

Site Description:			
<p>The site is a greenfield site, located to the west of Ashford just off Junction 9 of the M20. The site wraps around the John Lewis at Home store to the south. The railway line runs along the eastern boundary of the site, with new housing development the other side of the railway line. The Warren Local Wildlife Site is located to the north of the site. The site is accessed off Fougères Way via a new access which was constructed to access the John Lewis store. The site has been previously allocated for a park and ride facility.</p>			
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 located within or adjoining. No known impacts.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Yes adjacent to Ashford Warren Local Wildlife Site	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Potential features on the site, would need further investigation. Assume that these could be protected through any development.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site located adjacent to The Warren Local Wildlife site, there is therefore potential to create linkages with this site through development	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?	The site sits within a mixed character area, with open space/woodland to the north and east, and urban built development to the south and west. There would be some loss of semi-rural landscape character, however this would not be out of keeping with the surrounding character.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The development of the site would change the character of the open character of this site.	-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, however area of archaeological potential	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	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?*	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 1 in 100 year event	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Major Groundwater vulnerability	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	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?	Site proposed as mixed use so potential gain of on-site services	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Waitrose, between 400-800m	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Hollington Surgery, Blue Line Lane (Approx 1.2km)	-1

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Repton and St Mary's, both between 400-800	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 Warren is directly adjoining the site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Repton	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential to provide open space as part of site development	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The railway line runs along the eastern boundary	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 existing	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, route 10	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
9.3	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes Hollington Surgery.	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0

Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes, limestone hythe 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?	Promoted for mixed use	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?	Godinton Local and Ashford Town Centre	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No impact	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The site is located on the edge of the urban area of Ashford in close proximity to existing services and facilities. Whilst the site is greenfield its surrounding character is mainly that of built development. The site has been previously allocated for development as a park and ride facility. Development could protect and potentially enhance the LWS to the northern boundary of the site. The site is considered suitable for development.			Total: 6

Site Description:			
<p>Ashford Golf Club includes an 18 hole golf course, club house and parking. Eureka Business Park adjoins the course to the north along with undeveloped agricultural land in the western part. The M20 motorway borders the southern boundary. Access to the golf course is currently off Sandhurst Lane which is ribbon development and adjoins the western boundary. Eureka Leisure Park is located adjacent the site to the east with access to J9 of the M20. There is currently no access from the course to the east. The course itself is of varied topography sloping down from north/west to the south/east, it is well established and maintained, many mature trees feature throughout the course, with high native hedging around the perimeter.</p>			
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 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?	Ashford Warren is 120m south of Ashford Golf Club, however it is the other side of the M20 so is unlikely to have negative 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 are no TPOs on the site, however due to the nature of the golf course there may be several losses of mature trees, and impacts on streams and ditches.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	This site falls within the Mid Kent Greensand and Gault Biodiversity Opportunity Area. It is currently facilitated as a golf course, this green area would be lost to development.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Not within or adjoining the green corridor	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Not within or adjoining AONB, 250m to the west is North Downs AONB	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This is a significant green space, however it is within urban Ashford so would have a minor negative impact on the landscape.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative	Development would have a negative impact as currently provides an attractive green space	-1

	visual impact from the development?	within an urban setting.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site not within or adjoining 'archaeology' but is wholly an area of archaeological potential.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Not contained within site.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic / cultural assets	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	In Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% coverage of 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 low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Site contains both minor and major ground water vulnerability areas.	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?	Loss of a private golf club (however could be part of a long term strategy to relocate to better facilities).	-1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Within the urban area of Ashford, adjacent to Ashford Leisure Park to the east of the golf course, and Eureka local shop 420m north of site.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Kennington	-1

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Goat Lees Primary School is the closest being 688m away	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).	A small area of public open space adjoins the site to the south.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	The site is 400m west of an equipped play area at Rectory Way.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, a footpath runs through the middle of the site and around the parameter to the east and south.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Although the proposal will result in the loss of open space, it is not accessible to the public as a member's only golf club; the public can access the PROW that runs through the site.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The Golf Club adjoins the M20 motorway which is a potential source of 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 Sandyhurst Lane	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 borders the site to the east, along the A251	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus route along Trinity Road, Eureka Park.	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?	Yes, New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			

10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	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?*	Not showing mineral reserves, but forms part of the silica sand construction and sandstone formation mineral safeguarding area within draft M&W Plan 2014.	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, however it is currently used as a golf course and so is not cultivated.	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Housing and associated uses	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	n/a	
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Within Ashford urban area, close to Eureka leisure park, Bockhanger	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site scores well in terms of sustainability, being located within the urban area close to local services and facilities. It is well located to be connected to the strategic road network being close to J9 of the M20, however it is currently accessed via Sandyhurst Lane. It is a greenfield site, which currently provides an attractive green space within an urban setting so development is likely to have a negative impact on the current setting, however it is well located to support some development. The site is not currently available for development.			Total: 2

