development in this area of the village, and all is linear and low density. However, this site is considered suitable for allocation as it helps to provide a smoother transition between the main village and the sporadic linear development along Church Road, filling in an open gap in the frontage. This site would be less visually intrusive than suitable alternatives.			**Total:** **4**

Site Ref: SS8 **Date Survey Completed: 27/10/2014**

Site Name: Old Builders Yard, Smeeth

Site Description:

This site is located along Plain Road in the village of Smeeth. The road at this point is quite narrow. The site is a former builder's yard and sand quarry and contains a derelict building in disrepair and an area of hard standing at the front of the site, and to the rear of the building. There are mature trees around the rear of the site to the south which prevent views outwards and the remainder of the site is overgrown land and woodland. The site is situated between two detached residential properties and then wraps around the rear of two additional properties to the west (this area is woodland). There is a small cul-de-sac opposite the site of 5 large detached properties.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially. There are mature trees on the western part of the site, which forms part of a larger woodland area.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site lies on one of the main roads through the village, although it is quite narrow. The current built form in this area is a ribbon development of 2 storey detached houses. However, there are some cul-de-sacs here and on the opposite side of the road to the site so development would not be out of character	0

		for the village.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site is well screened by the surrounding woodland and therefore the overall visual impact would be minimal	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	150m from a potential area of Archaeology at Bog Farm	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No – Bog Farm Historic park and Garden is 150m south but divided from site by woodlands	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 0.5ha, however, not all of the area is suitable for development as it is woodland and therefore a smaller development would not meet the threshold	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – 500m	0

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Sellindge	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 800m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 750m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	750m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No footpath on this side of Road	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Potentially – site was a quarry and contamination issues need to be assessed.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	150m from Bus stop at Ramstone Close. 10A runs every 35 minutes to Town between 9.30 and 3.30	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Sellindge Surgery and Willesborough Health Centre accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Yes - Partly	1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	ungraded	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes. The site is on the outskirts of Smeeth and Brabourne Lees which offer a variety of services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site is partly brownfield and the frontage of the site is within the confines of the Smeeth settlement. However, the site is an unusual shape, and is narrow at the road frontage and widens to the**			**Total:** **3**

south and then changes to woodland in the west. Development to the rear of the site would therefore be back land development of the properties along Plain Road. The character of these surrounding properties on Plain Road is very low density and linear and therefore this site is unsuitable for an allocation in the Local Plan, as a development of the size needed for allocation in the Local Plan would be out of character with this part of Smeeth . The access and highway capacity also need to be assessed in detail, as well as any land contamination issues.	

Site Ref: **SS29** **Date Survey Completed: 27/10/2014**

Site Name: **Land rear of Fortescue Place, Smeeth**

Site Description:

This site is located to the south of the village behind the linear housing along Plain Rd. The western edge of the site, adjacent to Calland Cul-de-sac has already been developed for Local needs Housing. The remainder of the site is on varying ground levels. Fortescue Place ands the southern edge of the site is much higher land than the rest and slopes down to create a 'dip' in the landscape where the site joins the back gardens of housing in Plain Rd. On the eastern boundary and to the east of the site is a woodland area, and a pumping station with access road is along this boundary. There are some mature trees and hedgerows scattered around the boundaries of the site and the rest of the site is overgrown grass and scrub.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially. There are trees and hedgerows on the site, however none are protected	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the	This site is on the edge of the built confines and is currently part of the	-1

	landscape/ townscape?	countryside, Development of this site would impact on the rural character and setting of this location, but as part of the site has already been developed, it could also fit in well with existing housing.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site has long views of the countryside to the south. Due to the varying site levels, development here would need to be designed to avoid overlooking into existing properties.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in	Site is 2.5ha, although not all is suitable for development	1

	excess of 0.5 ha)		
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – 700m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Sellindge	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 800m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – PROW along site and footpath on main road	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes - farm access off Fortescue Place, potential access points from Plain Rd, one garage access and possible demolition of house to create access.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing	No	0

	designated cycleway?		
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	150m from Bus stops. 10A runs every 35 minutes to Town between 9.30 and 3.30	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Sellindge Surgery and Willesborough Health Centre accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			

