

**APPENDIX 4 – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

**Review of site conclusions HAM01; HAM02/03; HAM07/10/12**

The Sustainability Appraisal highlights the following conclusions for each of the sites at Hamstreet listed above, where different conclusions are reached:

	<b>HAM01</b>	<b>HAM02/03</b>	<b>HAM07/10/12</b>
<b>4 Landscape</b>	-	0	0
<b>7 Places</b>	+	+ +	+ +
<b>12 Land use</b>	- -	-	-

The same rating is reached for each other criterion, for each of the three sites.

We comment on the topic areas noted above below, together with comments considered relevant on the topics where the Sustainability Appraisal does not distinguish between the four sites.

**4 Landscape** – the Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix 7 to this statement) confirms that visibility of the site is limited, other than from viewpoints close by; and that the proposed woodland planting would mitigate the impact, from the public footpath to the north east.

**7 Places** – the proposed development includes the provision of public open space; accordingly, this section should be amended, with a similar ranking given to each of the three sites.

**12 Land use** – each site involves development of previously undeveloped land, we do not consider that there is any justification for a different scoring for HAM01.

With regard to the other factors considered in the Sustainability Appraisal, we note that the appraisal for HAM01 does not reflect the mixed use allocation proposal; accordingly, employment should be shown as a positive impact, for HAM01.

With regard to geology and biodiversity, we consider that the proposal for woodland planting would be a positive benefit to biodiversity, which should be reflected in a positive score for HAM01. With regard to HAM07/10/12, the comments of Kent Wildlife are noted, with regard to its present biodiversity interest.