Ashford Borough Council

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (SA/SEA) ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

ADDENDUM

JULY 2017

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This report provides an Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Environmental Report May 2016, which was published and consulted upon (under Regulation 13 of the 2004 Regulations[1]), alongside the Regulation 19 Version Ashford Local Plan 2030. Consultation took place over an eight week period between June and August 2016.

1.1.2 This Addendum provides an update where this is considered necessary to address **the Main Changes to the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan 2030** which proposed as a result of new evidence and in response to issues raised in representations received during the 2016 consultation.

1.1.3 This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the original SA Report May 2016.

1.1.4 This SA Addendum Report is subject to a period of public consultation alongside the Main Changes to the Local Plan 2030 between 7 July to 31 August 2017. Comments and representations can be submitted using the comments form, which should be sent by email to planningpolicy@ashford.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Ashford Borough Council, Civic Centre, Tannery Lane, Ashford, Kent TN23 1PL.

1.2 National Policy and Guidance

1.2.1 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides guidance on whether the SA report should be updated if the draft Local Plan is modified following responses to consultations.

1.2.2 The NPPG provides the following relevant guidance in this respect:

- 'the sustainability appraisal report will not necessarily have to be amended;

[1] The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004). These regulations implement European Directive 2001/42/EC, the SEA Directive.

- modifications should only be considered 'where appropriate and proportionate to the level of change being made to the Local Plan';
- 'a change is likely to be significant if it substantially alters the Plan and/or is likely to give rise to significant effects';
- 'further assessment may be required if the changes have not previously been assessed and are likely to give rise to significant effects'

1.2.3 The NPPG also advises that further consultation on the SA may be required in such circumstances; however this should only be undertaken where necessary.[2]

1.3 Summary of changes proposed to Draft Ashford Local Plan 2030 and requiring SA re-assessment

1.3.1 The following tables identify and summarise where changes are proposed to the Plan, the significance of the change and whether the change has been previously assessed in the SA.

Strategic Policies

Issue/ Policy	Summary of proposed change	Significance	Previously assessed	Conclusion
Vision	Minor changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
Strategic Objectives	Minor changes to wording and additional objective regarding climate change	Not significant	Yes	No update required
Housing Delivery – amount (Policy SP2)	Overall housing requirement increase from 14,680 to 16,120 (2011-2030) Net housing requirement (2017-2030) of 12,950	Potentially significant	Yes – alternative 2.2 and 2.4	Explanation of revised alternatives and reasons for preferred alternatives
Housing Delivery – spatial strategy (Policy SP2)	Increase in housing provision at Ashford from 10,125 to 10,411 Increase in housing provision in the rural	Not significant	Yes – alternative 4.2	No update required – overall strategic distribution remains broadly

[2] NPPG Paragraph 021 Reference ID: 11-021-20140306 Revised date: 06 03 2014

	areas / villages from 1,030 to 2,069 Change in proportionate split of Ashford: Rest of Borough from 90:10 to 83:17			the same and already assessed
	Distribution of housing around Ashford – additional allocations to south and north-west of town	Potentially significant	In part – alternative 5.3	Update required to assessment of distribution around Ashford and reasons for preferred alternative
Economic Development (Policy SP3)	Minor changes to wording	Not significant	Yes – alternative 1.2	No update required
Retail and Leisure Needs (SP4)	Minor changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
Ashford Town Centre (SP5)	Minor changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
Promoting High Quality Design (SP6)	Minor changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
Separation of Settlements (SP7)	New Policy	Not significant	No	SA required as new policy

Table 1 summary of proposed changes to the strategic policies of the Local Plan

1.3.2 Table 1 identifies two areas where the proposed changes to the Strategic Policies of the Plan may have a potentially significant effect. These are addressed in Section 3 of this Addendum. It should be noted however, that both of these have already been assessed within the reasonable alternatives of the original SA assessment, as set out in the SA Report 2016.

1.3.3 In addition, the Plan has been amended to include one new Strategic Policy (SP7 Separation of Settlements). This is also assessed in Section 3 of this Addendum.

Site Allocations

1.3.4 In order to accommodate the increase in the housing requirement for the borough since the Regulation 19 Version Local Plan June 2016, additional

sites are required. Section 4 of this Addendum clarifies which new sites have been selected to meet this revised housing requirement. Some of these will have been previously assessed, either in whole or in part, while others are new sites which came forward during the Regulation 19 consultation. One site (S39) is proposed to be deleted.

Issue/ Policy	Summary of proposed change	Significance	Previously assessed	Conclusion
S1	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
S2	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S3	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S4	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S5	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S6	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S7	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S8	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S9	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S10	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S11	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S11a	New Policy[3]	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S12	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S13	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S14	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S15	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S16	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S17	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
S18	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required

[3] This Policy is a subdivision of allocation S11 (previously allocated for a mix of residential and commercial) to retain the railway sidings in response to a request from Network Rail. No new issues arise from this which are likely to give rise to significant effects.

S19	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S20	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S21	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S22	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
S23	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S24	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S25	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S26	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S27	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S28	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S29	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
S30	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S31	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S32	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S33	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S34	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S35	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S36	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S37	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S38	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S39	Policy deleted	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S40	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S41	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S42	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S43	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
S44	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
S45	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy

S46	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S47	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S48	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S49	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S50	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S51	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S52	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S53	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S54	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S55	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S56	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S57	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S58	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S59	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S60	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S61	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
S62	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy

Table 2 summary of proposed changes to the site policies of the Local Plan

1.3.5 Factual updates to Sustainability Appraisals of previously assessed sites are set out in Appendix 1 of this Addendum. Sustainability Appraisals of new sites not previously considered are set out in Appendix 2.

1.3.6 New sites which were submitted during the Regulation 19 Consultation in 2016 but which were ruled out at the SHELAA stage and therefore which did not progress to the SA stage are listed in Appendix 3. Otherwise Site Appraisals are as set out in the SA Report 2016.

Neighbourhood Plan areas

1.3.7 A number of sites have come forward which are located in Neighbourhood Planning Areas. In those Areas where the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted or where the Group have already started their own site analysis and processes for allocation within a Neighbourhood Plan, such sites were not considered for allocation. These sites are also therefore not considered as reasonable alternatives for the purposes of allocation in this Local Plan.

Topic Policies

Issue/ Policy	Summary of proposed change	Significance	Previously assessed	Conclusion
HOU1	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU2	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU3	Policy replaced with new wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU4	Policy replaced with new wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU5	Policy replaced with new wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU6	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU7	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
HOU8	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
HOU9	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU10	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
HOU11	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
HOU12	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU13	Policy deleted	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU14	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU15	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
HOU16	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU17	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
HOU18	New Policy	Potentially significant	No	SA required as new policy
EMP1	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP2	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
EMP3	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP4	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP5	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP6	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP7	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP8	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
EMP9	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
EMP10	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
EMP11	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA1	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
TRA2	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA3a	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA3b	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required

TRA4	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
TRA5	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA6	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA7	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
TRA8	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
TRA9	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV1	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV2	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV3a	Policy replaced with new wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV3b	Policy replaced with new wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV4	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV5	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV6	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV7	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV8	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV9	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV10	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV11	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV12	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
ENV13	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV14	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
ENV15	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
COM1	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
COM2	Changes to wording	Not significant	Yes	No update required
COM3	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
COM4	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
IMP1	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
IMP2	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
IMP3	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required
IMP4	No changes to wording	n/a	n/a	No update required

Table 3 summary of proposed changes to the topic policies of the Local Plan

1.3.8 In addition to the new strategic policy (SP7) covering the separation of settlements (para 1.3.4 above), a new policy promoting the provision of a range and mix of housing in new developments has been included in the Plan to address concerns raised in consultation responses (HOU18).

1.3.9 Other proposed changes to topic policies in the Plan see Policies HOU3 and HOU4 (which dealt with residential windfall developments in the Ashford Urban Area and in rural settlements) deleted and replaced with a single policy (HOU3) addressing windfall development within settlements. The wording of HOU5, which addresses residential windfall development in the countryside, has been replaced in its entirety. Policy ENV3 has been amended to create two new policies ENV3a and ENV3b. In the case of the changes to HOU3, HOU4, HOU5 and ENV3 the content has been previously assessed and therefore no new SA is considered necessary. Policy HOU18 has not

previously been assessed, and therefore forms part of this Addendum (Section 5).

1.3.10 One topic policy (Policy HOU13) is proposed to be deleted. This is addressed in Section 5.

1.3.11 Other minor revisions to the wording of topic policies are proposed in the Main Changes to the Regulation 19 version Local Plan but these are not considered significant enough to justify a review of the SA for these policies. There is therefore no need to re-assess any other topic policies.

Mitigation and Monitoring

1.3.12 Monitoring indicators will be finalised after consultation on the Main Changes to the Regulation 19 Local Plan and included in the submission version of the Plan. Those that relate to the SA Objectives will be included in an Addendum Report which will accompany the submission version of the Plan.

1.4 Contents of this Report

1.4.1 The remainder of this Addendum report is set out as follows:

- Addendum to Section 3 – Appraisal of strategic development proposals and reasonable alternatives
- Addendum to Section 4 – Appraisal of sites
- Addendum to Section 5 – Appraisal of topic policies, including strategic policies.

2. SCOPE AND CONTENT

2.1 No changes are proposed to the Scoping, Framework or Objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal Environmental Report May 2016.

2.2 The scoring system is retained, and is repeated here for ease of reference.

Table 4 – Key to scoring used in SA of plan policies

SCORE	DESCRIPTION	SYMBOL
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed policy contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed policy contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly	+
Neutral	The proposed policy does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed policy detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed policy detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective	--
No Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed policy and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible	/
Uncertain	The effect of the policy is uncertain and subject to implementation	?

3. ADDENDUM TO SECTION 3 - APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS AND REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

This section updates Section 3 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report 2016, to explain how the reasonable alternatives have changed and why the preferred alternatives have been selected for the revisions to the draft Local Plan 2030, for the following issues:

- The number of homes to be developed
- The strategic distribution of housing and employment at Ashford

3.1 The number of homes to be developed

The original assessment of alternatives identified the following four reasonable alternatives for the number of homes to be developed:

Alternative 2.1 – Meeting Objectively Assessed Need: 13,799 dwellings (2011-30)

Alternative 2.2 – Meeting Objectively Assessed Need with some additional housing to help accommodate migration from London: 13,799 dwellings plus additional 55 dwellings per annum from 2017

Alternative 2.3 – Meeting Objectively Assessed Need with uplift to achieve planned job growth: 13,965 dwellings

Alternative 2.4 – Meeting the housing need of the Enhanced Performance/Productivity Employment Scenario: 15,900 dwellings (2011-2030)

These options were based upon the evidence of housing and employment needs set out in the SHMA 2015[4] and SEOR 2012[5]. Following the release of the 2014-based Sub National Population Projections and Household Projections in 2016, it has been necessary to update the SHMA 2015, to ensure that the evidence regarding the objectively assessed need (OAN) for the Borough is based upon the most up to date projections.

The revised housing target of 16,120 dwellings (2011-30) is based upon evidence from the SHMA Update 2017 as set out in the Table 5 below:

Table 5 – Local Plan Housing Requirement

[4] Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015
[5] Strategic Employment Options Report 2012

	Households	5% uplift	Total	Grand Total
2011 - 17[6]	786	39	825 (x6)	4,950
2017 – 30[7]	820	39*	859 (x13)	11,167
				16,117

* *uplift relates to OAN number only*

The revised housing requirement closely matches the level of housing development already assessed under Alternative 2.4 in the SA and therefore a further appraisal is not required.

Reason for selection of preferred alternative

The original SA Report at paras 3.6.20 to 3.6.31 assesses the impact of the alternatives and explains the reason for selecting the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative that forms the basis of the increased housing target contained within the proposed changes to the draft Local Plan is shown to have stronger negative effects upon a number of the SA objectives in relation to the environment, including, the following:-

To protect and enhance the Borough's areas of biodiversity importance; to ensure that development responds appropriately to and enhances landscape/townscape character, quality and topography; to conserve and enhance sites of cultural heritage and archaeological importance; to protect and make the most efficient and appropriate use of land, soils and geological assets, and to ensure the prudent use of resources and the sustainable management of waste.

The assessment concludes that due to the amount of additional land that is required to raise the housing supply to meet this need, there would likely be more significant negative impacts on these objectives.

Whilst this is likely to be the case, the NPPF (para 14) requires Local Plans to meet *'objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:*

- *any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted*

Whilst the additional provision of housing might be likely to have a further negative impact upon some of the objectives, it is not considered that there would be such

[6] 2014-based projections
[7] 2014-based projections including additional uplift of 34 dpa for net migration from London from 2017

adverse impact that would outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing required to meet the objectively assessed need for the Borough. In addition, through site selection and detailed proposals, it is likely that mitigation can be provided to reduce the potential impact upon these objectives.

Whilst the previous assessment demonstrated that all scenarios would have a significant positive impact upon ensuring the delivery of a mix of good quality, sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs, the provision of the higher level of housing is likely to have a more significant positive impact upon this objective than the other alternatives and this is particularly the case in the context of a higher OAN over the Plan period.

3.2 The strategic distribution of housing and employment development within the Borough

The original assessment of alternatives identified the following four reasonable alternatives for the strategic distribution of housing and employment development within the Borough:

Alternative 4.1 – Focus all development in and on the periphery of Ashford urban area, with no development in Tenterden or the villages.

Alternative 4.2 – Focus a large majority of development in and on the periphery of Ashford urban area supported by proportionate growth in Tenterden; the rural services centres and other villages.

Alternative 4.3 – Focus significant development outside of Ashford urban area, in particular at Tenterden, Charing, Hamstreet, Wye and the majority of the remaining parishes.

Alternative 4.4 – Focus significant development outside of Ashford urban area with the creation of a new settlement

The assessment concluded that Alternative 4.2 was the preferred alternative. Alternatives 4.3 and 4.4 performed significantly worse against the SA objectives than Alternatives 4.1 and 4.2, particularly in relation to the range of environmental objectives as well as access to services and infrastructure, and encouraging model shift and enhancing connectivity.

In identifying additional sites for housing development to meet the increased overall housing requirement for the borough it is desirable to do so in a way which ensures that the overall strategic distribution of development still sits within the parameters of Alternative 4.2.

This also applies to the need to address any shortfall in the delivery of housing since 2011 whilst enabling the delivery of a rolling 5 year housing land supply in

accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. To meet these requirements, it has been necessary to identify the majority of additional housing allocations at sites which can be realistically delivered in the early post-adoption years of the Plan. The most easily deliverable sites tend to be smaller sites, located in the rural areas where viability is generally higher and infrastructure constraints generally lower. However, a balance is needed given that the SA indicates allocating significant amounts of additional housing development in the rural areas would have major negative impacts in terms of overall sustainability.

Two broad options have been considered in assessing how this balance should be struck.

The first option is to meet the shortfall since 2011 by the end of the Plan period (i.e. the Liverpool approach) but with a 20% buffer to account for recent undersupply. In practice, a significant element of the land supply in this Local Plan is drawn from already committed sites such as at Chilmington Green, Finberry and in Ashford town centre and a combination of these sites and other existing and new allocations in the urban area will mean that the shortfall since 2011 should be rectified by the mid-2020s at the latest. As such a full 'Liverpool' approach to rectifying the shortfall is not necessary.

However, to achieve a 5 year land supply in the short term, further deliverable sites are required even if a Liverpool-style calculation is made. A total of around 700 additional units that can be realistically delivered in the period 2017-22 are required if a 20% buffer is applied.

The second option is to meet the shortfall since 2011 by allocating enough sites to achieve a 5 year housing land supply and rectifying the whole shortfall within 5 years (i.e. the Sedgefield approach) plus a 20% buffer to account for recent non-delivery. This would require further additional short term deliverable allocations of around 870 dwellings beyond the 700 under the first option. As most, if not all, of these additional dwellings would need to be located in the rural areas and most likely outside the main service centres given the scale of allocations already proposed in those centres this represents an option significantly closer to Alternative 4.3 than Alternative 4.2. A further consequence of this option would mean a level of overall allocation across the Plan period of nearly 2000 dwellings above that needed to achieve the Plan's housing target or the substitution of more sustainable Ashford based allocations for less sustainable rural based ones.

Comparison of these two options indicate that, although the second option has the benefit of providing more housing development in the short term and therefore meeting housing needs more quickly, this benefit is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the negative impacts of considerable further development in the rural areas of the borough. As demonstrated through the SA assessment, this would not

be a sustainable approach in terms of its environmental impact, access to services and infrastructure, and impact on existing communities.

3.3 The Strategic Distribution of Housing and Employment at Ashford

The original assessment of alternatives identified the following three reasonable alternatives for the strategic distribution of housing and employment at Ashford:

Alternative 5.1 – Focus development in a single growth area to the north-west of Ashford.

Alternative 5.2 – Focus development in a single growth area to the south of Ashford.

Alternative 5.3 – Disperse development around the periphery of Ashford (north; south; north east and south east).

These alternatives were developed based upon the land that was identified as being available for development in the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. In alternative 5.3, the North West sector was reduced to the north sector only to provide a distinctive alternative which can be tested without impact on the AONB.

The preferred distribution of housing across the borough remains to focus a large majority of development within and on the periphery of Ashford urban area, supported by a proportionate scale of growth in rural service centres and other smaller settlements. It has therefore been necessary to find additional housing sites in and around Ashford, as well as in the rural settlements.

Additional sites have been submitted to the Council as omission sites, in response to the consultation on the draft Plan. In addition to this, the Council has sought to identify additional sites around Ashford. This process is set out in more detail in the SHELAA. This has resulted in additional options being available around Ashford which were not previously assessed in the reasonable alternatives. There is a selection of sites now identified as available in the north-west sector which means this sector should be included within the assessment of alternative 5.3.

Update to assessment of Alternative 5.3

Table 6 sets out the re-assessment of Alternative 5.3, with the inclusion of the north-west sector. The assessments of Alternatives 5.1 and 5.2 remain the same, and are included for reference only.

Table 6 – Assessment of Development Distribution at Ashford Urban Area Scenarios against the SA Objectives

Strategic Distribution of housing and employment options at Ashford town	Alternative 5.1 Focus development in a single growth area to the north west of Ashford	Alternative 5.2 Focus development in a single growth area to the south of Ashford	Alternative 5.3 Disperse development around the periphery of Ashford
SA Objective			
1 To protect and enhance the Borough's areas of biodiversity importance.	-	-	-
2 To ensure that development responds appropriately to and enhances landscape/ townscape character, quality and topography	--	--	--
3 To conserve and enhance sites of cultural heritage and archaeological importance.	0	-	?
4 To help mitigate, and reduce the impact of, climate change and flooding.	-	-	-
5 To ensure the delivery of a mix of good quality, sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs.	+	+	++
6 To ensure that all groups of the Borough's population have access to services and facilities so that opportunities for social inclusion are maximised.	--	-	+
7 To improve the health and quality of life for those living and working in the Borough.	-	+	++
8 To encourage modal shift and enhance connectivity between communities and town/ district centres through safe pedestrian and cycle routes.	-	+	++
9 To ensure that development responds appropriately to current and future infrastructure requirements	--	--	+

10 To protect and make the most efficient and appropriate use of land, soils and geological assets.	--	--	--
11 To ensure the prudent use of resources and the sustainable management of waste.	--	-	--
12 To facilitate sustainable economic growth and high quality employment opportunities in accessible locations within the Borough and increase the skills base of Ashford's residents.	+	+	++
13 To improve and sustain the town and district centres' economic performance and vitality and maintain their roles within the Borough's retail hierarchy.	--	--	+

The only change in the assessment of the updated Alternative 5.3 is the impact in terms of objective 2, as development in this area is relatively close to the AONB. The updated alternative 5.3 still performs better than the other alternatives, for the reasons set out in the original report. It will be necessary to identify sites which would not have a significant negative impact on landscape character including the AONB, as stated in the original SA report (para 3.9.28).