13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes. The site is in Smeeth (adj Brabourne Lees) which both offer a variety of services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Overall the site scores well as it is on the edge of the built settlement that offers a variety of services and therefore is sustainable. However, the access points to the site are a concern, as are the land levels, which make the site sit lower in a 'bowl like' topography . Therefore, this site could have a considerable impact on the landscape, being highly visible when viewed from the existing development and from the wider Landscape. Development would also have an overbearing impact on the existing residents of Plain Road.			**Total:** **3**

Site Ref: **SS54** **Date Survey Completed: 27/10/2014**

Site Name: **Land at Walnut Tree Farm, Church Road, Smeeth**

Site Description:

This site lies off Church Road, one of the main entrances to the village behind the site SS7. It is currently a flat field, used for grazing and is separated from site SS7 by a small wooden fence. The site is part of Walnut Tree Farm and there is no other residential development on its boundaries. The site is opposite the recreation field, play area and scout hut. The area is very rural in character and the road narrows to a single lane at points close to this site with high hedges along the road either side.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially. There are mature trees on the site.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	There is no residential development around this site with the exception of the farm. The site is backland and forms part of the open countryside.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of this site would not be visible from the road as it is very set back. However, it would be very visible within the wider landscape as it does not join any residential areas and would be out of keeping with the surroundings	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Small area of archaeological importance 150m to the east	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests the area has no risk of groundwater flood emergence.	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 0.8ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss	No	0

	or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?		
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – 700m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Sellindge	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – less than 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	The sports field is located at the opposite the site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	100m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – PROW along site and footpath	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes - farm access	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	150m from Bus stops. 10A runs every 35 minutes to Town between 9.30 and 3.30	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			

9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Sellindge Surgery and Willesborough Health Centre accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	ungraded	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes. The site is in Smeeth and Brabourne Lees which offer a variety of services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of	No	0

	shops/services?		
Conclusion: This site is on the edge of the confines of a settlement that offers a variety of services and therefore is sustainable. It is close to the school and the recreation and play facilities. There is limited development in this area of the village, and all is linear and low density. However, on its own this site is considered unsuitable for allocation as it would be deemed development in the Countryside and would be visually intrusive when viewed from the south. However, if a small area of this site was developed in association with SS7. It would help to provide a smoother transition between the main village and the sporadic linear development along Church Road, filling in an open gap in the frontage. This site would be less visually intrusive than suitable alternatives.			**Total:** **4**

Site Ref: **RTW2** **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: **Pickhill Business Centre**

Site Description:

Sheep pasture at west of site.

Two rows of conifer separating sheep from orchard with parallel fruit trees to rear (east) of site.

Adjacent to existing (8-unit) business park (late 1980s).

Level land

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Yes	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The area is still defined by open horticultural uses	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	No – the existing business park acts as the visual anchor	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	--	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% 1 in 30 and 1 in 100	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	**N/A**	**0**
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Gain	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	No	-2

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No	-2
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – open countryside	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No -1.2km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW immediately to East of site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Neutral	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – through existing business centre access.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes – 1.5km	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting	Yes	1

	new patients?		
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No - horticultural	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes – sandstone sandgate formation	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Yes – greater business/employment space.	2
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Yes	1
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Intensification of development for employment on this site is logical, but would have to be managed sensitively given the existing surrounding conditions and constraints on the site and beyond. The site is very far from services of Tenterden Town Centre and, with			**Total:**

public transport infrequent, would be extremely reliant on the private car. Current development is incongruous with the surrounding landscape, but rural employment could be diversified through development. The site is suitable for further employment development related to the existing development.	**-2**

Site Ref: **SM1** **Date Survey Completed: 24/9/2014**

Site Name: **Beechwood Farm**

Site Description:

The site is grassland that is level to the north and which dips significantly under the large tree in the SE part of the site. Currently used as grazing land that is bounded by hedgerow to east and young trees to west. There are telegraph wires at NE of site.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Yes – significant tree at SE of site, and bounded to W by TPOs	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The density of development in this location would be out of keeping with larger houses on single plots in this location.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the	Yes – loss of significant mature tree	-1

	development?		
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	--	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	No	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No – 12 dwellings in 0.5ha	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	450m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – 2km	-2

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – 300m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	No, but informal green areas in vicinity	-2
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No – 2.5km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Access to pedestrian footway, but could be improved as some stretches grassed over	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes – 540m	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus stop 180m from site	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1

Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-2
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	--	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	--	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes – St Michael's 350m	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The site is relatively close to local services and the site is a prominent gap in the frontage to the A28 that is part of the overall character of this rural approach to St Michaels. Development of the site would also necessitate the removal of a substantial character tree, and may well impact on neighbouring TPOs. Development would also have to deal with varying site			**Total: -3**

levels.	