Site Description:			
Eureka Park is an existing business park located just off Junction 9 of the M20 in the outskirts of Ashford. The Upper Terrace is linked by a spine road southwards via the Lower Terrace to Junction 9 of the M20. The site is on undulating land which is generally south facing. The north-east of the site is bounded by Goat Lees Housing Estate, the north west is bounded by arable land which in turn is bounded by dwellings along Sandyhurst Lane. To the south is the Ashford Golf Course and the west is bounded by older residential development.			
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 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?	Tile Lodge Wood LWS is located 250m north of the Eureka Park so development unlikely to have 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?	This is a large site with no TPOs, and limited tree / hedge coverage so any losses would be minor. Pond likely to be maintained as part of development.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	This site falls within the Mid Kent Greensand and Gault Biodiversity Opportunity Area. Potential to enable managed access to landscaped areas.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Not within or adjoining the green corridor	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	Not within or adjoining AONB, 750m to the north is the North Downs AONB	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Large areas of this site are already developed for employment uses. The western part of the site is currently cultivated and provides an attractive backdrop to the business park a negative impact would result if developed.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative	This is predominantly an employment site, which is relatively enclosed with no far	-1

	visual impact from the development?	reaching views, any development in this location would have minimal impact of visual amenity.	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Site is covered by archaeology potential and includes a small area of 'archaeology' in the north.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Not contained within site.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic / cultural assets	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	In Flood Zone 1	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% coverage of 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 low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Site contains both minor and major ground water vulnerability areas.	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?	A mixed use proposal for housing, employment uses and large landscaped area.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Forms part of urban Ashford, site contains a local convenience store.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Kennington	-1

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Goat Lees Primary School is the closest being 238m away.	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 proposal includes informal open space, however the nearest existing open space is located approx. 400m south of the site.	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	The site is 430m west of an equipped play area at Rectory Way.	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, a footpath crossed through the middle of the site both north/south and west/east directions.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	The proposal includes using underused area which could be opened up and restored to provide access greater access for the public	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes, Eureka Business Park	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 borders the site to the east, along the A251	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Bus route along Trinity Road, Eureka Park.	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, New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	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?*	Not showing mineral reserves, but forms part of the silica sand construction and sandstone formation mineral safeguarding area within draft M&W Plan 2014.	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)	Much of the site is in business use, however the western corner of the site is still cultivated and form agricultural grade 3 classification.	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Yes, is proposing bringing forward mixed use development with a significant employment element.	2
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Yes broadband available at existing business park	1
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	Not referred to within site submission	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 Ashford urban area, close to Eureka leisure park, forms part of Eureka business park, Bockhanger	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No, although it will form part of the employment offer within the town.	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site scores well in terms of sustainability, being located within the Ashford urban area close to local facilities and services. The proposal will benefit the community by bringing forward additional employment space and informal public open space. The western part of the site is currently rural in nature so any development will impact on the landscape setting, although this should be minimal as it is relatively enclosed. This is a sustainable and suitable location for development - employment uses and the residential element of the proposal will need to be balanced so as to not prejudice the long term employment strategy for the town. The site is considered suitable for			Total: 6

development.	
--------------	--

Site Ref: KE1

Date Survey Completed:04/11/2014

Site Name: Land at Ulley Farm, Ball Lane, Kennington

Site Description:			
<p>The site is located in the countryside to the north of built up area of Ashford and is close to the Kennington conservation area. It is currently accessed via a narrow access lane to Ulley Farm. The landscape is undulating and is set within a rural aspect with the backdrop of the North Downs AONB. The site is currently cultivated for agriculture.</p>			
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 not within or near internationally / national designated site. No impact.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site not near or within LWS.	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?	Development would not result in the loss of trees or hedgerows.	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not improve linkages or enable managed access.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Potentially in setting, views from AONB affected	-1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site adjoins the conservation area at the southern boundary and has a rural setting; development would not sit well in this location.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development would have a significant negative impact on the landscape as it rural and open in aspect and has a backdrop of the North Downs 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?*	Site adjoins Kennington conservation area to the south of the site.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Adjoins the Glovers listed building, and is 60m away from St. Mary's Church, Kennington	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Negative impact on the setting of St. Mary's church from surrounding countryside.	-1
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	North eastern part of site (less than 10% coverage) within 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?	Site at risk from surface water flooding from the 1 in 30 years, and 1 in 100 year event (less than 10%).	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Northern and southern parts of site are within 'minor' vulnerability from 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)	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?	Site approx. 100m from Kennington.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Hayesbank Surgery is located 1.68km south of the site, Cemetery Lane, Kennington.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kennington Primary School 150m to the west	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).	Site 200m, away from public open space to the south (Recreation Ground).	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Kennington Recreation Ground is equipped with a play area (200m south).	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	A PROW runs through the site in a south to westerly direction.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of public open space.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Access via Ball Lane, although very narrow so would need improvements	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 – A251 is approx. 1.5km from the site to the west.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Route 1 is 300m from the site, within Kennington.	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
9.3	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	New Hayesbank Surgery is accepting new 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?*	Mineral safeguarding area identified within submission Mineral & Waste Local Plan 2014 -	-1