Whilst the north-west sector within the original assessment has been considered negatively in terms of access to existing community infrastructure and transport facilities, this assessment has been made on the basis of the scale of development proposed in Alternative 5.1, and the need for significant additional infrastructure that would result from it. The scale of development proposed within the north-west sector which forms part of the Updated Alternative 5.3 is of a much lesser scale, which can more easily accommodated within existing services.

It is not considered that the addition of this area as part of the Alternative would result in any significant negative impacts on the overall sustainability of this Alternative, which still remains the most positive in terms of its overall assessment when compared to the other Alternatives.

In addition to this, it has also been necessary to find sites which are deliverable early on in the post-adoption Plan period to assist with addressing the shortfall in housing delivery since the beginning of the plan period (2011). Large scale development along these corridors would not be able to address this issue positively. This is already reflected in the assessment against SA objective 5.

4. ADDENDUM TO SECTION 4 - APPRAISAL OF SITES

4.1 Section 4 of the original SA report sets out Stage B of the Sustainability Appraisal process in relation to the development sites proposed in the Regulation 19 Version Local Plan (2016), and their reasonable alternatives. It explains the process for site selection and individual site assessments explain the reasons why sites were originally proposed to be allocated or not.

4.2 As a result of the increase in the housing requirement for the Borough and the need to address 5 year housing land supply requirements, additional development sites have needed to be identified for inclusion as part of the main changes to the draft Plan. It has therefore been necessary to re-consider all sites which were assessed in the SA but not proposed for allocation in the 2016 Regulation 19 version of the draft Plan. The change in strategic context means that some sites which were previously assessed to be unsuitable for allocation are now proposed to be included in the draft Plan.

4.3 The individual site assessments included in Appendix 1 of this Addendum replace the relevant assessment within Appendix 3 and 4 of the original SA report where they have been updated for factual reasons.

4.4 Appendix 2 of this Addendum includes assessments for all new sites which were not previously assessed through the original SA, including 'new' sites which the Council were not previously aware of which were submitted in response to the consultation on the Regulation 19 draft Local Plan (2016) or subsequent to that; and new sites subsequently identified by the Council through the SHELAA process. Any new sites regarded as not available or suitable in the updated SHELAA 2016/17 have not been assessed in this Addendum.

Sustainability Impact of Proposed Site Allocations

4.5 The original SA report, at Table 13, sets out the sites proposed to be allocated in the draft Local Plan and a summary of their effects. The following table provides an update to this, with a summary assessment of the additional site allocations proposed in the Main Changes.

Update to Table 13

Policy Ref	SHELAA site ref	Site Name	Summary of Sustainability Impact of Proposed Site Allocations and Mitigation

S39	WS25	Woodchurch - Lower Road	During the consultation on the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan the allocation of this site was objected to by the local community, in part on the basis that they wished to see a larger site coming forward in Woodchurch in order to enable the delivery of affordable housing. This site allocation has therefore been deleted and a larger site (S62) has therefore been allocated in place of this site.
S11a	VC4	Former Bombardier Works, Leacon Road	This site lies to the south of the Ashford – Tonbridge railway line and to the immediate east of the Matalan retail building and car park. The site is that of the former Bombardier Works site, and is now vacant. The land contains railway sidings within the northern section of the site, which provide a signalled connection to the mainline. The site and in particular the railway sidings, has been identified by Southeastern Railways, the Department for Transport and Network Rail as a highly important piece of infrastructure that needs to be maintained for rail purposes. The site has the potential to provide facilities for the berthing of trains for storage, cleaning and light maintenance. Additional provision of train berthing is required in the Borough in order to accommodate additional rolling stock that is required to meet the increased demand for rail services from Ashford and the surrounding network. The site is therefore allocated for a mix of operational railway use and commercial (B1-B8 uses) development. The land to the south remains allocated for residential development (site S11).
S45	WE47	Land south of Brockman's Lane, Bridgefield	Large portions of this site are located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and it is relatively distant from services, and public transport infrastructure. However, allocations to the north are coming forward and much of the area is under construction. The built area will come to border this site and there is scope for continuation of residential development on the northern part of this site as well as significant biodiversity and habitat enhancement on the eastern and southern part of the site which is located in the floodzone, and Green corridor extensions.

S46	G05	Chart Road	This site is part of the larger GO5 site, the former Ashford Hospital site in Kings Avenue, which was identified as a potential redevelopment opportunity in the Urban Sites and Infrastructure DPD and has been mostly redeveloped for residential use in the last couple of years. This remaining part of the site, which adjoins Chart Road (A28) is mostly vacant and cleared. It is located within walking distance of the Town centre and a number of other local service centres with direct access to the A28.
S47	DW9/DW41	Land East of Hothfield Mill	The site lies just outside the recognised existing built up edge of Ashford. The local facilities and services at Repton Park lie around 1 mile away but accessibility along the A20 is good with an hourly bus service. The overall sustainability of this site would be affected by the scale of development here and by how far it extended over the whole site. Large scale development would not be suitable but a more limited allocation can be justified in the context of the relative proximity and accessibility to services in Ashford. Previous negative scoring of site DW9 relating to the vehicle access to the site has been resolved with the addition of a new available adjoining site (reference DW41), which would allow an access to be created directly on the main highway of the A20, in addition to providing a solution to a problematic layby parking issue currently being experienced by residents here.
S48	DW36/DW39	Land rear of Holiday Inn Hotel	This site is located approximately halfway between Ashford and the primary rural service centre of Charing. With the exception of a very limited range of facilities at Tutt Hill itself, and a slightly greater range in Hothfield village which lies approximately 1.6km to the south, the majority of day to day services would be accessible at Charing or Ashford. The A20 provides a highly accessible route for the private car and existing bus services to either location. The proximity to the AONB means that the landscape impact of development here would need to be mitigated but the existing backdrop of the Holiday Inn building and other development

			of varying scale and bulk at Tutt Hill mitigates any strategic visual or landscape impact from this site. This site also provides an opportunity to establish a development of sufficient scale to create some limited on-site local facilities for recreation that would serve the local community and ameliorate recreational pressures on the nearby SSSI. The site is fairly well visually contained and would be seen as an extension to the Tutt Hill settlement with the motorway acting as a physical boundary. The site provides an available and deliverable opportunity to deliver residential development in a relatively accessible and unconstrained location in the short term and would be suitable for a lower-density form of development that utilises the natural topography and vegetation on the site.
S49	DW40	Land north of Tutt Hill, Westwell	This site is located approximately halfway between Ashford and the primary rural service centre of Charing. With the exception of a very limited range of facilities at Tutt Hill itself, and a slightly greater range in Hothfield village which lies approximately 1.6km to the south, the majority of day to day services would be accessible at Charing or Ashford. The A20 provides a highly accessible route for the private car and existing bus services to either location.
S50	SS58	Land at Caldecott, Smeeth	This site represents an opportunity to redevelop (in part) an existing brownfield location with good accessibility to the main highway network. Although not within or adjacent to the body of an existing settlement, the site is relatively close to facilities in Smeeth / Brabourne Lees and Mersham (including the nearby Evegate Mill site). It does not have any major infrastructure constraints or designations that would affect the principle of development here and lies in an area of limited landscape value between the A20 and M20. The site is available and deliverable within the short term.
S51	SS5	Aldington – land north of Church View	Aldington is a sustainable settlement with access to many local services, and this site is located on the edge of the current built form. This site is located in a sensitive landscape location at the

			top of a ridgeline on a key entrance to the settlement of Aldington, and development of the whole of the site would be very visually intrusive in this landscape. Part of the site also falls within the Roman Road Area of Archaeology. The whole site is therefore unsuitable for development. A smaller part of the site on the Goldwell Lane frontage is however suitable for limited development, where the impact on the landscape and wider views and other constraints can be mitigated. The access would need to be created on Goldwell Lane which is a key entrance to the village and new footpaths provided to the village centre to ensure good access to the local services provided there.
S52	SS4	Aldington – land south of Goldwell Court	Aldington is a sustainable settlement with access to many local services, and this site is located on the edge of the current built form. This site is located in a sensitive landscape location at the top of a ridgeline on a key entrance to the settlement of Aldington, and development of the whole of the site would be very visually intrusive in this landscape. Part of the site also falls within the Roman Road Area of Archaeology. The whole site, is therefore unsuitable for development. A smaller part of the site on the Goldwell Lane frontage is however suitable for limited development, where the impact on the landscape and wider views and other constraints can be mitigated. The access would need to be created on Goldwell Lane which is a key entrance to the village and new footpaths provided to the village centre to ensure good access to the local services provided there.
S53	SS12	Brook – Nat's Lane	The whole village of Brook is located in the AONB, and so any development in this location would need to ensure its design and layout is sensitive to this location. The village is small and has no facilities except for a primary school and therefore this site would not be suitable for large development. The site, however, could assist in the sustainable growth of the village through small-scale development especially given its situation in the heart of the settlement adjacent on three sides to existing development.

S54	DW4	Challock – land at Clockhouse	This site is within the locally-established settlement confines in a reasonably ample parcel between existing development to the north and to the south. Given its situation adjacent to Ancient Woodland and within the Kent Downs AONB, there is little scope for large-scale development. However, a certain level would be suitable especially given the site's proximity to a certain number of local services.
S55	CH17	Charing – land adjacent Poppyfields	This site is located on the edge of the primary rural service centre of Charing that has a good range of local services and facilities. The village centre is easily accessible on foot from the site and the site can be well connected to adjoining development. The site is contained by the A20 and the Ashford- Maidstone railway line. The proximity to the AONB means that the landscape impact of development here would need to be mitigated but the A20 forms the distinct boundary edge of the AONB and hence the impact is mitigated to a certain extent in terms of the overall visual or landscape impact. This site also provides an opportunity to establish a development of sufficient scale to create some limited on-site local facilities as well as contributing to the wider range of facilities within Charing.
S56	DN2	Chilham – Branch Road	This site is located within the village of Chilham and is close to the services available there such as GP, School, Shops, play park and sports facilities. The site is within the AONB and Conservation area and is within 50m of the archaeological historic centre of the village. In conclusion, the site is located within a sustainable location and also offers benefits to the village with the potential to increase car parking for the GP surgery, and therefore will lead to a reduction of the on-street parking which is causing traffic concerns. Previous vehicle access issues have now been resolved and the site is suitable for allocation.
S57	WS38a and WS38b	Hamstreet – land at Warehorne Road	This site is located along the north of the western entrance road of the village. The site is located between the two bridges for the A2070 bypass and the railway line, and is defined by a mature hedgerow, limiting visibility of the site from the

			road. There is a small amount of housing opposite the site. Any development on this site would have to take into account its constraints – it is in close proximity to the wastewater treatment works that could affect resident amenity and partly within FZ 2&3 and has no footpath access to the village.
S58	WC37 /WC92	High Halden – A28, Stevenson Brothers site	This site is located approximately halfway between the rural service centres of High Halden and Bethersden which both offer a range of facilities and day to day services. The site would be seen as an extension to the existing built frontage along the A28. The site provides an available and deliverable opportunity to deliver residential development in a relatively accessible and unconstrained location (which is partly brownfield) in the short term.
S59	WE53	Mersham – land at Rectory Close	This site lies on the edge of the existing confines to the village of Mersham, and although development here would extend the confines of the village, it would be reasonably well contained by the mature boundaries. Access would be from an existing cul-de-sac and so would not impact on the main road network or be visually intrusive in the landscape or wider village character. Careful consideration will need to be given to protection of the mature trees and ponds within and around the site, and layout and densities would need to respect the Conservation Area setting and the proximity to the nearby listed buildings as Newhouse is Grade ll*. Development of the site could provide opportunities to enhance the recreation ground and pedestrian links through to Glebelands, and provide affordable housing.
S60	WC19	St Michaels, Tenterden – land at Pope House Farm	This site is in close proximity to the main services and amenities in St. Michaels, in particular to bus routes, primary school and local shops, with excellent access to the primary settlement of Tenterden Town. The site is relatively open in a countryside setting but does adjoin the built form of development along Ashford Road and development would therefore form a natural extension to the settlement confines. Development of the site also presents

			an opportunity to enhance the setting of the listed building and associated buildings.
S61	IO25	Wittersham – land between Lloyds Green and Jubilee Fields	The site has good access to services due to its village location, and also provides an opportunity to improve the existing road network by linking together 2 cul-de-sacs, and improve links to the amenity space and play area off Woodland View. The southern areas of the site, where it already joins built development in the two cul-de-sacs is suitable for a limited amount of low-density development which is more suitable for AONB, and must not impact on the listed buildings which adjoin. Due to the close proximity to the LWS and Woodland, and views and setting of the AONB, development on the northern area of this site would not be suitable. However, this area could provide enhancements to the overall network and mitigation of negative effects by acting as buffer of enhanced natural green space, with additional planting and screening.
S62	WS44	Woodchurch – Land at Appledore Road	This site it is located within walking distance of many of the village services. It is visible from the south and east, along busy routes entering and travelling through the village. However, the current development in this location is already visible in the wider landscape and therefore additional development here would not be out of character.

ADDENDUM TO SECTION 5 – APPRAISAL OF TOPIC POLICIES

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 This section assesses the sustainability against the Sustainability Objectives of the revised strategic policy SP2 (The Strategic Approach to Housing Delivery), and two proposed new topic policies included in the main changes to the draft Local Plan - Policy SP7 Separation of Settlements and Policy HOU18 Housing Range and Mix.

5.2 Update to SP2

5.2.1 Following the release of the 2014-based Sub National Population Projections and Household Projections in 2016, it was necessary to update the SHMA 2015 to ensure that the evidence regarding the objectively assessed need (OAN) for the Borough was based upon the most up to date projections.

5.2.2 This analysis has resulted in an increase in the overall housing requirement over the regulation 19 Version of the Local Plan level from 14,680 to 16,120 for the period 2011 – 2030. The Main Changes to the Plan include an increase in housing provision at Ashford from 10,125 to 10,411 and in the rural areas and villages from 1,030 to 2,069.

5.2.3 These changes are included in a revised strategic approach to housing delivery which is set out in an updated SP2 and reasoned justification paragraphs.

POLICY SP2 – THE STRATEGIC APPROACH TO HOUSING DELIVERY	**APPRAISAL**	**COMMENTS**
SA Objective		
1 To protect and enhance the Borough's areas of biodiversity importance.	0	Site allocations within the draft Local Plan have in the majority avoided areas of biodiversity importance. Where this has not been the case proposals are required to mitigate any negative effect. There are also opportunities to enhance areas of biodiversity importance. The overall effect is therefore considered to be neutral.
2 To ensure that development responds appropriately to and enhances landscape/ townscape character, quality and topography	-	Due to the nature of the Borough and limited availability of brownfield sites it has not been possible to avoid areas of open countryside, where there will be negative impact on the landscape. Development proposals will be required to mitigate this where possible through detailed design and

		layout of proposals. Although minor negative effects are likely to remain. Some allocations are able to enhance the townscape particularly those on brownfield sites in the urban areas.
3 To conserve and enhance sites of cultural heritage and archaeological importance.	-	In the main the proposals do not impact significantly upon cultural heritage and archaeological importance, but it has not been possible to avoid such areas completely, and there therefore may be some minor negative effect
4 To help mitigate, and reduce the impact of, climate change and flooding.	0	The majority of development sites have avoided areas at risk of flooding. Where sites have been identified in such areas, it is possible for the risks of flooding to be mitigated and in some cases improvements made to the risk of flooding. The proposals are likely to increase the demand for water, but other policies in the Plan are in place to mitigate this as far as possible. Locating development in the most accessible locations provides opportunities for transport by non-vehicular modes reducing potential for air pollution. There are a number of factors at play in the criteria, but overall the proposals are considered to have a neutral impact.
5 To ensure the delivery of a mix of good quality, sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs.	++	The proposals ensure the delivery of a mix of good quality; sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs, and would therefore have a significant positive effect.
6 To ensure that all groups of the Borough's population have access to services and facilities so that opportunities for social inclusion are maximised.	++	By locating a significant proportion of development at Ashford Urban area and by scaling development proportionately to the size of the settlement, this enables maximum access to existing services and facilities.
7 To improve the health and quality of life for those living and working in the Borough.	++	Facilities are likely to be in close range increasing opportunities for access on foot or cycle. Populations would also be well served by a range of existing and new green open spaces
8 To encourage modal shift and enhance connectivity between communities and town/ district centres through safe pedestrian and cycle routes.	+	The strategy locates a large majority of development at Ashford town which has the widest choice of sustainable modes of transport, providing a positive effect. There is also excellent connectivity by pedestrian and cycle.
9 To ensure that development responds appropriately to current and future infrastructure requirements	+	The strategy allows for existing social, green, transport and utilities infrastructure to be utilised and enhanced where necessary. Other policies in the Plan require additional infrastructure to be provided where it is required.

10 To protect and make the most efficient and appropriate use of land, soils and geological assets.	--	Due to the lack of availability of brownfield land, the strategy relies quite significantly upon the use of greenfield land and would therefore have significant negative impact on this objective.
11 To ensure the prudent use of resources and the sustainable management of waste.	--	Due to the majority of agricultural land in the borough being classified as high grade the strategy relies upon the use of high grade agricultural land to deliver additional development and would therefore have significant negative impact on this objective
12 To facilitate sustainable economic growth and high quality employment opportunities in accessible locations within the Borough and increase the skills base of Ashford's residents.	++	The strategy for housing supports directly that for economic growth, by providing sufficient housing to meet the needs of a growing workforce and providing it in locations which are accessible to employment opportunities.
13 To improve and sustain the town and district centres' economic performance and vitality and maintain their roles within the Borough's retail hierarchy.	++	By locating a significant proportion of development at Ashford Urban area and by scaling development proportionately to the size of the settlement, this provides maximum opportunities to enhance the towns' economic performance whilst also supporting the centres of smaller settlements.

5.3 New Policy SP7 – separation of settlements

5.3.1 The separate and distinctive identity of individual settlements forms part of the particular character of much of Ashford borough. It helps to define communities and is an important feature in maintaining the quality and attractiveness of the borough for residents and visitors alike. As Ashford town in particular has grown in recent years, some of the open space between the edge of the town and the closest surrounding villages has been eroded. In some locations, such as at Park Farm, specific features such as the buffer zone with Kingsnorth village have been implemented. However, as pressure for additional growth to the south of Ashford continues (reflected in the proposed allocations in this Local Plan), the need for such protective features is likely to increase with more settlements potentially affected.