Site Ref: TS7 **Date Survey Completed: 7/10/2014**

Site Name: Land Adj to Belcot and Hopes Grove

Site Description: **The site slopes from the south to the east and is flanked by a narrow belt of woodland and the stream of Tilden Gill. There are mature hedgerows to the south west and an access track to the west/south west.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Yes. Ashenden Gill Local Wildlife Site at northern boundary	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential to improve diversity amid current monoculture use	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	AONB to immediate south	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	As yet, no details of proposal submitted, but development is not currently a landscape characteristic of the immediate vicinity	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Yes – development would cause major negative impact on visuals	-1

Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	--	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% for both	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	**Yes**	**1**
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – Tenterden town centre 500m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes – Tenterden town centre 600m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a	Yes – Tenterden town centre 400m	1

	Primary school?		
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – Tenterden recreation ground	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – Tenterden recreation ground	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – PROW across SE flank of site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus at High Street and Smallhythe Road, but 600m	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	Yes – access road will need to be much improved from Smallhythe Road	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Half of site, south-west; on sandstone sandgate formation	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Unknown	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	-	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	-	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Just over 400m	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The current use of this field is for agriculture and development would change the character of the land significantly and would extend development beyond the built up area of Tenterden into its agricultural periphery. Despite the close proximity to the town centre and services, surrounding road infrastructure improvement would be necessary to enable site access. The site is not considered suitable for development.			**Total: 4**

Site Ref: TSTRW1 **Date Survey Completed: 7/10/2014**

Site Name: Phase B TENT1

Site Description: The site is currently a flat agricultural field. The site is bounded by hedgerows which include a few trees, some of which are quite large and established. The B2082 runs along the SW edge of the site. The site is currently separate from the Town, although it adjoins the site allocated as TENT1 (phase a) in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD.			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No international or national sites nearby.	**0**
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Ashenden Gill is a LWS.	**-1**
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Site has the potential to lose elements of the habitat network, such as hedgerows and trees. These all contribute to supporting local biodiversity networks.	**-1**
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Yes, site is large enough to have the potential to design and created habitat networks as part of any proposals. Such networks could offer an enhancement to the biodiversity in the area.	**1**
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	**0**
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Site adjoins the AONB.	**-1**
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site lies outside of any designated landscape area, although parts of the site are adjacent to the AONB. The wider landscape is currently punctuated by large buildings such as Tesco's and the leisure centre. New development would be seen against the background of the wider town. Development of this site in isolation of TENT1 phase a, would be out of keeping with the existing character of the town and the quality	**-1**

		of the landscape and townscape. This would lead to clearly isolated development.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of this site would lead to a visual impact, as set out above. However, there are also opportunities through design to enhance a number of key features of the town, such as views of the church.	**-1**
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	**0**
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	**0**
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	**0**
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	**0**
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10%	**-1**
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No	**0**
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	**1**
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes, the site is large enough to accommodate affordable housing.	**1**
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	**0**
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local	Yes – Tenterden Town Centre	**1**

	Centre/ Shop?		
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes – Ivy Court Surgery	**1**
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes	**1**
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes	**1**
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – Tenterden Recreation Centre	**1**
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes –PROW runs through site	**1**
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No, has the possibility to gain local open space provision in line with meeting the needs of the development.	**1**
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	**0**
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	Decile 8	**0**
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	**1**
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	**1**
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus stops at Tenterden Town Centre	**1**
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	**0**
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	**1**

Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	**-1**
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	**0**
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	**0**
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	**0**
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	**0**
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	**0**
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	**0**
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	**0**
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	**0**
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	**1**
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	**0**
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	**0**
Conclusion: The site scores well on accessibility and access to services criteria, although scores fairly poorly in relation to its integration with the existing built form of the Town. However this is due to its assessment as a standalone site. This position needs to be placed in its correct context. This site is allocated in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD (2010) as part of a wider site allocation that included the TENT1 phase a land, located to the north. It was considered that in combination, these sites provided a good opportunity to deliver a sustainable extension to Tenterden without a significant impact on the quality of the surrounding landscape or the historic integrity of the Town. When future development of this site is considered within this context - and TENT1a is taken account of – this view remains valid. In			**Total: 0**

this context, this site is suitable for development, provided TENT1a comes forward. **However, as a standalone site, development here would be considered unacceptable in that it would effectively lead to isolated development in the countryside which would not be well related to the existing built form of the Town.**	

Site Ref: TSTRW2 **Date Survey Completed: 7/10/2014**

Site Name: Hopes Grove South

Site Description:

Current use as a commercial nursery.