5.3.2 The Council is also concerned to ensure that coalescence does not occur at other locations across the borough. In particular, that larger scale allocations or expansion at Ashford or towns and villages do not serve to encompass nearby hamlets and that progressive 'ribbon' or linear development along roads do not result in the joining up of individual settlements.

5.3.3 A new policy SP7 Separation of Settlements has therefore been added to the Plan in order to prevent unplanned erosion of countryside between built up areas which would have a serious and significant adverse impact on the

character and individual identity of villages through loss of their setting or through coalescence.

POLICY SP7 – SEPARATION OF SETTLEMENTS	APPRAISAL	COMMENTS
SA Objective		
1 To protect and enhance the Borough's areas of biodiversity importance.	+	This policy seeks to restrict development on non-allocated sites that fall outside and between the confines of settlements. As such areas are often rich in biodiversity and regularly provide opportunities for wildlife corridors, habitats and stepping stones between built up areas, the overall effect of this policy is considered to be positive.
2 To ensure that development responds appropriately to and enhances landscape/ townscape character, quality and topography	++	By seeking to restrict development of sites that fall outside and between the confines of settlements in order to prevent coalescence, this policy will have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.
3 To conserve and enhance sites of cultural heritage and archaeological importance.	+	This policy will have a restrictive impact on new development outside the built up areas of settlements. This will have a positive impact on this objective insofar as sites of cultural heritage or archaeological importance which are located away from existing settlements.
4 To help mitigate, and reduce the impact of, climate change and flooding.	+	This policy seeks to limit new development of non-allocated sites outside the confines of existing settlements and therefore is considered to have a positive effect on this objective.
5 To ensure the delivery of a mix of good quality, sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs.	-	This policy will limit the numbers of new dwellings permitted between and on the edge of existing settlements and there may therefore be some minor negative effect on this objective.
6 To ensure that all groups of the Borough's population have access to services and facilities so that opportunities for social inclusion are maximised.	+	This policy will limit the numbers of new dwellings outside the built up confines of settlements where access to services and facilities are limited. However, it will not prevent the delivery of outdoor sports and recreation uses and so for both these reasons there will be some positive effect on this objective of this policy.
7 To improve the health and quality of life for those living and working in the Borough.	++	The retention of gaps between built up settlements will work to ensure the retention of areas of open space within reasonably accessible distance of

		local residents, which will in turn have a positive impact on this objective.
8 To encourage modal shift and enhance connectivity between communities and town/ district centres through safe pedestrian and cycle routes.	-	This policy will limit the numbers of new developments coming forward on the edge of existing settlements and there may therefore be some minor negative effect on this objective.
9 To ensure that development responds appropriately to current and future infrastructure requirements	0	This policy will have a neutral impact on the delivery of this objective.
10 To protect and make the most efficient and appropriate use of land, soils and geological assets.	++	By seeking to restrict development of sites that fall outside and between the confines of settlements in order to prevent coalescence, this policy will have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective.
11 To ensure the prudent use of resources and the sustainable management of waste.	+	This policy will have a restrictive impact on new development outside the built up areas of settlements. This will have a positive impact on this objective with regard to the prudent use of agricultural land.
12 To facilitate sustainable economic growth and high quality employment opportunities in accessible locations within the Borough and increase the skills base of Ashford's residents.	+	By seeking to restrict development of sites that fall outside and between the confines of settlements in order to prevent coalescence, this policy will help to focus development within existing built up areas and will therefore have a positive effect on the achievement of this objective.
13 To improve and sustain the town and district centres' economic performance and vitality and maintain their roles within the Borough's retail hierarchy.	+	By seeking to restrict development of sites that fall outside and between the confines of settlements in order to prevent coalescence, this policy will help to focus development within existing built up areas and will therefore will have a positive effect on the achievement of this objective.

5.4 New Policy HOU18 – Housing Range and Mix

5.4.1 The NPPF requires that Local Plans include policies that encourage the provision of a range of house types and sizes to cater for the existing and future population's needs. This topic should be based on a local assessment of current and future demographic trends, market trends and the differing needs of the various sectors of the community in order to ensure that housing is provided in the borough that met a variety of needs.

5.4.2 In the Regulation 19 consultation in 2016, a number of respondents queried the lack of specific policy criteria as a means of providing certainty on this issue. It is therefore considered that a policy seeking a mix of housing types and sizes to meet local needs is required and would mean a greater chance of matching new residential development to identified local needs and trends and thus be a more sustainable form of development.

POLICY HOU18 – HOUSING RANGE AND MIX	**APPRAISAL**	**COMMENTS**
SA Objective		
1 To protect and enhance the Borough's areas of biodiversity importance.	/	No relationship
2 To ensure that development responds appropriately to and enhances landscape/ townscape character, quality and topography	/	No relationship
3 To conserve and enhance sites of cultural heritage and archaeological importance.	/	No relationship
4 To help mitigate, and reduce the impact of, climate change and flooding.	/	No relationship
5 To ensure the delivery of a mix of good quality, sustainably constructed homes to meet identified needs.	++	This policy will have a significant positive effect on the achievement of this objective as well helping to create and foster sustainable communities, provide resilience to the housing market, and increasing choice and widening the opportunities for home ownership.
6 To ensure that all groups of the Borough's population have access to services and facilities so that opportunities for social inclusion are maximised.	+	This policy will have a positive effect on the achievement of this objective by helping to create and foster sustainable communities.
7 To improve the health and quality of life for those living and working in the Borough.	+	This policy will have a positive effect on the achievement of this objective by delivering a range of house types and sizes.
8 To encourage modal shift and enhance connectivity between communities and town/ district	/	No relationship

centres through safe pedestrian and cycle routes.		
9 To ensure that development responds appropriately to current and future infrastructure requirements	/	No relationship
10 To protect and make the most efficient and appropriate use of land, soils and geological assets.	/	No relationship
11 To ensure the prudent use of resources and the sustainable management of waste.	/	No relationship
12 To facilitate sustainable economic growth and high quality employment opportunities in accessible locations within the Borough and increase the skills base of Ashford's residents.	/	No relationship
13 To improve and sustain the town and district centres' economic performance and vitality and maintain their roles within the Borough's retail hierarchy.	/	No relationship

5.5 Other changes to Topic Policies

5.5.1 Policy HOU13 is to be deleted and its content (seeking to ensure that housing designed for family occupation incorporates at least two separate rooms for cooking, eating and living) is to be incorporated into the supporting text to Policy HOU12 (Residential Space Standards) where it is considered to be more appropriate. This change does not raise significant issues requiring an SA.

Appendix 1 – Update to original site assessments of previously considered sites

Site assessments for the following sites replace the original assessments included within Appendix 3 and 4 of the May 2016 Sustainability Appraisal report.

SITE REF	SITE POLICY REF	PARISH/AREA	SITE ADDRESS
SS5	S51	ALDINGTON	Land between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane
DN2	S56	CHILHAM	Harvest House, Branch Road
WS38	n/a	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Ashford Road
WC12	S33	HIGH HALDEN	Land at Hope House, High Halden
DW6	S32	HOTHFIELD	Station Rd, Coach Drive
WS4/ WE45	n/a	KINGSNORTH	Land on Church Hill, Kingsnorth (WE45 Larger area than WS4 submission)
WE11 / WE51	S16	SEVINGTON	Waterbrook Gateway – updated site area with addition of WE51
WN6	n/a	SMARDEN	Ware Field, Copper Lodge Farm, Water Lane
SM1	S42	ST MICHAELS	Beechwood Farm, St Michaels
DW12	n/a	WESTWELL	Beechbrook, Maidstone Road
DW9	S47	WESTWELL	Woodside, Westwell lane (including new site DW41)
WS27	n/a	WOODCHURCH	Land south of Rectory Close, Woodchurch
WS25	S39	WOODCHURCH	Lower Road site allocation
WS44	S62	WOODCHURCH	Land adj to Bridge Close

Site Ref: Site Policy Area S51 (Part of site SS5) **Date Survey updated: 03/02/2017**

Site Name: Land between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane, Aldington

Site Description:

The whole site of SS5 is a large area of agricultural land, currently in an arable rotation. The field boundary is marked by hedgerow and fencing. There is no boundary between the site allocation and the remainder of the site.

This site is located at the north 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. The southern extent of the site is bounded by linear housing development along the road frontage, and a terraced row of residential bungalows is located opposite the site.

The topography of the site is significant, in that the site is located on the top of a ridgeline, where the Roman Road and existing housing development are located. This makes the site predominant in the landscape when viewed from the north and easterly directions, particularly from the area in the east where a church and others buildings of historic importance are located.

To the north of the site is a paddock used for equine purposes and beyond this, a rural employment centre and then open countryside.

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 is a mature hedgerow on the road frontage (and set back) and loss of this may be detrimental to the habitat network.	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?	The surrounding development is linear development along the road frontages so development of a similar nature could respect this existing character.	1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is located on a visually obtrusive entrance into the village, especially when viewed from the north and east because the site is located on a ridgeline.	-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 but the site is located in an area of archaeology potential.	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?	Potential negative impacts on the views towards the Church to the east.	-1
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 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?	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 (Meets the size requirements of revised Local Plan policy)	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 nearby to 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?	No	0
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 adjoining uses have 16mb broadband	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, Aldington is not considered as a 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: **Aldington is s sustainable settlement with access to many local services, and this site is located on the edge of the current built form.** **This site is located in a sensitive landscape location at the top of a ridgeline on a key entrance to the settlement of Aldington, from where important vistas of the heritage cluster around the church to the east, and of the wider countryside are achieved. Development of the whole of the SS5 site would be very visually intrusive in this landscape and could be seen from many locations in the wider area and would remove these important vistas. Part of the site also falls within the Roman Road Area of Archaeology. The whole site, is therefore unsuitable for development.** **A smaller part of the site is suitable for limited development, where the impact on the landscape and wider views and other constraints can be mitigated. This area is specifically on the Goldwell Lane frontage, where existing linear housing is already located and development can reflect the built form already in this location. The access would need to be created on Goldwell Lane which is a key entrance to the village and new footpaths provided to the village centre to ensure good access to the local services provided there. Negative impacts on views, vistas and the topography of the wider site and ridge can be mitigated in a frontage only scheme.**			**Total: 3**

* 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: **DN2** **Date Survey Updated: 03/03/2017**

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

Site Description:

The site is located on the South west of the settlement of Chilham, located on the entrance road, Branch Road. This site consists of the residential property and curtilage of Harvest House and a building on the northern area 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, and the main built area of the village to the north and therefore built development would not be out of character. However, this area does have a rural edge, as the southern part of the site joins open countryside, and the development	-1

		to the south east is a sports hall so is open in character.	
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 and would require screening.	-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?	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 -1.3ha	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	1
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 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:	Total:
This site is located within the village of Chilham and is close to the services available there such as GP, School, Shops, play park and sports facilities and therefore scores well in this sustainability assessment. **The site is within the AONB and Conservation area and is within 50m of the Archaeological historic centre of the village. The site is also partly visible from the A28 and in the wider landscape from the south. Development of this site could potentially be detrimental to these settings and would require careful planning and landscaping.** **In conclusion, the site is located within a sustainable location and also offers benefits to the village with the potential to increase car parking for the GP surgery, and therefore will lead to a reduction of the on-street parking which is causing traffic concerns.** **Previous vehicle access issues have now been resolved and the site is suitable for allocation.**	**5**

* 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: WS38a (original submission area WS38) Date Survey Updated: 30/01/2017

Site Name: Land rear of Ashford Road, Hamstreet

Site Description:

This site is a field located at the western edge of the village, directly behind existing linear housing development in Ashford Road, with their access road and garages adjoining the eastern site boundary. The site spreads out in the western direction into the open countryside and sites on a ridgeline as the land falls down towards the A2070 from this point. The railway line bounds the site along the south/southeastern boundary. There is a waste water treatment works adjoining the SW boundary of the site, which is accessed from a track off Warehorne Road that goes under the Railway line. There is Ancient woodland adjoining the site to the north and north west, which wraps around the rear of the Primary School in Ashford Road, and extends to the A2070 bypass which is on the west 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?	Not within or adjacent. 430m from the Hamstreet Woods National Nature Reserve and 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?	On the northern and NW boundary of the site adjoins Ancient woodland – Stumbletree Wood	-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?	Development here would be 'backland' development, and would sit behind the linear development along the main road through the village. Development of this site would create an extension to the built form of the area and change the views between Warehorne Road	-1

		and the village. This area is currently rolling countryside used for agriculture.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The landscape opens out from this site in a south western direction with views to and from Warehorne Road/ The A2070 bypass and beyond. Development here could have a negative impact on this setting and the overall rural character of the area.	-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?	Neutral 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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable	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 - Site is 2.1ha	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?	420m	0

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	680m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	80m	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 390m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Lancaster Close play area and open space 390m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Footpath along Ashford 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?	Yes – on the southern boundary of the site lies adjacent to the WWTW.	-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?	Access to this site as proposed is difficult. There are two possible access roads, one is a single track between existing housing on Ashford Rd, up a steep hill that leads to the garages at the rear of existing properties. There is a large bank on the right hand side which could prevent the road being widened. The second access is a narrow track from Warehorne road which is not suitable for traffic in its present state.	-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?	100m from Railway. 30m 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?	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?	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 town centre?	Not applicable	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0

Conclusion:	Total:
The site scores well in the environmental sections and proximity to services as it is located close to the centre of the village, the railway station and school. However, there is a significant constraint with the only access to the site via a single track road, on a gradient, which serves as a rear parking access to existing housing. It is not possible for this to be widened to accommodate 2-way traffic. **The site is also in close proximity to the wastewater treatment works that could affect resident amenity. These constraints make this site unsuitable for development.** **(See site appraisal WS38b for larger site area assessment)**	**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: WC12 **Date Survey updated :18/03/2017**

Site Name: Land at Hope House, High Halden

Site Description:

This site is located on the western side of High Halden village on the A28 main road, adjoining the Millfield residential estate and 3 detached properties 'Oakland', 'Rowans' and 'Lynton' along the eastern boundary of the site and 'Hope House' to the east. The site extends to the rear of Hope House and Monarch House in the west. Opposite the site is the entrance to a large housing close – Hopes Grove, and the sports field and pavilion is beyond these houses.

Currently pasture (not in use) with mature hedging and trees surrounding the site on three sides, the northern boundary has an open aspect fronting the A28. Within the site frontage, adjacent to Hope House are a number of ponds. The site slopes down from south to the north and is relatively open in character at the rear where it adjoins open countryside.

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, but the site boundary features mature hedgerows / trees and a number of ponds on the frontage which have been identified as having biodiversity value and must be retained.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Development of this site will enable managed access to a habitat network.	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 surrounded by existing residential development to the north and east and west so development here would not be out of character.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site slopes down from south to north with no far reaching views into the countryside so limited development could be achieved	0

		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?	No	0
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 town centre?	No	0
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 and impact can be minimised with buffer and screening so a minor negative effect should result. This is considered a suitable site for development.** **The area on the frontage which contains the ponds is considered to be important in biodiversity terms, and development of the site should retain and enhance this area to enable managed access.**			**Total:** **8**

* 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: DW6 **Date Survey Completed: 16/10/2014 (updated February 2017)**

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.

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 100m of a designated habitat, SSSI and Nature Reserve – Hothfield Common. There are opportunities for developments in this location to contribute to enhancements to this area, which over time is likely to increase the species and quality of the environment	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, 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 have potential to include a visitor centre/café which would compliment the draw of the nearby Hothfield Common, thus creating a green linkage between the existing settlement and the important wildlife site and promoting 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	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 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 1 in 30 year coverage.	0
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?	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, 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. However it is not part of the site proposal.	0
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 reserves?*	Yes, the site is a Mineral Safeguarding Area for Silica/Construction Sand. Sandstone – Folkestone 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)	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 being explored.** **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.** **The assessment of this site results in an overall positive score and there are opportunities here to provide the enhancements to the settlement, which includes the Hothfield community offer. It is considered that the DW6 could be a suitable for allocation.**			**Total:** **8**

* 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: **WS4 (and larger area WE45)** **Date Survey updated: 02/02/2017**

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 a 2 small agricultural fields, 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.

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	-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?	Not within or near green corridor at present but is identified as an area of potential future extension	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 1mile 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	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 – larger 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?	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 demolished to access the site.	1
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 would form a backland development of the properties on Church Hill, Kingsnorth, and this area has been identified in the plan as a 'strategic green buffer' area to protect the village from the planned large scale developments proposed further south. This site is not suitable for allocation in the Local Plan for development, as it would remove the planned buffer area and impact on the future potential area for Green Corridor extension.**			**Total:** **6**

* 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: WE11 & WE51 **Date Survey updated:15/03/2017**

Site Name: Waterbrook Park, Sevington

Site Description:

The site south of the A2070 and HS1 and railway to the east. The site includes an operating 24 hour truck stop. The remainder of the site is agricultural land. The River Stour is located to western boundary of the site. The site to the north between the submission and the A2070 has planning permission for commercial development. The site is currently allocated in the Core Strategy for mixed use.

The site boundary now includes the site WE51, which together make up the site policy area S16.

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 significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	The southern and eastern edges of the site are in close proximity to the South Willesborough Dykes LWS, but the Green Corridor designation between it provides a buffer.	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?	Trees and hedgerows across the site, may be some loss, and features adjacent to the river Stour	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential to enhance the green corridor and related components of the habitat network, and provide managed access	2
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Green Corridor is within the site along the south western boundary, adjacent to the River Stour, but development would not be permitted on this area.	-1
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Although agricultural land, part of the site is already developed. The area of undeveloped	-1

		land is between built development, so impact on landscape would be minor.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Minor visual impact on partially rural character of surrounding area	-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
3.2	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?*	Yes Flood Zones 2 and 3 to south-western boundaries along river corridor	-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?	Site is at risk from 1 in 100 year event and less than 10% coverage of 1 in 30.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Most of site in minor groundwater vulnerability area, small area to north of site in major	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?	Gain	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Cheeseman's Green	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Willesborough	-2

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Cheeseman's Green	-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)	Cheeseman's Green	-1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Cheeseman's Green	-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?	Lorry Park, Railway line	-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	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	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, Junction 10a	-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?	Part brownfield, part greenfield	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?*	Yes Alluvium	-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?	Greater	1
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: This a large site for development on the edge of the urban area which scores relatively poorly because a part of the site falls within the flood plain and also the green corridor designation. **However, development of the whole area could avoid these constraints and achieve a mixed use development that would help deliver some benefits for the community in the form of an extended lorry park. Access to services will improve in the near future following the under construction developments nearby of Finberry, and the site has excellent access to the Highway network.** **The site is suitable for mixed use development.**			**Total:** **-6**

* 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: 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 site which development here could mirror.	-1
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	0

		opposite side of the road, 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 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 access to the site is through a narrow road junction, which passes through a heritage sensitive area.	-1
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?	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 2.5ha (Smaller area submitted in 2016 which would not provide 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 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 centre?	Smarden is a small village with some services and shops. The nearest district centre would be Biddenden.	0
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, particularly with regards to the heritage assets and additional traffic travelling through the narrow junction of this sensitive area.** **A smaller site submission received would not provide affordable housing and reduces the score to 0, but in turn a reduced number would have less impact on the heritage assets so is balanced.**			**Total:** **1**

* 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: SM1 **Date Survey updated: 16/03/2017**

Site Name: Beechwood Farm, St.Michaels

Site Description:

This site adjoins the northern edge of St.Michaels, to the south of London Beach Golf Club/Hotel and The Little Silver Hotel.

The site is grassland that is level to the north and which dips significantly under a 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.

The site boundary has been updated and now include an additional field to the west, extending further into the countryside. There is a strong mature tree boundaries across the site, north to south and other boundaries are largely defined by tree and hedgerow boundaries. The SW corner adjoins a substantial area of Ancient 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?	Yes – significant tree within site, and bounded to W by TPOs and Ancient woodland. As a low scale proposal, trees must be retained.	-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?	The density of development proposed in this location would be in keeping with larger houses on single plots in this location.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Yes – current road frontage is rural in character and development would extend into countryside but is low density	-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	1
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 – although a large site, it is proposed for exclusive homes**	**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)	St. Michaels recreation ground is approx. 620m to the south of the site	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	St. Michaels recreation ground is approx. 620m to the south of the site, and includes an equipped play area	0
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 in St.Michaels 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 may necessitate the removal of a substantial character tree, and may well impact on neighbouring TPOs or Ancient Woodland. Development would also have to deal with varying site levels.** **Proposals for the site are low density exclusive homes, and in this regard the impact on the woodland and other trees would be minimal and the 'rural' character retained. Therefore the site is suitable for this minimal scale of development.**			**Total:** **3**

* 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: DW12 **Date Survey Completed: 08/02/2017**

Site Name: Beechbrook, Maidstone Road

Site Description:

Large proposed development site located to the northwest of the Ashford urban area. It was formerly a construction site for the CTRL but has been returned to agricultural use for several years. The site is bounded to the north by the M20 and to the south by the A20. Currently there is Ancient Woodland and Tree Preservation Orders either contained within the site or adjoining.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat buts lies in proximity to the Hothfield Common SSSI. The scale of the proposal here could put significant additional indirect recreational pressure on the SSSI.	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, there is no LWS in close proximity.	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 majority of the site has been in agricultural (cropped) use in recent years so it is not expected to be species rich and there is a limited amount of trees / hedgerows that would be directly affected.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	As the site of the site is so large, a neutral score is appropriate here as there are no specific proposals for habitat creation	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?*	The site is not within an AONB but is directly adjacent to the Kent Downs AONB to the north.	-1
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The scale of the proposal and the relative openness of the area, in particular the views from the AONB to the north would make this proposal a significant and major new visual intrusion in the landscape of the area	-2

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – the scale of the proposal in this location would result in a significant visual impact on the surrounding 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 not within or adjoining an archaeological site or a CA.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain or adjoin a LB, SM or registered park/garden.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not in a 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?	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 location.	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)	The size of the site is 51.1 Ha and therefore is far in excess of 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?	The scale of the proposal is such that it could reasonably be anticipated that some new on-site services or facilities would be needed in order to mitigate the additional demand created. A neutral score is appropriate here given that only a detailed proposal would result in being able to assess the balance of potential gains and pressures on existing facilities	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The site lies just outside 1.6km of the nearest Local Centre but given the scale of the potential development, this score should be mitigated by the potential for the provision of a new Local Centre as part of the site	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	The site lies just outside 1.6km of the nearest primary school at Repton Park but given the scale of the potential development, this score should be mitigated by the potential for the provision of a new primary school as part of the site.	-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 lies within 800m-1.6km of the Warren	-1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	The site is over 1.6km from the nearest equipped play area but the site is of a scale that would be expected to make provision for a new facility on the site, hence the score is mitigated.	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	The scale of the proposed development would be such that it would generate the need for additional public open space as part of the development	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The site adjoins the motorway and railway lines, so there is potential for some noise and disturbance.	-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	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?	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?	Potentially yes as the scale of additional traffic generation from such a large proposal may have implications for the capacity of M20 junction 9 and the Drovers Roundabout, given other commitments.	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes (although it is questionable whether the scale of new patients generated by such a large scheme can be accommodated elsewhere)	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	-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)	Half Grade 3/Half 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?	The scale of the site would lend itself to the provision of some additional business space but a neutral score is appropriate given the uncertainty over detailed proposals	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?	The scale of the site would lend itself to the provision of some additional education facilities but a neutral score is appropriate given the uncertainty over detailed proposals	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: **This is a potentially a very large site with the capability of delivering over 1000 dwellings but the SA of other large sites has shown these to be preferable in sustainability terms. There are potential significant infrastructure constraints that could limit the potential of the site and its deliverability.** **The site lies immediately adjacent to the AONB and is very open with long views from the AONB to the north with no existing natural screening. The proximity of the motorway at grade with the site provides a further constraint. The scale of development proposed here would have very significant implications for the setting of the AONB and its character and whilst development of such scale can deliver additional local services and facilities that could serve the site itself and nearby development and the site has good road and bus links to Ashford, this would not, in the context of this Plan, provide sufficient justification for allocating this land in the Plan.**			**Total:** **-9**

* 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: Policy Area S47 (site DW9 now combined with DW41) Date Survey Updated: 03/02/2017

Site Name: Land east of Hothfield Mill, A20

Site Description:

This site is currently a field in agricultural use, surrounded mainly by open countryside with the exception of the area to the east which is a hamlet sized built residential area along Westwell Lane, Sandyhurst Lane and Hoads Wood Gardens. This residential area consists of mainly ribbon development along Westwell Lane road frontage and the surrounding housing is typically detached and semi-detached 2 storey properties with large gardens. The residential area is separated from the site by a tall mature hedgerow boundary along Westwell Lane.

To the south of the site on its boundary is a large detached property, 'Woodside' within a large curtilage, which fronts on to the A20 (off a layby). The property is enclosed from the site by a generous tree buffer. There are fields that lie either side of Woodside between the site and the A20.

Along the western boundary for the length of the site, is a substantial woodland buffer that is irregular in shape and alters the site boundary with a 'nib' which cuts into the field. The south west corner of the site adjoins an employment and agricultural property with large barns/ warehouses and hardstanding parking areas, Hothfield Mill, which is accessed from the A20 directly.

The north of the site is bounded by the M20 motorway.

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, or an area used by protected species?	Not within or adjoining	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No – there is a LWS designation to the south of the site, but this is on the opposite side of the A20 wo will have no impact.	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of 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 may impact on neighbouring TPO woodland which adjoins the site but it is outside of the boundary and therefore no identified effects.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or green linkages?	There is potential but no proposals.	0
1.5	Does the site present opportunities for protecting and enhancing 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?*	200m from AONB	-1

2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development would have a minor impact on landscape setting. The site is located on the edge of a very small settlement. Development of a large site here would change this landscape and countryside.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Site would be visible from the wider landscape to the south of the site, and would change the views of neighbouring properties in Westwell Lane, but is relatively well screened from the open countryside and AONB to the west and North.	-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
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No historic/cultural assets affected	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% coverage of surface water flooding from the 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year event.	-2
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?	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)	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?	The site lies almost exactly 1.6km from the shopping facilities at Repton Park on the edge of Ashford.	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No. More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Repton Park primary school lies just under 1.6km from the site	-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 site lies within 800m of the Warren informal green space.	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No. More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Public footpath within 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of strategic open space.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes it is adjacent to the M20 and Ashford-Maidstone railway so noise may be a concern but dwellings would not be built on the most sensitive part of the site	-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	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. Route 17 is within 1.6km	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	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
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Hayesbank , Kennington 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?*	Yes. Silica sand construction sandstone Folkestone 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 units/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 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?	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: The original SA of site DW9 has been factually updated to take account of the availability of the frontage land at DW41 to provide a suitable direct access to the site from the A20 as well as a re-assessment of the proximity of available services and facilities.			**Total: -7**

The site lies just outside the recognised existing built up edge of Ashford. The local facilities and services at Repton Park lie around 1 mile away but accessibility along the A20 is good with an hourly bus service on Mondays to Saturdays. The full services in Ashford town centre are less than 10 minutes travelling time from the site by car or bus. This level of accessibility mitigates significantly the actual distance to services from the site and, on balance, this may be considered to be better than more rural alternatives. **The potential landscape and visual impact of development here is recognised in the SA. However, ensuring that the development footprint is limited to the less prominent parts of the site, away from the motorway and railway line would provide some mitigation of these negative impacts.** **The original negative scoring of site DW9 relating to the vehicle access to the site has been resolved with the addition of a new available adjoining site (reference DW41), which would allow an access to be created directly on the main highway of the A20, in addition to providing a solution to a problematic layby parking issue currently being experienced by residents here.** **The overall sustainability of this site would be affected by the scale of development here and how far it extended over the whole site. Large scale development would not be suitable but a more limited allocation can be justified in the context of the relative proximity and accessibility to services in Ashford.**	

* 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: WS27 **Date Survey Completed: 05/04/2017**

Site Name: Land to the south of Rectory Close

Site Description:

The site is grassland bounded by late twentieth century development to the north of the site comprising large detached 2 storey houses. The site is relatively level but sloping down to the SE with commanding views to SE of site. A PRoW runs NE to SW through the centre of site. The site is bounded by trees along the eastern edge to public open space.

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?	No the development would be backland development, extending an existing cul-de-sac which is already extending into the countryside.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Potential view from SE and interruption of country views from north. Proximity to Grade I listed church and its setting.	-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 - but within 40m	0

3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Within 70m of Grade I listed All Saints Church	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Development on this site will further erode the character and rural setting of the Grade I listed church.	-1
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 – less than 10% 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 100m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes, circa 550m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, circa 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)	Yes – adjoining PRoW to East	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No – open space but not equipped, though equipped play area 400m	1

7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – PRoW from NE to village centre and public open space	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 currently – access via turning circle in narrow road housing estate – currently not open. However, proposed solution could be acceptable in highway terms.	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 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?	Potential need for access route to be designed	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)	Majority 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?	--	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	--	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	--	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: **While this site is in very close proximity to local services and has fewer constraints than most sites in Woodchurch there are three key areas of consideration. The first is access, as links to main roads are highly constrained by the current neighbouring cul-de-sac form of development, potentially necessitating major works to create a new access point. While this is possible and is supported by KCC highways, KCC notes that capacity issues for the site (and associated traffic movements) would clearly be limited.** **The second is landscape character, and especially long-ranging views from the south, effectively extending the existing built up area of the village into open countryside. This would undoubtedly have an impact given the slope of the site.** **Finally, this site is proposed as a "rounding off" of residential development in Woodchurch around the church. However, development on this site will further erode the character and rural setting of the Grade I listed church, cutting it off from its direct access to the surrounding countryside and historic link with the surrounding agricultural communities.** **The site is not considered suitable for development.**			**Total:** **5**

* 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: WS25 **Date Survey updated: 04/02/2017**

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

Site Description:

This site is agricultural land, bounded by native hedgerows and trees. There are 2 large detached dwellings to the north to the north 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 site 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. There are 2 new large dwellings in the north, but these are set back from the frontage.	-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)	**No – due to the location in the centre of the village, the part of the site which is considered suitable for development is not large enough to meet the Affordable Housing 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, 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 shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site is considered suitable for development because it is centrally located in the village and scores highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. Development 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.** **However, only the eastern part of the site is considered suitable so as not to encroach into the green centre of the village which has been recently identified as an important part of the village character in the Conservation Area Appraisal. This suitable area is not large enough to accommodate a development of 10 or more, and therefore does not meet the threshold for affordable housing provision, making it less suitable for allocation.**			**Total:** **7**

* 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: WS44 **Date Survey Updated: 30/01/2017**

Site Name: Land adj to HA development on Appledore Road, Woodchurch

Site Description:

This site is located to the south east of the settlement of Woodchurch, adjacent to Bridge Close, with frontage onto Appledore Road. This is one of the main roads into the village and is also an important route between the larger settlements of Tenterden and Hamstreet (B2067).

The site is an agricultural field, currently used for grazing. On the north eastern boundary of the site is an agricultural vehicle entrance onto the main highway, and a small copse. Within the copse there appears to be building debris and sheds in disrepair and the area appears not to be maintained. There is a mature hedgerow boundary around the perimeter of the site.

To the south is a large double gabled corrugated iron farm building and beyond this, open countryside and farmland. To the north west of the site is a relatively recent local needs housing development, Bridge Close, with a large 4 storey care home beyond it which also fronts Appledore Road. To the south west is a residential close, Brattle, which is accessed on the opposite side of a 'loop' in the highway network.

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 – potential for loss of a copse on northern point, but this is not designated and is unkempt with disused building supplies, broken sheds and rubbish within. There is one notable tree on the frontage.	-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 from NE entrance to the settlement; yes from West – as this area is built	0

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Viewpoint impact from south, but mitigated by existing housing development of Brattle and Bridge Close which is already visible. Highly visible from the north and east along busy routes entering the village, but again – existing development here already is visible and prevents longer views.	-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?	--	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?	Site is at risk from the 1 in 100 year flood event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration likely to be suitable	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?	Circa 1000m	-1

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes, 150m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Circa 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)	730m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Circa 800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No – potential for easy connection to footway at North through Bridge Close	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?	The site is in close proximity to a wastewater treatment works	-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?	There is currently on a farm access from Appledore road. Highways recommend new access from Bridge Close	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 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?*	Sub-alluvial river terrace 2 to NE of site. Not located on reserves.	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?	--	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	--	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	--	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: Development of this site as proposed would mirror neighbouring development and would be a logical culmination in the semicircle of land between Brook Street and Appledore Road, providing a finite edge to the built form, and it is located within walking distance of many of the village services. **The site would be visible from the south and east, along busy routes entering and travelling through the village and therefore will impact on the setting and character of this part of the village. The adjacent Bridge Close development was permitted as an exception site for local needs housing. However, the current development in this location is already visible in the wider landscape and therefore additional development here would not cause greater harm. The site is suitable for allocation.**			**Total:** **2**

* 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.

No corrections have been made to the site assessments of the following sites and therefore the assessments included within Appendix 3 and 4 of the original Sustainability Appraisal report still apply.

(Appendix 3 of SA Report May 2016)

Sites in Ashford Urban Area

Site ref	Town/Parish/Area	Site Name
AG1	ASHFORD	Klondyke, Newtown Road
AG7	ASHFORD	Newtown Works - Phase 2
BE16	ASHFORD	Former Ashford South Primary School (Policy U6A)
BE17	ASHFORD	K College, Jemmett Road (Policy U6B)
NO2	ASHFORD	Romney Marsh, Romney Marsh Road
ST3	ASHFORD	Lower Queens Road (Policy U4)
ST8	ASHFORD	Land at Henwood Industrial Estate, off Kennard Way
VC4	ASHFORD	Leacon Road
VC17	ASHFORD	Gasworks Lane
VC47	ASHFORD	Commercial Quarter
NW1	WILLESBOROUGH	Willesborough Lees Park, Ashford
NW7	WILLESBOROUGH	land At Willesborough Lees (Policy U14)
BO1	ASHFORD	The Warren, land adjacent Drovers roundabout (Policy U8)
BBAE1	KENNINGTON	Ashford Golf Club, Sandyhurst Lane
BBAE2	KENNINGTON	Land at Eureka Park (Policy U17)
KE1	KENNINGTON	Land at Ulley Farm, Ball Lane, Kennington
KE2	KENNINGTON	Orchard Farm, Kennington
KE3	KENNINGTON	Land NE of A2070 Willesborough Road
KE4	KENNINGTON	Land east of A28
WE4	KINGSNORTH	Land at Finn Farm

WE5/ WE6	KINGSNORTH	Land to the South of Park Farm East
WE15	SEVINGTON & MERSHAM	Sevington Park, Land east of Highfield Lane, Mersham
WE16	KINGSNORTH	Various Sites around Kingsnorth Village
WE17	KINGSNORTH	The Retreat, Taylor Farm, Bond Lane
WE18	KINGSNORTH	Taylor Farm, Bond Lane, Kingsnorth
WE20	KINGSNORTH	Land adjoining Finn Farm House, Finn Farm Road, Kingsnorth
WE21	KINGSNORTH & MERSHAM	The Park, Cheeseman's Green (Finberry)
WE24	KINGSNORTH	Land adjacent to Stumble Lane/Church Hill and including Stumble Wood
WE37	KINGSNORTH	Land at Kiln Farm between Bond Lane and Church Hill
WE38	SEVINGTON	Sevington (Policy U19)
WS11	KINGSNORTH	land at Court Lodge
NW3	WILLESBOROUGH	Land adjacent to Julie Rose Stadium

Sites in Rural Settlements

Site ref	Town/Parish Area	Site Name
IO2	APPLEDORE	Land rear of Appledore Village Hall and Doctors Surgery
IO22a	APPLEDORE	The Walnut Field
BD4	BIDDENDEN	Land adjoining Gate House, Townland Close, Biddenden
BD8	BIDDENDEN	Land at North Street
CH4	CHARING	Northdowns Service Station, A20 Charing
CH6	CHARING	Land at the top of Charing Hill
CH9	CHARING	Land adjoining Burleigh Bungalow, Burleigh Road
CH14	CHARING	Land south of Arthur Baker Playing Field (POLICY CHAR1)

DN12	CHILHAM	The Avenue Field, Bagham Road
DN13	CHILHAM	Land between Bagham Road, Arden Grange and the Recreation Ground
WN2	EGERTON	land to the NE of New Road, Egerton
WS1	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Hamstreet Garden Centre, Marsh Road
WS30	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Land north of St. Mary's Close, Hamstreet
WS37	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Land and buildings at Parker Farm (POLICY HAM2)
WE39	MERSHAM	Land rear of Village Hall, Church Road
WC14	PLUCKLEY	Land NE of Smarden Road, Pluckley
WC15	PLUCKLEY	Land west of Smarden Road, Pluckley
WC16	PLUCKLEY	Former Pluckley Brickworks
WC62	PLUCKLEY	Land adjacent to Little Farm
WN4	SMARDEN	land Adjacent to Smarden Village Hall
SS7	SMEETH	Land at Church Road
SS8	SMEETH	Old Builders Yard, Plain road
SS29	SMEETH	Land rear of Fortescue Place, Calland
SS54	SMEETH	Additional land on Church Road
RTW2	TENTERDEN	Pickhill Business centre
TS7	TENTERDEN	Land adjacent to Belcot and Hopes Grove, Tenterden
TSTRW1	TENTERDEN	Phase B of TENT1 allocation (TENT1b) land adjoining Smallhythe Road
TSTRW2	TENTERDEN	Hopes Grove - South
WS17	SHADOXHURST	Field to the north of Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst
WS19	SHADOXHURST	Land north of Farley Close

WS21	SHADOXHURST	Land rear of Kings Head PH, Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst
WS26 and 29	WOODCHURCH	Land to the west of Lower Road, Woodchurch (site 1 and 2)
WS28a	WOODCHURCH	Land between 82 and 120 Front Road (POLICY WOOD1)

(Appendix 4 of SA May 2016)

Site ref	Town/Parish Area	Site Name
NO4	ASHFORD	Coneybeare, Torrington Road
SW1	ASHFORD	Gas House Field, Land adjoining New Town Road, New Town
SW2	ASHFORD	Open land to east of Bushy Royds and north of Fairview Drive
ST5	ASHFORD	Mabledon Avenue
BD6	BIDDENDEN	Newcastle Farm Field, Newcastle Corner, Headcorn Road
CH3	CHARING	Land west of Pluckley Road, Charing
DN4	CHILHAM	Land at Mulberry Hill
DN5	CHILHAM	Noveis, Canterbury Road
DN29	CHILHAM	Land at 1-5 The Oast House, Lower Lees Road, Old Wives Lees
DN31	CHILHAM	Land adjacent to Tollgate Cottage, Maidstone Road
GCS4	GREAT CHART	Pig and Whistle, Ashford Road
GSC5	GREAT CHART	A28 Bethersden Road (Land north of Possingham Farmhouse)
WS35	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Land adjacent to Mountain Farm, Marsh Road, Hamstreet
WS71	ORLESTONE (HAMSTREET)	Land adjacent to Lancaster Close, Cotton Hill Land, Bourne Lane

WC11	HIGH HALDEN	Land to the north side of Church Hill
BY1	KENNINGTON	Ashford Rugby Club (2 submissions)
NO3	KINGSNORTH	Ashford Canal District
PFN3	KINGSNORTH	Land adjacent to Kingsnorth Medical Practice
PFN4	KINGSNORTH	Triumvirate House, Millbank Road (Imagine play centre)
WE40	KINGSNORTH	Land at Court Lodge Farm, Church Road
HG1	SEVINGTON	Land adjacent to Church Road, Sevington
WS18	SHADOXHURST	Criol Barn Field
WN3	SMARDEN	Mill Lane, Smarden (Land between Boughton Cottage & Millview Cottage)
WN5	SMARDEN	Land adjacent to Long Meadow, Smarden
SS9	SMEETH	Land to west of Station road, Opposite Evegate Business Park, Smeeth
TS2	TENTERDEN	Land at Belgar Farm, Appledore Road
TS3	TENTERDEN	Land at Appledore Road/Woodchurch Road
WS9	WOODCHURCH	Land adjacent to Sunny Mead Farm, Bethersden Road
NW2	WILLESBOROUGH	Land at 10A Blackwall Road North
IO5	WITTERSHAM	Land at Lloyds Farm
IO6	WITTERSHAM	Land north of Stocks Road, Wittersham
IO7	WITTERSHAM	Jubilee Fields, Land adjoining North East boundary of Jubilee Fields, Wittersham

Appendix 2 – New site appraisals

This Addendum includes site assessments of the following new sites.