Parcelled fields along West, North, East boundaries; hardstanding and business offices in centre of site.

Polytunnels and dwelling house at South.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Yes – NE boundary abuts Ashenden Gill wildlife site	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No. AONB to immediate South	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development would be an intensification of present uses	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	There will be visual impact. The site is relatively flat, and at present surrounded by countryside	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation	Conservation area across Smallhythe Road to	0

	Area?*	West of site	
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will maintain similar effect on Conservation Area as current use	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% for both	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	**Yes**	**1**
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes – Tenterden town centre and supermarkets within 10min walk – 450m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes – Tenterden town centre – 850m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes – Tenterden town centre 400m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes – Tenterden recreation ground	1

7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – Tenterden recreation ground	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – three PROWs cross the western part of the site, interconnecting with each other	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus at Tenterden Town Centre at High Street and Smallhythe Road – 800m	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Yes – use for market gardening and some permanent structures	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	On sandstone sandgate formation	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0

11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Yes	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes – Tenterden town centre	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The site is in current use as a rural employment location, and allocation for intensification of such activities would be appropriate. At present the site is removed from the existing built up part of Tenterden and development here would be a significant intrusion into open countryside – the site is some distance from the existing local services in the centre of Tenterden. The development of the adjoining site at TENT 1B will change the context of the site. Access could be achieved from Smallhythe Road. The site is not considered to be suitable for development.			**Total: 5**

Site Ref: **WS17** **Date Survey Completed: 18/09/2014**

Site Name: **Field to the North of Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst**

Site Description:

This site is a green gap in the built form which fronts onto the Woodchurch Road that runs through the village. The site is flat, grassed field at present but has been used for animal grazing in the past as there are unused feed trays on the field. There is an existing farm gated access point in the centre of the southern boundary on the road. There are 4 large oak trees along this boundary in addition to other mature trees and high hedges. On the eastern edge the site joins the rear gardens of a cul-de-sac of 2 storey detached houses, 'Park Farm Close'. On the western boundary there are 4 properties separating the site from a local needs housing development 'Farley Close'. However, this boundary has little screening and the property adjacent has windows overlooking the site. Opposite the site on the other side of Woodchurch Road there is a row of terraced two storey houses 'Moreton Terrace', which are set back from the road and have hedges to screen them, and a bungalow which is in disrepair and not occupied at present. To the north is open countryside, which can be viewed from the site, and from the road at this point. There are mature tree and hedge boundaries around the eastern and North eastern boundary.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potentially. There are mature trees along the boundary with the road, where access would need to be created. These may need to be removed for visibility splays but none are TPO	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0

Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site lies on the main road through the village. The landscape is very rural in this location and the site is one of the few areas of green space and views into the countryside left in this part of the village. However, there are cul-de-sacs set back this far on either side of the site so development would not be out of character for the village.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site is currently a view into the open countryside from the village and acts a green buffer, creating a gap between the built areas of the village. Development would remove this view corridor of the landscape.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is 320m from an Archaeological site to the north which is a Roman Road. It is over 600m from the CA.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0

	systems?		
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 0.9ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.5km	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a bus from Shadoxhurst	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	There are no areas of green open space that are useable for recreation in this location. The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 750m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	750m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No footpath on this side of Woodchurch Road	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when	No	0

	measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?		
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. Not a designated cycle lane, but the High Weald Route 18 goes through the village as well as regional route 11.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	150m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less	No	0

	business/ employment space?		
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No. Shadoxhurst is a small village without many services. Nearest District centre would be Park Farm/Kingsnorth.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site scores poorly on the access to services as Shadoxhurst is a small village, spread out into 3 different areas, and relies on nearby villages and the Town Centre for services. **Overall this site scores well in the environmental, heritage and biodiversity sections as there are no constraints on the site. However, the impact on the landscape and the long views of the countryside from this site make this site unsuitable for allocation. The site is a long established green gap in the built form and contributes to the rural character and setting of the village.**			**Total:** **0**

Site Ref: **WS19** **Date Survey Completed: 18/09/2014**

Site Name: **Field to the North of Farley Close, Shadoxhurst**

Site Description:

This site is a field of unmanaged, overgrown grassland to the north of a cul-de-sac of Farley Close. There is a farm gate access into the site from this close. There are some mature trees and hedgerows along the boundaries of the site and with the exception of the southern boundary of residential properties; the remainder of the site is surrounded by open countryside and pockets of woodland.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would extend the built form of the village into the countryside beyond.	0

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is well screened from the wider landscape by the existing properties in the close and the tree boundary around the site and therefore the visual impact would not be great.	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is 320m from an Archaeological site to the north which is a Roman Road. It is over 600m from the CA.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 0.9ha	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.6km	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a bus from Shadoxhurst	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	There are no areas of green open space that are useable for recreation in this location. The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 750m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	750m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. Not a designated cycle lane, but the High Weald Route 18 goes through the village as well as regional route 11.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1

Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No. Shadoxhurst is a small village without many services. Nearest District centre would be Park Farm/Kingsnorth.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the		n/a

	regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is not suitable for development because it spreads beyond the built confines to the north of the village and developing in this location, although slightly screened by trees, would be visually intrusive when viewed from this direction. The only access to this site would be to access the site through Farley Close, which is a local needs schem, this would extend this cul-de-sac and change the character of this part of the village and increase small piece meal development.			**Total:** **2**

Site Ref: **WS21** **Date Survey Completed: 18/09/2014**

Site Name: **Land rear of Kings Head Public House, Shadoxhurst**

Site Description:

The site wraps behind the southern boundary of the Kings head Public House in Shadoxhurst. It is a flat site that is currently unmanaged and overgrown grassland with trees and hedges around most boundaries. It is separated from the PH by a car park and a single track private access road to a new 4 house development in Maytree Place, which is within the site boundary on the western edge. The site spreads in a southern direction from the PH and joins housing in Nairne Close, although it is bounded by hedges and trees so is well screened. Open countryside is to the South East.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is an open area at present which does contribute to the rural character and setting of this part of the village. Development on this site would change	-1

		the character of the area and the existing built form and landscape.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is well screened from the wider landscape by the existing properties in the close and the tree boundary around the site and therefore the visual impact on the wider landscape would be minimal. The main impact would be the views of the landscape from properties opposite the site, and from the road and PH.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is 40m from an Archaeological site to the north which is a Roman Road. It is over 500m from the CA.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in	Site is 1.2ha	1

	excess of 0.5 ha)		
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Gain. The proposal includes a gain in onsite community facilities. Potential for community hall and GP rooms.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.6km, However the site is proposing a Shop as part of development which would benefit the village as a whole for access to services	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a bus from Shadoxhurst	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	There are no areas of green open space that are useable for recreation in this location. The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 800m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	200m small area in Nairne Close (Proposal includes plans for play area)	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			

8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. Not a designated cycle lane, but the High Weald Route 18 goes through the village as well as regional route 11.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No (with the exception of the already developed area)	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0

12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No. Shadoxhurst is a small village without many services. Nearest District centre would be Park Farm/Kingsnorth.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Overall this site scores well in the environmental, heritage and biodiversity sections as there are no constraints on the site. The site is also located in the centre of the village, ensuring that the development does not extend into the countryside beyond. However, this site scores poorly on the access to services as Shadoxhurst is a relatively dispersed small village, and relies on nearby villages and the Town Centre for services. This proposal, if taken forward is proposing a gain in community facilities and services as part of the development, which would benefit the wider community. However, these would not necessarily need to be delivered to make the site a suitable allocation in the Local Plan as it is suitable for housing in its own right.			**Total:** **3**

Site Ref: **WS25** **Date Survey Completed:24/10/2014**

Site Name: **Land in Lower Road – North of the Granary**

Site Description:

This site is agricultural land, bounded by native hedgerows and trees. There is no built development to the north and east and the site currently forms an area of agricultural land in the centre of the village, which adjoins the village green. The site is adjacent to some built development on its western edge - Kirkwood Avenue which starts in Front Road. It is a cul-de-sac development of detached bungalow housing. The remainder of Lower Road is built up with linear housing, and this forms part of the gap in the built form.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potential for loss of hedgerow/ tree. No TPOs or protected hedgerows.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site comprises green fields in the heart of the village.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of this site would be visible in the landscape and from Lower Road where it is currently a gap in the built frontage. *UPDATE 2015 – The site to the east (WS29) has been granted permission for development and once built will change the visual landscape in this location.*	-2
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Wholly within conservation area; across the road from known area of archaeological importance to East	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Not 1 in 30; Between 10% and 50% coverage for 1 in 100	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			