SITE REF	SITE POLICY REF	PARISH/AREA	SITE ADDRESS
GO5	S46	**ASHFORD**	Land at Chart Road
SS4	S52	**ALDINGTON**	Land south of Goldwell Court, Goldwell Lane
BD5 b	N/A	**BIDDENDEN**	Land rear of Cheeselands and Sandeman Way (Larger area than BD5a)
SS12	S53	**BROOK**	Nats Lane
DW4	S54	**CHALLOCK**	Clockhouse Land, Clockhouse Farm Land, Canterbury Road
CH17	S55	**CHARING**	Land west of Poppyfields, Charing
WS38b	S57	**WAREHORNE /HAMSTREET**	Land on Warehorne Road, Hamstreet
WC37 and WC92	S58	**HIGH HALDEN**	Stevenson Bros, A28
WC19	S60	**HIGH HALDEN (St.Michaels)**	Pope House Farm, A28
DW34	N/A	**HOTHFIELD**	South of West Street, Hothfield
DW35	N/A	**HOTHFIELD**	North of West Street
DW36 DW39	S48	**HOTHFIELD**	Kempton Manor Farm and Land rear of Holiday Inn, A20

DW37	N/A	**HOTHFIELD**	Pinetrees, Chapel Road
WE46	N/A	**KINGSNORTH**	Kingsnorth Glebe & The Rectory, Church Hill (2 Sites)
WE47	S45	**KINGSNORTH**	Steeds Lane (Land South of Park Farm South allocation)
WE30	N/A	**KINGSNORTH**	Hedge and Sarac, Stumble Lane
WE52	N/A	**MERSHAM**	Bower Farm
WE53	S59	**MERSHAM**	Land at Old Rectory Close
WE54	N/A	**MERSHAM**	Land on Bower Road
WE44	N/A	**SEVINGTON**	Batts Farm, Rear of Sevington Church
WS33	N/A	**SHADOXHURST**	Land adjacent to Bethersden Road and Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst
SS58	S50	**SMEETH**	Land at The Caldecott Foundation School
SS59	N/A	**SMEETH**	Smeeth Playing Fields
DW40	S49	**WESTWELL**	Land at Oakover Nurseries, A20.
IO25	S61	**WITTERSHAM**	Land adjoining Poplar Farm, Poplar Farm

Site Ref: GO5 (Policy S46) **Date Survey Completed:20/03/2017**

Site Name: Chart Road, Ashford

Site Description:

This site is part of the larger GO5 site – the former Ashford Hospital site in Kings Avenue, which was identified as a potential redevelopment opportunity in the Urban Sites and Infrastructure DPD and has been mostly redeveloped for residential use in the last couple of years. This remaining part of the site, which adjoins Chart Road (A28) currently lies mostly vacant and cleared with hoardings around its perimeter.

The site is located close to the town centre within a largely residential area of urban Ashford. There are a number of terraced properties along the Chart Road frontage and this site creates a gap in that built character.

The site lies in close proximity to the Ashford-Maidstone railway line and the Channel Tunnel Rail Link, along with the 'Tank' roundabout to the east of the site.

On the north-west corner of the site, there is a row of garages and an informal parking area which serve 20-33 Chart Road, and a number of mature trees on the boundary here.

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 not in close proximity to any designated habitats.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have 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 some trees on the site boundaries, which are protected by TPO but most of the site has been recently cleared and therefore biodiversity within the site is minimal.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes, the site is located on the edge of the Town centre, in a residential area. Development of this vacant site could improve the townscape significantly as it is currently	2

		unmanaged with hoarding around the perimeter.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	There could be some visual impact on the neighbouring residents, but overall would be a positive 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?*	Does not contain a listed building, SM and is not in a historic park or garden.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	No	
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further 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 that the submission site is located partly in an area which is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding.	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)	The site is located in the urban area and is approximately 0.8ha and therefore would provide 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 Centre/ Shop?	Less than 600m from Waitrose and The Town Centre	0

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	800m-1.6km	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	800m-1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	CTRL is nearby – noise may be a consideration.	-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	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	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?	Yes	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)	Not graded	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?	Within 600m of Town Centre	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	Yes	1
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site is located in the urban area of Ashford within walking distance of the Town centre and a number of other local service centres with direct access to the A28. The site is a brownfield site which has been previously identified as a suitable for site for allocation and partly been redeveloped. The site is suitable for allocation as a residential scheme.**			**Total:** **12**

* 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: **(Policy S52) Part of site SS4** **Date Survey Completed:03/02/2017**

Site Name: South of Goldwell Manor Farm, Aldington

Site Description:

The whole site of SS4 is a large area of agricultural land, currently used in part for horse grazing and associated storage. The field boundary is marked by hedgerow and fencing. There is no marked boundary between the site allocation and the remainder of the site SS4, however, there are some hedgerows within the site itself.

This site is located at the north eastern extent of the village of Aldington and marks a key entrance into the village from side of Goldwell Lane. To the north of the site is Goldwell Court Farm, which contains a number of converted agricultural buildings, now in use as a mixed rural employment site. Some of the area on the road frontage and within the site appears to be used as an informal parking area for this facility. Opposite the site is the Aldington Eco Centre and its associated grounds and parking areas, although the street is lined with mature trees so the building is well screened from the wider area.

The built character of the nearby residential settlement is linear housing development along the road frontage, and a terraced row of residential bungalows is located opposite the site to the south.

The topography of the site is significant, in that the site is located on the top of a ridgeline, where the Roman Road and existing housing development are located. This makes the site predominant in the landscape when viewed from the north and easterly directions, particularly from the area in the east where a church and others buildings of historic importance are located.

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 is a mature hedgerow on the road frontage (and set back) and loss of this may be detrimental to the habitat network.	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?	The surrounding development is linear development along the road frontages so development of a similar nature could respect this existing character.	1
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 whole 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?*	No	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Yes, the Grade II Listed Goldwell Manor Farm is situated 90m to the north, but its curtilage is adjacent to the site.	
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Potential negative impacts on the views towards the Church.	-1
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 (Meets the size requirements of revised Local Plan policy)	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 800m	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 Sellindge.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, the site is nearby to Aldington Primary.	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 80m from the site across 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 southern 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?	No	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, Sellindge 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?	No	0
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 adjoining uses have 16mb broadband	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?	The nearest district centres are Ashford and Hamstreet.	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:			**Total:**

Aldington is s sustainable settlement with access to many local services, and this site is located within a current gap in the built frontage between Goldwell Court and Roman Road. **This site is located in a sensitive landscape location at the top of a ridgeline on a key entrance to the settlement of Aldington, from where important vistas of the heritage cluster around the church to the east, and of the wider countryside are achieved. Development of the whole of the SS5 site would be very visually intrusive in this landscape and could be seen from many locations in the wider area and would remove these important vistas. The whole site, is therefore unsuitable for development.** **A smaller part of the site is suitable for limited development, where the impact on the landscape and wider views and other constraints can be mitigated. This area is specifically on the Goldwell Lane frontage, where existing linear housing is already located. The access would need to be created on Goldwell Lane which is a key entrance to the village and new footpaths provided to the village centre to ensure good access to the local services provided there. Negative impacts on views and the topography of the wider site and ridge can be mitigated in a frontage only scheme.**	**3**

* 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: BD5b **Date Survey Completed: 20/01/2017**

Site Name: Land rear of Cheeselands and Sandeman Way (Larger area than BD5a)

Site Description:

The site consists of vacant fields and is located on the outskirts of built-up residential development in Biddenden. The boundary of the site is defined by hedgerows and a gate to the south. There is a public right of way which runs alongside the northern edge of the site, reinforcing the hedgerow boundary.

The east of the site backs onto relatively new residential development at Maids Close, Cheeselands and Sandeman Way. There are a number of ponds to the west which are just behind the hedgerow that forms the western boundary to the site. To the north there is an abundance of vacant fields that are potentially used for grazing. To the immediate south there are vacant fields, whilst slightly further south there is a row of houses that align Sissinghurst Road (A262).

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 situation is amidst a landscape of scattered ponds of which this site is a focal centre. There is one pond on site, at the north-eastern corner.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There is already reasonable habitat connectivity on site, especially between scattered ponds, with shelter provided by hedged field boundaries. Development could deliver neutral impact if designed in.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site adjoins several inward-facing recent developments at Cheeselands, Sandeman Way and Maids Close. It would therefore be difficult for any meaningful extension of the built settlement in this direction. It would also	-1

		extend the village into the surrounding countryside.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – would constitute a notable north-western extension into 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?*	Although not within or adjoining, the site is in close proximity to both a site of archaeological importance and a CA.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No, the site does not contain or adjoin a listed building, SM or registered garden.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Given the location, it is likely to have a neutral effect on historic / cultural assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not in a 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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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 – 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?	Neither loss nor gain	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	400-800m	0

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400-800m	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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – ProW across northern boundary 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?	Yes – site is 140m from Biddenden WWTW	-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?	Potential for access, via Maids Close, but this has not been confirmed as acceptable by the LHA.	0
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	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 – greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No – no buildings currently 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?	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?	N/A	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	N/A	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: **This site is within close proximity to village services and areas of existing public space. However, in terms of the spatial form of Biddenden, as well as its relatively close proximity to the over-capacity WWTW, mean that at this time the site is not as suitable for development as others submitted. Development on this site would not help the biodiversity and habitat preservation/connectivity aims of the plan. Added to this, recent neighbouring development is oriented inwards – development at this location at this time would spread too far from the village centre. Further work is needed to assess the acceptability of providing access to the site via Maids Close with the Local Highway Authority.**			**Total:** **0**

* 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: SS12 **Date Survey Completed:17/03/2017**

Site Name: Nats Lane, The Street

Site Description:

This site is located in the village of Brook, within a gap of existing development in the south of the village. The village is characterised largely by linear development, mainly bungalows of different ages and styles. The site is currently utilised as a grazing field for sheep and provides a gap in otherwise continuous frontage development. The topography of the site is relatively flat with a very shallow upward gradient moving northwards.

The site is bordered on its northern boundary by woodland, which is designated as a SSSI. The brook which runs through the village borders the site on its eastern boundary, as does a concrete track leading to a small water pumping station, despite these, the site itself is not in the floodplain.

The south western boundary of the site is adjacent to the rear gardens of the properties on Nats Lane, however, there is thick hedging and small trees screening these properties from view. Despite its central location, the site has a feel of seclusion and is not visually intrusive.

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, the rear boundary of the site is less than 20m away from the Wye and Crundale Downs SSSI. However, because the site is large development could be kept away from this boundary and would therefore only have a minor short-term effect.	-1
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, a small length of hedgerow would need to be removed at the frontage of the site to provide site access. However, hedging elsewhere should be retained to provide screening to the existing properties.	-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, the whole of Brook village is located in the AONB	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes, due to the layout of the site, development could respect the existing surrounding uses.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	No, despite its central location, the site has a feel of seclusion and is not visually intrusive as it is surrounded by mature hedging on three of its boundaries.	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	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Yes – adjacent to Grade II listed Westdown Cottage	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Any development could be designed so as to minimise the setting of the listed building, especially given the large curtilage of the LB.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Only a small strip of the site is within the flood zone, along the eastern boundary of the site, and development in this area could be easily avoided.	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?	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, the site is large enough to accommodate affordable housing requirements.	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 services	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	There is no village shop. Wye is the closest.	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, there is no doctors surgery in Brook, the nearest surgery is in the village of Wye.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, the site is 500m from the 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)	Yes, there is a recreation ground behind the village hall, which is approximately 250m from the site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, there is a play area behind the village hall, which is approximately 250m from the site	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, there is a public footway in front of the site and a PROW on the western boundary	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, from national cycle route 18	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
9.4	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, 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)	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?	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?	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: **The whole village of Brook is located in the AONB, and so any development in this location would need to ensure its design and layout is sensitive to this location. The village is small and has few facilities except for a primary school and therefore this site would not be suitable for large development. The site, however, could assist in the sustainable growth of the village through small-scale development especially given its situation in the heart of the settlement adjacent on three sides to existing development.**			**Total:** **-2**

Site Ref: DW4 **Date Survey Completed:16/03/2017**

Site Name: Clockhouse Land, Challock

Site Description:

This site is centrally located in the village of Challock, on the northern side of the A252 Canterbury Road. The site is located wholly within the AONB and the rear of the site adjoins ancient woodland on its western boundary. The frontage of the site falls within the newly defined built confines of Challock, with the surrounding development being linear to the west and a 'cul-de-sac style' local-needs scheme to the east. The frontage area is therefore characterised by mixed character and style housing development.

The site itself consists of a large grassed area, which provides an open gap in the development fronting Canterbury Road. The site provides an access track to the business unit on the outer northern boundary 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?	No, but the rear of the site is adjoining an area of ancient woodland and development of this part of the site would need further assessment to see if it would have cumulative impact.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There may be a way of improving connectivity to the wider landscape area from Carvet Wood through the site, and potential for the establishment of 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?	Yes, the whole of the village of Challock is located in the AONB.	-2
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes, providing existing screening on the site was retained and enhanced.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development would not look out of place in this locality and due to the flat topography of the site, development here is unlikely to create significant visual impact – it will not	0

		impact views from the south given that it would be behind existing dwellings, nor from the north given the presence of Mill Barn.	
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?*	The site is 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?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event or the 1 in 30-year event.	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	No, mapping suggests low permeability at this site	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)	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, the site is less than 100m from the village shop.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, there is no GP surgery in Challock. The nearest surgery is in Charing	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, the site is less than 500m from Challock 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)	Yes, the site is within 150m of the Challock Green	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No, there is no equipped play area in Challock, the nearest site is in Charing	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, there is a footway in front of the site and there is a public footpath at the rear 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?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes, the site directly accesses the A252 Canterbury Road by way of Old Clockhouse Green	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?	Yes, the site has a frequent bus service between Ashford and Faversham	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?	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 green field	-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)	The site is located on 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?	Not applicable	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?	No	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: **This site is partly within the locally-established settlement confines in a reasonably ample parcel between existing development to the north and to the south. Given its situation adjacent to Ancient Woodland and within the Kent Downs AONB, there is little scope for large-scale development. However, a certain level would be suitable especially given the site's proximity to a certain number of local services. Careful consideration should be given to limit the impact of any development on both the immediate adjacent and the wider landscape through landscaping within the site, which could serve biodiversity improvements.**			**Total:** -1

* 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: CH17 **Date Survey Completed: 03/02/2017**

Site Name: Land west of Poppyfields, Charing

Site Description:

The site is located south of the Maidstone Road (A20) and the land rises up towards the west and Hook Lane. The site boundary is defined by hedgerows, whilst there are also a number of hedgerows within the site that seemingly divide it into parcels of land. Prominent views of the site can be had from the north and west due to its open nature, although the site is broken up in some places by tree coverage and hedgerows.

The site directly adjoins the new Poppyfields residential development to the east, whilst to the west there is agricultural land. To the south the site is bounded by a railway line which reinforces the boundary created by hedgerows. Beyond this there is open countryside. To the north the site is bounded by a restaurant and the Charing Motors buildings, as well as the A20.

The new Poppyfields estate is the nearest residential development and primarily consists of detached and semi-detached houses which is in keeping with other houses within the 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?	The site is not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 some hedges and trees on the boundary with the Poppyfields development to be retained as boundary treatment	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	The site enables the creation of a landscaped northern and western edge to the development with a substantial boundary planting	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?*	The site is not within an AONB, but the most northern part of the site is less than 100m from the Kent Downs AONB.	-1

2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The development of the site would have an impact on the setting of the AONB	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	There would be an impact on visual amenity	-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 not within or adjoining an area of archaeological importance but is in close proximity to a CA.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain or adjoin a listed building, SM or registered park/garden.	0
3.2	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?*	The site is not within a 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?	The site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone.	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)	The size of the site is 7.15 Ha and is therefore above 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?	The development of the site would contribute to the provision of related infrastructure – some of which may be on site	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	400-800m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	400-800m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400-800m	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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	400-800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	The site would provide some 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?	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	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?*	The site is located on existing mineral reserves.	-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?	No	0
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?	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: **This site is located on the edge of the primary rural service centre of Charing that has a good range of local services and facilities. The village centre is easily accessible on foot from the site and the site can be well connected to adjoin development.** **The site is contained by the A20 and the Ashford- Maidstone railway line. The proximity to the AONB means that the landscape impact of development here would need to be mitigated but the A20 forms**			**Total:** **6**

the distinct boundary edge of the AONB and hence the impact is mitigated to a certain extent in terms of the overall visual or landscape impact. **This site also provides an opportunity to establish a development of sufficient scale to create some limited on-site local facilities as well as contributing to the wider range of facilities within Charing.** **The site provides an opportunity to deliver residential development in a primary rural service centre that would enable the creation of a distinct edge to the village.**	

* 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: WS38b (New Omission site area) Date Survey Completed: 30/01/2017

Site Name: Land on Warehorne Rd, Hamstreet (Warehorne Parish)

Site Description:

This site is an omission site which is a large extension to a previous site submission - WS38. This SA will score on potential of larger and smaller areas within this revised submission.

This site is located along the north of the western entrance road of the village – Warehorne Rd. The site boundary here is located between the two bridges for the A2070 bypass and the Railway line, and is defined by a mature hedgerow, limiting visibility of the site from the road. There is currently no built development on the northern side of Warehorne Road in this location, but there is a small amount of housing opposite the site which consists of 2 sets of terraced cottages. Viaduct Terrace properties do not front the road, but Prospect Cottages, closer the Railway Bridge, look on to the site and its current farm access which is located alongside the Railway Bridge.

This site is bounded by the A2070 boundary on the western edge, the railway line on the eastern edge and a sewage treatment works on the NE. The site is currently part of a larger field, used for grazing, and the topography of the land rises towards the west .

There are no natural boundaries along the northern boundary of the southern parcel itself as it is part of a wider field. The natural field boundary lies to the north of the site and follows the Speringbrook Sewer which also has some tree and hedge 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. Less than 300m from the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay Ramsar site and SSSI.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	There is a LWS to the North of the site (Orlestone Forest), but this is beyond the A2070 bypass so separated from the site.	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 create an extension to the built form of the area and change the views along Warehorne Road, however much of the site is screened from wider views by the A2070 and the railway line.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The landscape opens out from this site in a south western direction with views to and from Warehorne Road/ A2070 bypass and beyond. Development here could have a negative impact on this setting and the overall rural character of the area, and entrance to the village. However, the site is well screened from the road by a mature hedgerow.	-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 and across the Railway Line.	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 – partly within FZ 2 & 3 following the Speringbrook Stream. Enters the site from the south of Sewage works under Railway line.	-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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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 - Site is over 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	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?	Less than 800m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Over 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)	Victory Hall – less than 800m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Victory Hall – less than 800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No – There are currently no footpaths beyond the Railway Bridge	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?	Sewage Treatment works, Railway and A2070 bypass noise which may affect the amenity of the proposed residents.	-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?	Site is currently accessed from gated farm entrance in Warehorne 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?	700m from Railway. 500m from Bus (Ws38b) This may be improved if a pedestrian access can be created as part of WS38a	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	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?*	Yes – partly within Sub Alluvial River Terrace (Strip south of Sewage Works)	-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?	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 town centre?	Not applicable	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0

Conclusion:

Total:

The landscape opens out from this site in a south western direction with views of rolling countryside to and from the Warehorne Road entrance to the village and beyond, therefore development here has the potential to impact on this setting and the overall character of the area without carefully thought-out design deserving of this village gateway location. However, the southern area of land at WS38b is lower than the WS38a site and less visible in the wider setting. It is also well screened from Warehorne Road by a mature hedge.

Any development on this site would have to take into account its constraints – it is in close proximity to the wastewater treatment works that could affect resident amenity, partly within FZ 2&3 and Mineral safeguarding zone and has no footpath access to the village. However, many of the constraints of the site relate only to one part of the larger site submission and could be resolved/mitigated through specific layout options or requirements.

- **If a pedestrian access could be created direct to Ashford Road, incorporating WS38a land then the scores could be improved for access to services such as School, Bus Stops and Railway Station.**
- **Avoid the area of the site within FZ 2 & 3 (which is also the mineral safeguarding area) located to the south of the Sewage Treatment works. This would also create a 'buffer' from the sewage works and the railway line, mitigating the amenity concerns for residents**
- **Footpath/crossing to be created on Warehorne Road which increases the access to services scoring and also allows safer access to the village for existing residents in Prospect Cottages and Viaduct Terrace.**

0

Subject to the above, this site is suitable for allocation.

Site Ref: WC92 & WC37 (Policy S58) **Date Survey Completed:18/03/17**

Site Name: Stevenson Brothers and land to rear, Ashford Road.

Site Description:

The site is located to the south-east of the A28 between Bethersden and High Halden and occupies the Stevenson Brothers manufacturing/ storage site as well as agricultural land to the rear. The site is bound to the west and to the south by mature hedgerow with fields beyond. To the north lies the current business use and to the east is further agricultural land.

A small portion of the site is developed for business use but the remainder is agricultural land with a pond as well as a ditch and natural field boundaries running through the site.

Along the road frontage in this location, (and typical along the A28) on either side and opposite the site, is a small number of detached residential properties creating an intermittent ribbon development form and to the west is a relatively recent cul de sac of detached houses which extends into to countryside to the south- 'The Martins'.

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 is largely open countryside and contains a number of hedgerows, trees and ponds and therefore there could be a detrimental impact if those were lost. Existing habitats would need to be retained in development proposals.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Development of this site could enable managed access to the natural areas but this would require investigation.	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 existing character in this location is mixed between the open countryside landscape and the ribbon development built frontages along the road. As part of the site is brownfield,	-1

		development of this area could respect the character here. Development of the rear of the site, within the countryside would be more detrimental to the landscape character.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development of the site frontage could have a positive visual effect in this location. Development of the rear of the site would not be visible in the wider landscape setting.	-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?*	Across the road from the site is a grade II listed building and at present this site adjacent to the disused petrol filling station within the site. A sensitive development of this site has the potential to enhance the setting of the listed buildings.	1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	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?	Potential could be explored.	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?	2.5km from shop at Bethersden	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	1.6km away at High Halden	-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)	More than 1.6km	-2
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	5km away at Woodchurch	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Within site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain	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, the site is in Decile 8 of the IMD	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. Site is 700m from National cycle network (on road).	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 new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Approximately 10% of the site is previously developed land. Older petrol filling stations such as the one on this site can be sources of ground contaminants, and therefore redevelopment offers the opportunity to remove potential soil and water table hazards.	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?	Results in loss of business use on site	-1
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?	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: **This site is located approximately halfway between the rural service centres of High Halden and Bethersden which both offer a range of facilities and day to day services. The A28 provides a highly accessible route for the private car and existing bus services to either location, and on to the main Towns of Ashford and Tenterden. Whilst accessibility to services on foot are limited, this needs to be balanced with the potential accessibility by car or bus to a much broader range of services which should off-set some of the negative scoring in the table above.**			**Total:** **-5**

This site also provides an opportunity to establish a development of sufficient scale to create some limited on-site local facilities for recreation that would serve the new and existing residents. The site is fairly well visually contained to the rear and would be seen as an extension to the existing built frontage along the A28 as this part is already developed. The landscape impact of development into the countryside would need to be mitigated. **The site provides an available and deliverable opportunity to deliver residential development in a relatively accessible and unconstrained location (which is partly brownfield) in the short term and would be suitable for a lower-density form of development that utilises the natural topography and vegetation on the site.**	

* 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: DW34 **Date Survey Completed: 17/01/2017**

Site Name: South of West Street, Hothfield

Site Description:

This site is located on the western edge of the settlement of Hothfield, and is a parcel of land stretching between The Street and West Street. The site is currently a large field, and the land varies in height, inclining to a point in the centre from both roads, which creates a high ridge in the centre.

The site, on its West Street boundary, is higher than the road and is a large bank with hedgerow and mature tree coverage, limiting visibility into the site. West Street in this location is a narrow rural road, and the 30mph restriction commences between the site and as it enters the built area of the settlement, with a row of terraced 2-storey housing (no's 10-15). The land behind this row of terraces is a mix of gardens, parking and what appear to be some former allotments, sheds and scrubland. This area extends southwards by around 100m, and therefore adjoin the site for approximately 40% of its eastern boundary. There are some mature trees and scrub in this location, the boundary between the site and this land is not well established.

The southern area of the site slopes down towards and adjoins the rear gardens of a number of properties located along the Street, in linear form. There is no access to the site from this area.

(Site has been considered in combination with DW35)

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 adjoining a designated habitat, SSSI and Nature Reserve – Hothfield Common. There are opportunities for developments in this location to contribute to enhancements to this area, which over time is likely to increase the species and quality of the environment	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 areas of mature tree and hedgerow around the site, but no designated areas or TPOs. There are no visible ponds or ditches and the site is currently in agricultural use. Some boundary trees may require removal for site access but there is also an opportunity to provide increased planting.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There is an opportunity to provide enhancements with the creation of new areas and links to local networks in Hothfield Common	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	1
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of the whole site would be detrimental to the existing character and quality of the landscape, as the site is on higher land than the existing linear form of housing along West Street and The Street. A limited amount of development, on areas of the site which are less intrusive to the landscape may be acceptable.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The site would be highly visible from the West Street entrance to the village, but the site at present is well screened by mature trees and hedgerows, if this was retained and enhanced the impact would be minimal in the wider area. However, if development were to sit on the highest ridge within the site, it would be visible in the wider setting of the village.	-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 adjoins a CA	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	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?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess	1

		potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone.	
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 size is 2.158 Ha and therefore would be large enough to provide 10 or more 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?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – the nearest are Charing or Repton Park	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Development of this site could create a gain in public open space to mitigate negative impacts that new development could have on Hothfield Common and may also improve connections around the settlement to these open spaces.	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 3	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	There is no existing access on West Street, but there is potential to create one.	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?	Yes	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?*	Less than 10% of site is within Folkestone Beds Draft Mineral area	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?	No. The site is within 400m of Hothfield but there are limited services. Charing or Ashford are the nearest district centres	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:

There are a number of local issues in Hothfield village which create additional considerations when assessing the suitability of this site for allocation; these include the concentration of social housing in the central area and the poor physical integration between the social housing in the central core 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. Proposals for a visitor centre/café to complement Hothfield Common are being explored and development opportunities are being considered by the Neighbourhood Planning Group.

The assessment of this site results in an overall positive score and there are opportunities here (particularly when considered in combination with site DW35) to provide new areas of public open space, which both enhance the community offer in the area and go some way to protecting the common from additional regular walkers.

There are concerns about the current rural nature of West Street and the speed of traffic in this location, but development of this area may be able to resolve some of these issues with the movement of the 30mph limit further out of the village, and widening of the road, with the potential to consider a new footpath which is currently lacking.

The presence of the nearby allocation in Coach Drive means that the cumulative impact of development in the village if both sites were allocated would be quite significant. Therefore, an allocation here is not proposed.

Total:

5

* 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: DW35 **Date Survey Completed: 17/01/2017**

Site Name: North of West Street, Hothfield

Site Description:

This site is located on the western edge of the settlement of Hothfield, and is a parcel of land between West Street and Hothfield Common (Nature Reserve and SSSI), and joins the southern boundary of a detached dwelling, Wissenden Farm. Wissenden Farm is one of three large detached properties located on the edge the common itself, and their only vehicle access is through the common.

The site is currently a large field, with the common on its eastern boundary (defined by a mature hedgerow) and open countryside to the west, with a small cluster of rural properties 100m west of the site. To the south, on the opposing side of West Street, are fields which sit on higher land but are screened from the site by a bank and mature hedgerow.

The site boundary along West Street is defined by a well kept, but mature hedgerow. West Street in this location is a narrow rural road, and the 30mph restriction commences between the site and as it enters the built area of the settlement, with a row of terraced 2-storey housing (no's 1-9 West Street) whose gardens back on to the Common. These are Listed Buildings.

There are some trees and scrub within the site itself and around the boundaries However, there is no boundary between the site and agricultural land to the north and the western boundary of hedgerow is not well established along the full length, providing long views in places into the countryside beyond.

(Site has been considered in combination with DW34)

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 adjoins a Nature Reserve (Hothfield Common) and Downs West SSSI on the east side. Although development in this close proximity would be detrimental, there are opportunities for developments in this location to contribute to enhancements to the common, or mitigation by providing additional land which over time is likely to increase the species and quality of the environment	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 areas of mature tree and hedgerow around the site, but no designated areas or TPOs. There are no visible ponds or ditches and the site is currently in agricultural use. Some boundary trees may require removal for site access but there is also an opportunity to provide increased planting.	1

1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There is an opportunity to provide mitigation from development with enhancements through creation of new areas and links to local networks in Hothfield Common	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of the whole site could be detrimental to the existing character and quality of the rural landscape setting. The existing character of housing along West Street is linear form and set back from the road frontage, a limited amount of development, on areas of the site which are less intrusive to the landscape may be acceptable.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development of the site would be highly visible from the West Street entrance to the village and the countryside beyond; if current screening along the boundaries would need to be enhanced so that the visual impact would be minimal in the wider area.	-2
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 or adjoining	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not within flood zone 2 or 3	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?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The AStGWF map suggests that the submission site is located within a 1km grid square where less than 25% of the area is considered to be susceptible to groundwater flooding	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 4.67Ha and therefore would be large enough to provide 10 or more 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	
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1

7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Development of this site could create a gain in public open space to mitigate negative impacts that new development could have on Hothfield Common and may also improve connections around the settlement to these open spaces.	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?	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?	Yes	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?*	Sandgate Beds – Draft mineral areas 2014	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?		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?	No. The site is within 400m of Hothfield but there are limited village services. Charing or Ashford are the nearest district centres	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: There are a number of local issues in Hothfield village which create additional considerations when assessing the suitability of this site for allocation; these include the concentration of social housing in the central area and the poor physical integration between the social housing in the central core 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. Proposals for a visitor centre/café to complement Hothfield Common are being explored and development opportunities are being considered by the Neighbourhood Planning Group. **The assessment of this site results in an overall positive score and there are opportunities here (particularly when considered in combination with site DW35) to provide new areas of public open space, which both enhance the community offer in the area and go some way to protecting the common from additional regular walkers.** **There are concerns about the current rural nature of West Street and the speed of traffic in this location, but development of this area may be able to resolve some of these issues with the movement of the 30mph limit further out of the village, and widening of the road, with the potential to consider a new footpath which is currently lacking.** **The presence of the nearby allocation in Coach Drive means that the cumulative impact of development in the village if both sites were allocated would be quite significant. Therefore, an allocation here is not proposed.**			**Total:** **5**

* 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: S48 (DW39 and DW36) **Date Survey Completed: 16/02/2017**

Site Name: Land rear of Holiday Inn, Hothfield

Site Description:

The site is currently in horticultural use and sits to the rear of the Holiday Inn just off the A20. On the western boundary of the site there is more horticultural land that appears bordered by a hedgerow, whilst the north of the site is bounded by the M20 and screened by an embankment and mature hedgerow. The south of the site is bordered by Ram Lane, whilst to the east of the site there are scattered industrial buildings and residences which form a built up boundary.

Much of the site is clear from woodland, but there is one strip in the middle of the southern half of the site that is designated as Ancient Woodland and which is subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). There is a pond/lake directly adjacent to the southern edge of the site, as well as a TPO that lies next to it.

The site lies in proximity to a SSSI and Nature Reserve to the SE, as well as an AONB to the NE. Surrounding the site is predominantly agricultural fields. However, the east of the site is slightly more developed, consisting of residential and employment developments.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat. However, the Hothfied Common SSSI lies less than 500m SE of the site and additional indirect recreational pressure on the designated land may result. There is a parcel of Ancient Woodland (Kiln Field Alders) within the site.	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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?	Aside from the Ancient Woodland, there are a series of ponds at intervals between the north-east and south-west of the site, amid the Ancient Woodland. These would have to be maintained and enhanced.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential to reinforce the habitats supported by the Ancient Woodland, along the course of the drain, through this site and the adjoining site DW36.	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?*	The Kent Downs AONB is in close proximity to the NE.	-1
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development here is likely to have a minor negative impact on the landscape although this is mitigated by the bulky presence of the Holiday Inn building and other development in the Tutt Hill area.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development here would be likely to have a minor negative impact although the A20 has already seen significant ribbon development as a strategic road through the borough.	-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 not within or adjoining an area of archaeological importance or a CA.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain or adjoin a LB, SM or registered park/garden.	0
3.2	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?*	The site is not within a flood zone but adjoins a flood zone 2 and 3 on the west side.	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 – uFMfSW indicates site at risk from the 1 in 100 year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration may be suitable – further site investigation required to assess potential.	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)	The size of the site is approximately 44.76 Ha and therefore far exceeds 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?	Would need to provide on-site public open spaces and contribution to community facilities.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Although there are some local services available at Tutt Hill, main basic services are more than 1.6km away	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	More than 1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PRoW runs across the site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Gain – would be required to deliver an element of local public open space on the site	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes – 100m from M20 motorway to north of site.	-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	
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	The site would need to be accessed from the A20 (although it is also bordered by Ram Lane to the south). Access is currently via a 'lay-by' but direct access to the A20 is achievable and would provide a highway benefit.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No – just over 2km from National Cycle Route	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus stop 400m from site provides regular service (10x) to Ashford and Maidstone	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 – would be greenfield site where higher densities not appropriate	-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?*	The site is located atop known mineral reserves - silica sand/construction sand – Sandstone: Folkestone 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	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?	No – 1.5km from Hothfield village	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:	Total:
This site is located approximately halfway between Ashford and the primary rural service centre of Charing. With the exception of a very limited range of facilities at Tutt Hill itself, and a slightly greater range in Hothfield village which lies approximately 1.6km to the south, the majority of day to day services would be accessible at Charing or Ashford. The A20 provides a highly accessible route for the private car and existing bus services to either location. **Whilst accessibility to services on foot are limited, this needs to be balanced with the potential accessibility by car or bus to a much broader range of services than would be available in most edge of village locations which should off-set some of the negative scoring in the table above.** **The proximity to the AONB means that the landscape impact of development here would need to be mitigated but the existing backdrop of the Holiday Inn building and other development of varying scale and bulk at Tutt Hill mitigates any strategic visual or landscape impact from this site.** **This site also provides an opportunity to establish a development of sufficient scale to create some limited on-site local facilities for recreation that would serve the local community and ameliorate recreational pressures on the nearby SSSI. The site is fairly well visually contained and would be seen as an extension to the Tutt Hill settlement with the motorway acting as a physical boundary.** **The site provides an available and deliverable opportunity to deliver residential development in a relatively accessible and unconstrained location in the short term and would be suitable for a lower-density form of development that utilises the natural topography and vegetation on the site.**	**-7**

* 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: DW37 **Date Survey Completed: 18/01/2017**

Site Name: Pinetrees, Chapel Road

Site Description:

The site is a large area of land located between Ram lane and Chapel road, accessed directly from the A20, to the east of the petrol filling station and south of the Holiday Inn. The site is currently a large detached residential home and its curtilage which consists of a residential house, tennis court, swimming pool and stables, wooded land and paddocks.