6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, circa 300m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes, circa 300m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, circa 150m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, nearby to village green	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, circa 200m – play area and football pitch	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, pedestrian pavement	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential gain of formal space	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – Kirkwood Avenue and Lower Road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes, adjoining	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus route	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			

9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of	No	0

	shops/services?		
Conclusion: This site is considered suitable for development because it is centrally located in the village and scores highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. Once planning permission was granted on WS29, the context of this site changed, it now provides an opportunity to infill the gap in the frontage on Lower Road and link the development to the Kirkwood Avenue development. Development of this site will also provide the opportunity to provide additional public footpaths to help integrate the village green area, with the rest of the village.			**Total:** **8**

Site Ref: **WS26 and WS29** **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: **Lower Road sites**

Site Description: **Horse grazing land with mature tree near eastern boundary next to small pond. Land rises to West. Bounded completely by native hedgerows and trees. There is no immediate adjoining built development, but is located in the centre of a village, and joins the village green and an access route to the green on the eastern boundary.**			
No.	**Site Assessment/ Screening Question**	**Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions**	**SCORE**
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potential for loss of 1 mature tree. No TPOs or protected hedgerows.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No - current site comprises large green fields in the heart of the village amid an ensemble yet to be built up.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the	Development of this site would be very visible in the landscape, and parts of it	-2

	development?	currently form an informal part of the village green.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Wholly within conservation area; across the road from known area of archaeological importance to East	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Not 1 in 30; Between 10% and 50% coverage for 1 in 100	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, circa 300m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP	Yes, circa 300m	1

	Surgery?		
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, circa 150m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, adjacent to common	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, circa 200m – play area and football pitch	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, pedestrian pavement	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential gain of formal space	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes, adjoining	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus route	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1

Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No, but could achieve increased densities	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	No	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site is sustainably located at the heart of the village and therefore scores well in the Sustainability Appraisal. However, it is important that any proposals for development are not overbearing as this site is located in the centre of the Conservation Area and adjoining an area of informal Open Space, which provides character and an important asset to the community. Therefore, this site needs to be compared to the suitable alternative of Site WS25			**Total: 8**

as only the provision of one of these sites would be suitable for development. The WS29 part of this site now has planning permission and the site is underconstruction, the part of the site nearest to the tennis court, should be retained as green openspace to ensure that development does not become too overbearing in this location.	

Site Ref: WS28 **Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2014**

Site Name: Land between 82 and 120 Front Road

Site Description:

The site is located on the western side of Front Road, approximately halfway between the village green to the north and the Stonebridge Inn Junction to the south and is within walking distance of the many services and community facilities available at the centre of the village. The site is currently a field in agricultural use, located between the linear form of built development along this road which comprises of different dwelling types, styles and ages but has a very rural 'informal' nature. The site is raised above road level, has a hedged road frontage and open character Visibility of the site from Front Road is currently limited at most times of the year due to the high hedge. This site was allocated for residential development within the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD (as policy WOOD1) with an indicative capacity of 10 dwellings.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the	No	0

	green corridor?		
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes – continues built form along front road, infilling gap.	1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Yes – the development here will change the setting of the road in this location – currently an open gap.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Conservation area – upper ¾ of site	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Grade II listed farmhouse in field to NW beyond boundary	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	--	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	No	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No – low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable	Yes, the site is above the size threshold	1

	housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)		
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, circa 50m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes, circa 200m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, circa 50m	1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, under 300m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, under 300m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, directly across road from site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1

8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – bus route	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes	1

13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This is an existing allocation in the Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD, with close access to services and good transport links. Development here on the frontage can potentially continue the built form fronting Front Road in a logical manner. Consideration should be paid to the impact of development on neighbouring listed buildings and the Woodchurch Conservation Area, and impact on the countryside and the built form of the village. Further work needs to be undertaken to assess the number of units suitable for this site, as the previous allocation for 10 units was deemed unsuitable at the planning application stage.			**Total:** **11**

* In accordance with the importance and weight encompassed in the NPPF, SA scoring could be overruled on sites that fall in the AONB, are in areas of highest flood risk, provide a substantial harm or total loss of a heritage asset or are found in a mineral safeguarding area.