The area in which the site is located is currently a small hamlet area, with an irregular pattern of limited housing around the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. To the south of the site is Lakeside Gardens Residential Home complex, and the Hothfield SSSI and nature reserve is located directly opposite the site, in Chapel 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?	The site directly adjoins the Hothfield Common SSSI and Hothfield Common Nature Reserve and additional recreational pressure on the designated land would result.	-2
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	There is a LWS within 400m to the south of the site within the Hothfield Common SSSI	-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?	There is no designation within the site itself, but there are a number of mature trees and hedgerows around the boundaries which may be supporting biodiversity.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This hamlet area is very rural in character and landscape. There is limited development in this area, and the mature hedgerows and trees within the Hothfield SSSI opposite in addition to those within the site creates an enclosed rural character.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The site is not widely visible due to the wooded areas and road boundaries, however, removal of some of this planting would be required to gain suitable access to the site and therefore would make the development visible.	-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 parcel of the site is within an area identified to have Archaeological potential	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain a listed building, SM or registered park, but there are two Listed Buildings directly opposite the site to the NW.	0
3.2	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?*	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?	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?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration. Proposed SuDS should be discussed with relevant stakeholders (LPA, LLFA and EA) at an early stage to understand possible constraints given that the site is located with a Source Protection Zone.	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)	The site is 2.376 Ha and therefore could meet requirements.	**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?	Although there are some local services available at Tutt Hill, main basic services are more than 1.6km away	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	More than 1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	800-1.6km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW through the site, but no footpaths on access roads	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, but Chapel Road is narrow, and may require widening and increased visibility splays	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?	Yes	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?	Only the residential property, not curtilage	-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?	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:			**Total:** -7

There are very limited range of facilities at Tutt Hill itself, but a slightly greater range in Hothfield village which lies approximately 1.6km to the south, and the majority of day to day services would be accessible at Charing or Ashford by car or bus via the A20. **However, development of this site would cause detrimental impacts to the adjoining SSSI and nature reserve, including increased recreational pressure, which has been identified as a particular concern.** **A large part of the site is within an area of Archaeological potential and there are some listed buildings nearby, which may be impacted by increased traffic in Chapel Road. The road is narrow and the mature trees and planting create an enclosed character. A large amount of development, which would require the loss of trees and possible road widening of the narrow road, would change the character of this rural hamlet.** **The site is within a groundwater source protection zone and has been identified as an area of vulnerability.** **This site is unsuitable for allocation.**	

* 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: WE46 **Date Survey Completed: 19/01/2017**

Site Name: Kingsnorth Glebe and The Rectory, Church Hill

Site Description:

The site borders and adjoins the edge of Kingsnorth Village. A large area of land - primarily agricultural which is sub-divided into fields with hedges and trees throughout. The land slopes up to a ridge to the south of Kingsnorth Village and heads towards Stubbs Cross on the west. Access to the site would be through existing residential properties.

Part of this site is identified as a site allocation for residential development, but the area in the north, including the new proposed areas omission sites, are directly adjoining Church Hill properties and the area which has been identified as a strategic green buffer area to protect the character of the village.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 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	-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?	Not within or near green corridor at present but is identified as an area of potential future extension	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No – would not be in keeping with the current built form of Church Hill.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – it would change the open nature currently in the south of Church Hill, Particularly impacting on the setting of the CA.	-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 adjoining and partially within a CA, and is in very close proximity to a pair of archaeological sites.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Adjoins a number of Listed Buildings in the heritage cluster around the church	-1
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?*	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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	1
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	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?	400-800m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Less than 400m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 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	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	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **This site proposal would form a backland development of the properties on Church Hill, Kingsnorth, and most of this site has been identified in the Local Plan as a 'strategic green buffer' area to protect the village from the planned large scale developments proposed further south. This site is not suitable for allocation in the Local Plan for development, as it would impact on the planned green buffer area and the future potential area for Green Corridor extension.**			**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: WE47 **Date Survey Completed: 19/01/2017**

Site Name: Steeds Lane (Land South of Park Farm South allocation)

Site Description:

This site is currently in agricultural use within the open countryside, and is divided across its centre by a drain bounded with vegetation. The site is located between Brockman's Lane to the north, the Ashford- Hastings railway line and A2070 bypass to the east and the southern boundary of the site is formed by a mature hedge and a bridleway, which crosses the A2070 and into Steeds Lane. Beyond this, the south and east is open countryside. The eastern edge of the site adjoins a section of the South Willesborough Dykes.

The site is large, at over 13ha, but is limited by the fact that most of the centre and east of the site is located in Flood Zone 3.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in immediate close proximity to a LWS but the South Willesborough Dykes LWS lies within 600m to the NE.	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?	Majority of site is currently agricultural and therefore significant potential to improve biodiversity offer with on-site wetland enhancement and connectivity. However, there is potential for current field- and stream-bounding hedging to be lost	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Yes – potential to extend green corridor and to provide water-based habitat linkages through the drain on this site and ponds beyond, and particularly across the A2070 to the west.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No – potential to extend GC south with the assistance of this site.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This area has undergone much development in recent years with Bridgefield and Finberry to the north. At present the site is rural in	-1

		character and development would impact on the landscape.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – development on this site would extend the built urban area south and could only proceed once development to the west is completed, else it would constitute a standalone urban parcel in 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?*	Not within or adjoining	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Neutral impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	At least half of the site is within a 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?	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?	Infiltration may be suitable. Mapping suggests moderate risk of groundwater flooding and underlying soils may be permeable. Further 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 is in an area of variable risk to 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**
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?	Neutral impact	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	No - More than 1.6km	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No - More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	800m-1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	400-800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No	
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential for expansion of the Ashford Green Corridor through the site	
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?	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 new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No – currently agricultural land	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No – no structures on site	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes – southern part of site on Sub-Alluvial River Terrace Deposits	
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?	None	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: The site demonstrates a considerable number of constraints, including large portions of it being located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, the southern part's mineral reserves, and its relative distance from services, pedestrian and public transport infrastructure means that at present it cannot be said to be a particularly sustainable site at present. **However, land on the northern side of the Brockman's Lane is identified for residential development as Policy S14 and the allocation of that site presents the opportunity to bring forward this additional area of land to achieve a comprehensive approach to the area and form part of the wider network of development and supporting infrastructure that could be well connected to adjoining development and services. There is scope for continuation of residential development on the northern part of this site as well as significant biodiversity and habitat enhancement on the eastern and southern part of the site which is located in the floodzone, and Green corridor extensions.**			**Total:** **-2**

Site Ref: WE30 **Date Survey Completed: 07/02/2017**

Site Name: Hedge and Sarac, Stumble Lane

Site Description:

This site is located to the rear of two properties, Hedge End and Stumble Farmhouse on Stumble Lane. The site is agricultural land and curtilage in use mostly as equestrian paddocks and facilities.

To the north of the site is a large ancient woodland. To the east is open countryside and pockets of woodland. To the south east is Stumble Lane which is a rural road with ribbon form development along both sides, mainly detached properties with large gardens.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 contains numerous mature trees and hedgerows and adjoins Ancient Woodland therefore they may be some impact on biodiversity	-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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would significantly alter the rural character of the site and not be in keeping with the intermittent ribbon development which is prominent in this rural location.	-2

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development of the site would be visible from Finn Farm Lane, and would change the rural view for existing residents	-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 not within or adjoining an area of archaeological importance or a CA.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain or adjoin a LB, SM or registered park/garden, but Pickenden LB is just opposite the west of the site.	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?*	Not in a 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?	Between 10 and 50% coverage of 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability	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	**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?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	800m-1.6km	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	800m-1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	800m-1.6km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 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	1
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?	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 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	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?	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?	No, Park Farm, Kingsnorth	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: **The site is relatively poorly related to existing local facilities and separate from the main built up part of the Ashford urban area, and is not within a rural settlement. Development here would be a significant intrusion into open countryside and be backland development in this rural hamlet which will impact on the rural road network. The site is not considered suitable for development.**			**Total:** **-3**

* 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: WE52 **Date Survey Completed: 12/1/2017**

Site Name: Bower Farm, Mersham

Site Description:

This site is located on the edge of the settlement of Mersham, to the south of Bower Road where the access is located. The site is currently in active employment/Farming use and contains three large structures, along with a telecommunications mast, storage and hardstanding areas.

The driveway to the site is relatively long, and therefore the main area of the site is separated from the current built form of the village to the north and west by around 80-100m, by agricultural fields. However, there currently a new development of Local needs housing being construction to the north of the farm buildings in Bower Road, which adjoin the length of the driveway and a boundary to the site.

There are a number of large mature trees and hedgerows around the site, limiting visibility of the site from the wider 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 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 is currently an access so no loss would be required. There are a number of large mature trees on the site boundaries. Development of the site would require careful planning in order to retain these.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would be backland development at the rear of a Local Needs exception site. Due to its location – extending the current settlement form into the countryside it would not be in keeping with the current area, and would leave a field area gap in the built form. However, as the site is	-1

		currently employment use, its overall impact on the landscape would be minimal.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development of this could create an improved visual impact, due to its change from large storage and parking to residential, and as backland development this would be minimal visual impact from the street. However the views do extend into the wider countryside from this location, as the majority of the site is surrounded by agricultural fields.	1
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 or adjoining	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Yes, Bower House (LB) is opposite the site access but due to existing use of the site and new development adjacent, it would not increase negative impacts.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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)	Site is over 0.5 Ha but due to the shape and location is unlikely to meet the requirements to provide affordable housing. The site has	0

		been submitted for consideration for Exclusive Homes.	
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?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – closest GP surgery is over 1.6km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400-800m	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)	400-800m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	400-800m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 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	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	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	-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)	Site is 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?	Loss of rural employment space.	-1
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?	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:			**Total:**

This site lies on the edge of the existing confines to the village of Mersham, and would be backland development behind a new development of Local Needs homes permitted on an exception basis. **Development of the site would require demolition of the existing structures and storage buildings and would involve a loss of active employment space in the borough.** **The site is Grade 2 Agricultural land, and development of part of the site would alter the rural context of this site open up the remaining area between the site and the village for consideration in the future.** **The site does have access from the Highway but there are concerns about narrow access road due to its length and lack of passing places.** **The site is not considered suitable for allocation.** **The site was submitted for exclusive homes and therefore has been considered on this basis in addition to general market housing. The site location does not appear to meet the criteria to provide exclusive homes, partly due to the loss of employment space and partly due to the new, more urban setting created by the adjoining Local Needs homes development.**	**3**

* 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: WE53 **Date Survey Completed: 12/1/2017**

Site Name: Land at Old Rectory Close, Mersham

Site Description:

This site is located on the edge of the settlement of Mersham, on an entrance road into the village from the A20. To the north of the site is open fields, which are then dissected by the M20 motorway and the A20 from the wider area. To the south is the residential edge of the settlement, and the western corner adjoins the recreation field which adjoins Glebelands. It is separated from the site by a mature tree boundary.

The site is currently an enclosed field off the entrance to a small cul-de-sac of housing (Old Rectory Close) which consists of 7 large detached properties, and wraps around the rear of Glebe House, a large Grade ll listed building on the main road frontage. There is also a large natural open space buffer to the east of the site, on the entrance to the close which is covered in mature trees and hedgerows, limiting views into the site and the close from the main road frontage.

The land is relatively flat and grassed, with a low level wooden fence around the frontage. It may have been in use as a paddock as there is a gated farm access from the cul-de-sac. There are a number of large mature trees and hedges around the site boundaries and within the site also, and a pond in the eastern corner.

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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 trees or hedgerows on the frontage where the access would be created and therefore no loss would be required. There are a number of large mature trees on the site boundaries and within the site itself. Development of the site would require careful planning in order to retain these where possible due to their protection under the Conservation Area designation.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There are ponds within the site and connections to the countryside. Development here may be able to improve and enhance any identified linkages.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would be an extension of the built development already within the close and could respect the character and quality of this built area, if design and layout was carefully planned. To ensure protection of the landscape character, the trees and hedgerows must be retained in any new development scheme.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development of this site could create a detrimental visual impact, due to its change from greenfield to built development. The views do extend into the countryside from this location, but due to the mature tree boundaries, the site would be contained from the wider setting.	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Within 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 2 Listed buildings in close proximity, Glebe House, directly to the south within 25m of the frontage and Newhouse (with listed walled garden to the Southeast and a listed outbuilding) on the opposite side of the main road, within 50m.	-1
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?*	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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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)	Site is 1.382 Ha and would meet the affordable housing threshold.	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?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400-800m	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, and development could provide improved access from this side of the village (Glebelands access is very narrow) Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	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 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?	Yes	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?*	Yes	-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?	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?	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: **This site lies on the edge of the existing confines to the village of Mersham, and although development here would extend the confines of the village, it would be reasonably well contained by the mature boundaries and as access would be from an existing cul-de-sac it would not impact on the main road network or be visually intrusive in the landscape or wider village character.** **Careful consideration would need to be given to protection of the mature trees and ponds within and around the site, and layout and densities would need to respect the Conservation Area setting and the proximity to the nearby listed buildings as Newhouse is Grade ll*, - the area is important in heritage terms.** **Development of the site could provide opportunities to enhance the recreation ground and pedestrian links through to Glebelands, and provide affordable housing.**			**Total:** **3**

* 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: WE54 **Date Survey Completed 12/1/2017**

Site Name: Land at Bower Road, Mersham

Site Description:

This site is located on the edge of the settlement of Mersham, and incorporates one property on Bower Road (no.11), which then leads to a larger area at the rear and forms a square behind the properties in Oaklands and others along The Street and 1-10 Bower Road.

The main part of the site is currently an agricultural field, which is accessed through a gate from the end of the widened driveway of no.11 property. The site is however, part of a much larger field, which extends further into the countryside in the north easterly direction.

The land is relatively flat although does incline slightly northeast and currently grass (not planted for agriculture), There are a number of large mature trees and hedgerows around the wider field boundaries. However, there is not currently a boundary between the site itself and the remaining parcels of the field.

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?	Not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 is currently an access so no loss would be required. There are a number of large mature trees on the site boundaries. Development of the site would require careful planning in order to retain these as some have protection under the Conservation Area designation.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Development of this site would be an extension of the built development and would be backland. This would not be in keeping with the character of the current built area and the current linear form.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Development of this site could create a detrimental visual impact, due to its change from greenfield to built development and would impact on the properties which currently adjoin it, but as backland development this would be minimal impact from the street. The views do extend into the wider countryside (particularly the wider field) from this location, but due to the mature tree boundaries around the wider field these would be contained from the wider setting.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Adjoining 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 a number of Listed buildings in close proximity, Newhouse (with walled garden to North) is visible from the site itself.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?		
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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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)	Site is 1.356 Ha and would meet the affordable housing threshold.	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?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	400-800m	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)	800-1.6km away	-1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 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, but is opposite a junction and therefore access would be unacceptable	-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?	Yes	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)	Majority of the site is 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?	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: **This site lies on the edge of the existing confines to the village of Mersham, and would be backland development which would be visible to the properties on 3 boundaries, many of which are Listed buildings. The development of the site would require demolition of 11 Bower Road, which would alter the current linear form of development in this location.** **The site would be reasonably well contained visually in the wider setting due to its location and by the mature trees and hedgerows around most of its boundaries, although would be visible from the PROW**			**Total:** **-1**

which runs along the site boundary. Careful consideration would need to be given to protection of the mature trees around the site, particularly where it adjoins the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. **However, the site is part of a larger field which is Grade 2 Agricultural land, and development of part of the site would alter the context of this area and open up the remaining area for consideration in the future.** **The site does have access from the Highway but there are concerns about the proximity of this to the junction opposite, and the visibility splays that could be achieved here, making the access unsuitable for a site allocation.**	

* 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: WE44 **Date Survey Completed: 19/01/2017**

Site Name: Batts Farm (Court Lodge) , Rear of Sevington Church, A2070

Site Description:

The site is located on the urban periphery opposite the Barrey Road industrial estate, on the opposing side of the A2070. Currently it comprises of the Court Lodge Farm, other buildings and a veterinary practice. The buildings are set among agricultural land, and include the following:

- **Court Lodge, a large 16th century house which is Grade II listed;**
- **Court Lodge Barn, an 18th century barn, which is also Grade II listed;**
- **Large single storey barn, in use as a specialist equestrian veterinary practice; and**
- **Circa. fourteen other ancillary buildings used for paddocks, agricultural storage garages or barns.**

The site adjoins the St.Mary's Church curtilage on its northern boundary. The land that isn't currently developed is mainly vacant land adjoining agricultural. From the west and south the site is well screened by trees, whilst on the east it is possible to view the site from Church Road across the agricultural fields.

The site boundaries are defined by a fence that runs along the perimeter, which is reinforced in areas by woodland, hedgerows and Church Road. To the west there is a main highway, separating the rural site from a business park. To the north of the site there appears unused land, whilst to the east the land is used agriculturally. Immediately south there is a small area of woodland, whilst beyond this there is the HGV truck stop at Waterbrook.

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 not adjoining or within a designated habitat, but is in close proximity to a nature reserve.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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 a number of tree within the site itself and around the field and property boundaries of the site, along with mature hedgerows. There is a substantial tree buffer between the site and the A2070	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?	It is separated from the GC by the A2070	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is within a very sensitive character area, in that it is an area of land which contains numerous listed buildings and is currently surrounded by open countryside. Therefore development here would need to enhance this setting.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	At present, the area is rural in nature and could be visible from the countryside. In future, the nearby allocation to the east of employment uses, will change this rural setting, making development of this site less intrusive.	-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 not within or adjoining a CA or archeological site, but there is an archeological site adjacent to the north 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 site does not contain or adjoin a SM or registered park but contains the Court Lodge Farm and other Grade 2 listed buildings. The Church of St Mary LB is in the parcel of land just to the north of the site also and the site is part of the setting of these heritage assets.	-1
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No – see above, the site area is a heritage asset and a setting to the church	-1
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	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)	The site is large enough to provide 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?	The proposals for the site include enhanced community and employment	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	800m-1.6km	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	More than 1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	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 landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The A2070 is adjacent	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?	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 new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Part	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?*	Yes limestone_hythe_formation_kentish_ ragstone	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	
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?	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	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 on the urban periphery and has excellent access to the road network but at present has limited walking access to local services and is not considered suitable for residential allocation.** **The site is very sensitive in terms of heritage assets due to the amount of Listed Buildings within the site, and the setting of the church directly to the north. It is understood from the site submission that the development is intended to provide community and employment uses, in addition to residential, and provide benefits to/with the church. If this is to be proposed, then detailed work would be required to ensure these enhancements of the heritage assets.** **At present, the site is located in a rural location countryside edge, away from any settlement or significant built form. The context of the site is likely to change in future, once work is underway on the nearby urban fringe developments along the eastern side of the A2070, but at present the site is not suitable for allocation for residential use.**			**Total:** **0**

* 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: WS33 **Date Survey Completed: 26/01/2017**

Site Name: Land adjacent to Bethersden Road and Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst

Site Description:

This is a substantial site extending west from the village of Shadoxhurst, flanking the former Shadoxhurst garage premises to the site's south-east. The land is broadly flat. It adjoins Handcocks Farm buildings at the site's north-east which, at the present time, is some 600m from the edge of Shadoxhurst, well into the countryside. The Bethersden Road flanks the north/north eastern boundary and arable land and a large area of Ancient Woodland (Colebran/Whitepost Wood) form the western boundary. The southern edge of the land adjoins the Woodchurch Road.

A Roman Road runs E-W in a belt across the centre of the site. This takes up a substantial part of the middle of the site in conjunction with its associated area of archaeological potential. Further north, a tributary of the Bethersden Stream runs across the site, and there is therefore a notable part of the north of the site within Flood Zones 2 and 3.

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. The site is directly adjacent to a LWS along most of its south western boundary. There is also another area of LWS 100m to the north of the site. Development here would have a detrimental impact on this LWS and species and habitats around the site.	-2
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 directly adjacent to a large area of Ancient Woodland, the boundaries of the site also contain a number of mature trees and hedgerows.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There is some potential for habitat reinforcement and connectivity especially along the course of the stream. Given that this is a large site, there is scope for significant landscaping for biodiversity.	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?	This site is not well related to the existing built area of Shadoxhurst. There is currently an overwhelmingly rural entrance to the village from Bethersden and Woodchurch. Development on this site would erode the character of this location and the adjoining woodlands, and would stretch the village westwards in a linear fashion further from the centre.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is prominent and can be seen from a number of locations along the main roads around the village. Development here would create an identifiable visual impact and result in substantial change to the landscape views from the north and south in particular.	-2
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 has identified Archaeological potential - Roman Road that goes across the site. It is over 350m from the CA.	-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?	Development on the site has the potential to detrimentally impact a site of archaeological potential.	-1
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	The site has a strip across the northern area of the site which is within flood zones 2 & 3	-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 northern part of the site is at risk from both the 1 in 100 year event and the 1 in 30 year event. However, the majority of the site is not at 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	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 - Site is 21ha	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 1.1km	-1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	1.1km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No footpath on this highway, but there is a PRoW running north to south across 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?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – farm access points only	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. National Route 18 goes through Shadoxhurst, as does 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?	100m 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?	Increase – being promoted for mixed use	1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Limited	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?	No	n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: **There a multiple constraints across this large site, particularly the impact of such scale of development on a small settlement.** **The site is relatively far from any village services and there are limited accessible pedestrian routes connecting the site and the village and so significant upgrades would be needed to highways infrastructure to support development.** **The northern part of the site is highly constrained through its situation within Flood Zone 3 while, further south, the belt of Archaeological Potential should limit development further since this is a site of a notable Roman routeway. This would reduce any developable area quite substantially.** **Adjacency along the site's western edge to Ancient Woodland and a Local Wildlife brings further constraints to development. While the southern part of the site has fewer constraints, the Woodchurch Road frontage provides a rural gateway to Shadoxhurst. The landscape character of this area would be undermined by development along this route, which does not benefit from pedestrian footways connecting it to any village centre.** **Development in this location at this time, without significant community and infrastructure improvements on site – which could be challenging given the constraints above - would be unsustainable. Development on a site of this size would not be suitable given the scale of Shadoxhurst.**			**Total:** -9

* 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: SS58 **Date Survey Completed: 18/01/2017**

Site Name: Land at the Caldecott Foundation, Smeeth

Site Description:

This site is located between the M20 motorway to the south and the A20 to the north. It is currently in operation as a charitable, partly on-site residential, school; The Caldecott Foundation. Planned future changes to the operations of the charity will release a number of parcels of brownfield land within the site, which are currently used as the on-site residential elements.

The site is accessed from the A20, which is a key transport route into Ashford. The site is a short distance from the nearby local centres within Willesborough and the villages of Smeeth/Brabourne and Mersham. There is also an entrance to the site from Station Road on the eastern boundary.

Currently within the site are a number of buildings associated with the current use which are detached residential buildings within large curtilages, mostly situated around the western area of the site, most notably within the site boundary is the main building located on the A20 frontage, which although not listed, is significant in terms of local heritage interest

The site is relatively level. It contains a large amount of mature trees around the boundaries and within the site curtilage itself, which creates a secluded, parkland character and setting. Along the north western boundary of the site, adjacent to the A20 access in an area of long established woodland and a smaller pocket of trees which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order on the western edge.

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 not within or adjoining any designated habitats, but is in proximity to a SSSI to the north of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, the site is not in close proximity 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?	Yes, but there may be opportunities to mitigate any potential adverse impacts within the site and the wider land ownership.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potentially	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site's size will enable development to take account of the character of existing valued buildings on the site, any protected trees or ecological assets, with limited impact on landscape as it lies between the A20 and M20.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	No significant visual impact, due to site location.	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 southern third of the site is in an AAP (early prehistory), and is situated immediately south of the Smeeth Conservation Area.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Does not contain a listed building, SM and is not in a historic park or garden. The site is 200m to the east of a group of separately-listed buildings associated with Homelands, and there are no built structures between these and this site.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Any development on this site, despite being located between the A20 and the M20, will have to be sensitively designed and laid out to take account of the Conservation Area to the north (although this shows a variety of building types) and the listed buildings to the west.	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations 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	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 loss but unlikely to be a gain	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	800m-1.6km	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	800m-1.6km	-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)	Less than 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	800m-1.6km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Neither	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Site is adjacent to M20	-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	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	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?	Not known	0
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Yes, in part	1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	Potentially, yes	1
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)	The site is both Grade 2 and 3 land but is not used for agriculture	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	N/A	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?	Redevelopment in part of an educational facility	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	N/A	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:			**Total:**

This site represents an unusual opportunity to redevelop (in part) an existing brownfield location with good accessibility to the main highway network. Although not within or adjacent to the body of an existing settlement, the site lies relatively close to facilities in Smeeth / Brabourne Lees, Mersham (inc. the nearby Evegate Mill site) and fast journey time to Sellindge and Ashford. It does not have any major infrastructure constraints or designations that would affect the principle of development here and lies in an area of limited landscape value between the A20 and M20. The site is available and deliverable within the short term and suitable for allocation in the Plan.	**-1**

* 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: SS59 **Date Survey Completed: 18/01/2017**

Site Name: Smeeth Playing Fields

Site Description:

This site is located in the village of Smeeth, and is an area of land which is located at the main southern entrance into the village at the junction of Church Road and The Ridgeway. This site currently has 2 functions. The northern parcel of the site, which runs along The Ridgeway is currently a community facility consisting of a sports pitch, scouting hut, play area and small gravel car park, accessed from Church Road. The southern parcel of land along Church Road is part of a larger agricultural field.

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 not within or adjoining any designated habitats.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Would not have any known impacts, as site is 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 mature trees and hedgerows around the road boundaries of this site, which are well maintained. There is a hedge boundary between the playing fields and agricultural field. There is already a site access but this may not be large enough and therefore some hedgerow may need to be removed.	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	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site lies at the southern entrance to Smeeth. At present the northern area of this site is a gap in the linear development along the Ridgeway. There is also currently linear development adjacent to and opposite the site in this location, so limited development on this northern edge would not have a significant impact on the character of	-1

		landscape, although it would affect the character of this entrance to the village. The southern area of the site along Church Road is more rural in setting with minimal housing in this location and development would have a negative impact here on the rural landscape and character.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The southern area of the site along Church Road is more rural in setting with minimal housing. Development would be visible in the wider area from this location and have a negative 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 not within or adjoining an archaeological site but is in proximity to a CA to the south.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site does not contain or adjoin a listed building, SM or registered park/garden. The site is however in proximity to a variety of listed buildings to the south in the CA.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations 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 is in an area of variable risk to 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?	Overall site size and developable area large enough to provide affordable provision.	1

	(currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Proposal also suggests Local Needs may be considered.	
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?	Proposal includes Improved playing fields, including a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) and retention and enhancement of the play facilities and car parking but also redevelopment of existing playing fields. It is currently unclear how deliverable or sustainable the additional facilities are, so a neutral score is appropriate	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	400m – 800m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	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)	Less than 400m – the site is one	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Less than 400m – the site is one	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Site would potentially result in a gain of open space with improvements to the sports pitch provision	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 – this may need to be widened.	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?	Yes	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?	Not known	0
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?*	North west corner – Folkestone Beds Southern area - Sandgate beds	-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 mostly Grade 3 with a small amount of Grade 2 land in the NW corner – currently playing field.	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?	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: **This site scores well with regards to its accessibility to local shops and services in Smeeth / Brabourne Lees and is promoted as providing some improved community facilities which include additional playing fields, including a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) to serve a wider catchment area.** **However, the site forms a visually prominent entrance to the southern edge of Smeeth and would result in a significant change to the character of this part of the village. Built development would not be suitable on the southern parcel of the site, along Church Road, as this forms part of the rural setting of the village and the impact development in this location would have on the nearby Conservation Area, and the countryside setting as it would be highly visible in the wider landscape.** **Development on the northern part of the site would require the relocation of the existing playing field or otherwise the loss of an important local facility would occur. The southern part of the site may be suitable for the improved sports and community facilities but no case has been made for additional activity and traffic to the site. Church Road is very narrow in places.** **Development of the northern part of this site may be suitable in the future for a limited amount of housing development. This part of the site is adjoined by linear housing on all sides and therefore development would be in keeping with the built surroundings. Careful consideration would need to be given to the layout, to ensure minimal harm to the surrounding countryside and the character at this key entrance to the village.** **The presence of the adjoining allocation on the southern side of Church Road means that the cumulative impact of development in this part of Smeeth if both sites were allocated would be quite significant. Therefore, an allocation here is not proposed.**			**Total:** **3**

* 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: S49 (incorporating part of DW40) **Date Survey Completed: 08/02/2017**

Site Name: Land north of Tutt Hill, Westwell

Site Description:

The site is predominantly agricultural land that lies to the rear of Oakover Nurseries, the Beefeater Woolpack and the Ashford North Premier Inn. The north of the site is bordered by the M20, whilst the west side is bounded by the A20 and the east by hedgerows and a railway line.

The vast majority of the site is agricultural land, but there are trees on the northern boundary of the site and surrounding Lake House which is currently used as a commercial 'retreat' Centre. There are no ecological designations within the site currently, although there is a SSSI and Nature Reserve in close proximity to the south of the site.

The land east, west and north of the site (and the M20) is mainly agricultural fields with scattered residential development, whilst the south of the site consists of employment and housing developments.

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 located close to Hothfield Common, which is a designated SSSI. Potential for minor indirect disturbance due to recreational pressure and limited availability of alternatives in the vicinity of the site	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have 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?	Unlikely given site constraints and surrounding land uses and the nature of the site itself	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?*	Adjoins the AONB, which lies to the north	-1
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The presence of existing built development in the area at Tutt Hill and the adjacent Premier Inn / Beefeater mitigates impact on the	-1

		landscape from new development. Likely minor effects when viewed from the AONB.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Potentially a minor negative impact when viewed from the AONB.	-1
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 or adjoining.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	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?	Yes	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)	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?	Limited provision of services at Tutt Hill (pub, takeaway, petrol filling station) plus local store at Hothfield but nearest general services at Charing or Ashford.	-2

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km (Charing)	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	More than 1.6km (Charing or Repton Park)	-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)	The site is in proximity (400-800m) of Hothfield Common on the opposite side of the A20.	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	More than 1.6km	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes – a public footpath runs along the boundary of the site and provides access to the wider countryside	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of local or strategic open spaces	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes – the site adjoins the transport corridor carrying the M20, CTRL and Ashford – Maidstone railway, so there is potential for noise pollution	-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- from the A20	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?	Yes.	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	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?*	Silica sand – construction sand	-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?	N/A	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?	N/A	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	N/A	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: **This site is located approximately halfway between Ashford and the primary rural service centre of Charing. With the exception of a very limited range of facilities at Tutt Hill itself, and a slightly greater range in Hothfield village which lies approximately 1.6km to the south, the majority of day to day services would be accessible at Charing or Ashford. The A20 provides a highly accessible route for the private car and existing bus services to either location.**			**Total:** **-7**

Whilst accessibility to services on foot are limited, this needs to be balanced with the potential accessibility by car or bus to a much broader range of services than would be available in most edge of village locations which should off-set some of the negative scoring in the table above. **The proximity to the AONB means that the landscape impact of development here would need to be mitigated but the existing backdrop of development of varying scale and bulk at Tutt Hill reduces any strategic visual or landscape impact from this site.** **The site is available and deliverable in the short term and suitable for a limited scale of development.**	

* 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: IO25 **Date Survey Completed: 20/01/2017**

Site Name: Land adjoining Poplar Farm, Wittersham

Site Description:

This site is located on the northern edge of the settlement, to the east of Lloyds Green Cul-de-sac and north and west of Woodland View (a close of Local Needs housing accessed off the larger Forge Meads Cul-de-sac). There is also a large open amenity space and play area accessed from Woodland View which the site borders on its north and west boundaries. This boundary is currently defined by established hedgerow/trees.

The site is currently a large field, with mature tree and hedgerow borders on most sides. Along the northern boundary of the site is a large area Ancient Woodland, which is protected by TPO and a designated Local Wildlife Site. To the east of the northern parcel of the site is open countryside – agricultural fields, and at this point there is no mature planted 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 not within or adjoining a designated habitat.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	The northern edge of the site is within/adjoining a LWS (Comb Woods, Rushgreen Wood and Stemps Wood) and therefore development in the northern areas would have a significant effect.	-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?	The northern area of the site, is protected woodland (By TPO) and LWS. Development in this part of the site would result in a loss of important habitat networks. However, the more southern areas of the site are less sensitive and adjoin existing housing areas. There are some tree boundaries, and some may need to be removed to create access to the site.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	There is potential to create new habitat network in the northern area of this site.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	The site is within the High Weald AONB.	-2

2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site lies at the rear of 2 built up areas of the village, and would effectively join the two together, and therefore would be in keeping with the existing character of townscape. The site is currently agricultural fields, with strong tree boundaries in most locations and built development would alter the existing landscape character.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The site is not visible in the wider setting of the village, due to its location at the rear of the existing built development. To the north of the site is a strong woodland boundary, which prevents views of the site in the wider countryside/AONB setting . However, there is a gap on this boundary, which allows views to and from the site, particularly from PROW across this area.	-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 not within or adjoining an area of archaeological importance.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	The site adjoins a listed building on the SW (24 & 26 Poplar Road).	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	n/a	
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable. Mapping suggests a low risk of ground water flooding however, site investigations should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	1
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)	The size of the site is 5.858 Ha and therefore would be able to provide 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 Centre/ Shop?	Yes	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Under 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)	Adjacent	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Adjacent	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Less than 400m	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Not proposed	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	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	1
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Not currently, but 2 access points could be achieved. Development of the site could provide improvements to the network as would join 2 cul-de-sacs.	0
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?	Yes	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?*	Ashdown Beds to the north	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?	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:

This site has a number of constraints to development, in particular in the northern area where the site adjoins the Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Site. The site is also within the High Weald AONB.

The site scores positively in a number of areas, it has good access to services due to its village location, and also provides an opportunity to improve the existing road network by linking together 2 cul-de-sacs, and improve links to the amenity space and play area off Woodland View. Woodland View is a small close of Local needs housing, and is somewhat detached from the built area around it.

With regards to impact on the AONB and the landscape, development of this site would create minimal visual impact. The site lies to the rear of current built development and would not be from the main route through the settlement. The Ancient woodland which spreads beyond the site to the north for some distance, would also limit the views of development in the wider setting. Additional planting and screening on the sites eastern boundary could also go some way to mitigating the visual impact on the wider AONB and could improve the current views of Lloyds Green and Woodland View in this area.

The southern areas of the site, where it already joins built development in the two cul-de-sacs is suitable for a limited amount of low-density development which is more suitable for AONB, and must not impact on the listed buildings which adjoin. Due to the close proximity to the LWS and Woodland, and views and setting of the AONB, development on the northern area of this site would not be suitable. However, this area could provide enhancements to the overall network and mitigation of negative effects by acting as buffer of enhanced natural green space, with additional planting and screening.

Total:

3

* 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.

Appendix 3 – New sites that were proposed during the regulation 19 consultation but were ruled out at SHELAA stage.

SHELAA REF	ASHFORD URBAN SITES
WE30	Site 2 - Land to the rear of Hedge End, Stumble Lane, Kingsnorth,
WS4	Church Hill, Kingsnorth
WE4	Land at Finn Farm, South of Kingsnorth
WE48	Cheeseman's Green
WE50	Swanton, Cheeseman's Green
WE51	Waterbrook Gateway
WE10	Land at South Stour Apiary and Munday Farm House, Cheesman's Green
WE15	Sevington
NW3	S19 Conningbrook Phase 2 – Extension to boundary
NW2	10a Blackwall Road North
DW9	Land rear of 'Woodside', Westwell Lane, Ashford, A20
BO1	The Warren Park and ride site
BAE5	Land at 198 Sandyhurst Lane, Kennington
BAE2	Former sandpit quarry, Sandyhurst Lane, Ashford

SHELAA REF	TENTERDEN AND ST MICHAELS SITES
TS3	Land at Appledore Road/ Woodchurch Road Tenterden
TS2	Land South of Tilden Gill, Tenterden
SM1	St Michaels - Exclusive Homes extension
TS13 +TS7	Land south of Tenterden (Sandy Lane and Hopes Grove Farm)
WC85	Land to the east of St Michael's Vicarage
TS4/TSRTW2	Hopes Grove Nursery – Tenterden
RTW2	Extension to Pickhill Business Park, Tenterden

SHELAA REF	VILLAGES SITES
SS5	Land between Roman Road and Goldwell Lane Aldington
SS1	Coopers Field, Roman Road, Aldington
IO28	Magpie Farm, Appledore
IO29	School Field, School Lane, Appledore
IO22a	The Walnut Field 1022a, Appledore
IO22b	The Quillet 1022b garden and fields, Appledore
IO30	Land west of School Road, Appledore
WC33	Forge Hill. Bethersden
WC88	The Old Sawmills, Pluckley Road, Bethersden
BD18	The Old Railway Station,1 Headcorn Road, Biddenden
BD4	Townland Close, Biddenden
BAE1	Lenacre Hall Farm, Boughton Aluph
BAE4	Land at Rook Toll, Faversham Road, Boughton Lees.
SS57	Land off Lees Road, Brabourne Lees
DW38	Squids Gate Farm, Squids Gate Lane, Challock
DW2	Pony Park, Canterbury Road, Challock
DN3	Ashford Road Service Station, Ashford Road, Chilham
DN2	Land at Harvest House, Branch Road, Chilham,
DN1	Cobbs Hill and Long Hill, Chilham
DN2	Harvest House, Branch Road, Chilham

DN3	Ashford Road Service Station, Chilham
DN12	Land between Bagham Lane and Fellborough Close, Chilham
DN13	Land between Bagham Road, Arden Grange & Recreation Ground, Chilham
CH5	land at Charing Hill
CH30	Land South of Maidstone Road, Charing
WC72	Land at Great Chart Golf Course, Bears Lane, Great Chart
GCS14	Ninn Lane, Great Chart
WS35	Land Adjacent Mountain Farm, Hamstreet
WC12	Land at Hope House, High Halden
WC74	Church Road, High Halden
DN29	Land at 1-5 The Oast House, Lower Lees Road, Old Wives Lees
RTW1	Copfield Farm, Rolvenden.
WS17	North of Woodchurch road, Shadoxhurst
WN5	Land between Stanley House and Longmeadow, Smarden
WN6	Water Lane - Smarden
WN23	Gillets Farm, Smarden
WN4	Land at The Street, Smarden
SS8	Old Builders Yard, Plain Road, Smeeth
SS42	Bromley Green Road, nr.Ruckinge
WS69	Bournes Field (Land to the north of Bournes Place), Woodchurch
WS44	Land adjacent HA development at Appledore Road, Woodchurch
WS27	Land south of Rectory Close, Woodchurch