		2030 (sub_alluvial_RivTerrace 1 & 2).	
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 1	-2
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Being promoted for housing	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Not applicable	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Urban fringe site adjoining Kennington	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 does not relate well to the existing built up part of Kennington and is rural in aspect with far reaching views across an attractive landscape setting to the North Downs AONB. Existing access to the site is inadequate for any substantial development in this part of Kennington, it is a greenfield site and currently cultivated for agricultural use. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -5

Site Ref: KE2

Date Survey Completed: 05/11/2014

Site Name: Orchard Farm, Kennington

Site Description:			
<p>This site is an unused smallholding and as such is overgrown and covered in brambles and scrub. It is relatively flat and is located to the rear of residential dwellings along Canterbury Road and also to the north of the site. It is bounded by agricultural land to the south and east.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known 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 is potential due to the unused state of the site that it could support protected species. Site survey would be required to determine.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Will not create new habitats or green links.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining North Downs AONB.	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site does not relate well to the existing built form as it could be considered back land development.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	A minor negative effect would result as there are far reaching views out over the Stour Valley to the North Downs AONB.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation	Not within or adjoining Kennington Conservation Area.	1

	Area?*		
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain a listed building, SM or registered park / garden.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic or cultural assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	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?	Site has less than 10% risk from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Southern half of the site is within groundwater source protection zone.	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, site submission refers to 100+ dwellings.	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?	Co-op 0.8km from the site.	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is the closest surgery 1.6km away.	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kennington Primary School is located 0.8km west 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).	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 250m west of site.	1

7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 250m west of site.	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 loss or gain of public open space.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any. GIS mapping shows a landfill site adjoining the site to the north, although appears not to be in active use.	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?	New access required, narrow access currently used north of Croft Hotel.	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 (A251) 2km west of the site, however there are local routes along Ulley Road, and A28.	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 Route 1 along Canterbury Road, with stops at Tritton Fields.	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
9.3	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is currently accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	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 mineral reserves, however the southern half of the site is a Mineral Safeguarded Area (silica sand construction sandstone Folkestone) within the submission KCC	0

		Mineral and Waste Local Plan 2013-30.	
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 1 agricultural land	-2
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Promoted for housing, no impact.	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?	Site within urban fringe adjoining Kennington.	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 edge of the existing settlement boundary, with residential development bounding the site to the north and west. There is a question about whether access could be created from Canterbury Road and the site may not be able to come forward on its own. There would be some impact on the wider landscape and the site is Grade 1 Agricultural land. The site is considered to be suitable for development as part of the wider allocation of land on the adjoining site (KE3).			Total: -2

Site Ref: KE3

Date Survey Completed:05/11/2014

Site Name: Land NE of A2070 Willesborough Road

Site Description:			
<p>The Ashford to Canterbury railway line forms the eastern boundary of the site, with the A2070 Willesborough Road forming the south western boundary of the site. The site is broadly triangular in shape, flat and in agricultural cultivation and is featureless with expansive views of the North Downs to the east.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	The Great Stour, Ashford to Fordwich LWS is located within 100m of the site to the east, however it is the other side of the railway line and so would have a limited impact.	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 losses as no features on the site	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access to natural areas.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	The green corridor is located adjacent to the site to the west, albeit the other side of Willesborough Road.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining North Downs AONB	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The North Downs is clearly visible from the site, as it has an open aspect with views across the Stour Valley. Any significant development would change the character of this part of Ashford.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is clearly visible from the surrounding landscape and as such development would result in 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?*	Not within or adjoining Kennington Conservation Area.	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain listed building, SM or registered Park/garden.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Would not affect historic setting of Ashford.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	A small area of the site is within Flood Zone 2	-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?	Site has less than 10% risk from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year and 1 in 30-year event.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Site wholly within groundwater source protection zone.	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, site submission refers to 1000 dwellings and associated uses.	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?	Site submission refers to additional on site services and facilities likely to be required.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	One Stop Shop approx. 450m to the west.	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Haynesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is the closest surgery 1.3km away.	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	The site is located about 1km from Kennington Primary School, and the Phoenix 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).	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 215m west of site.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 215m west of site.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs through the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Proposal would include open space as indicated within site submission.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any. GIS mapping shows a landfill site adjoining the site to the north, although appears not to be in active use.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No current access but could be provided off the Willesborough Road.	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 (A251) 2km west of the site, however there are local routes along Ulley Road, and A28.	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 Route 517 Little Burton Farm	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?	New Haynesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is currently accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	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 mineral reserves, however most of the site is a Mineral Safeguarded Area (silica sand construction sandstone Folkstone, river terrace deposits 1 & 2) within the submission KCC Mineral and Waste Local Plan 2013-30.	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 1, 3 agricultural land	-2
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Promoted for housing, no impact.	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?	Site submission refers to on site primary school and expansion of existing secondary school likely to be needed.	1
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?	Site within urban fringe adjoining Kennington.	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This is a large site on the edge of the Ashford urban area at Kennington, it is greenfield, is relatively flat and has an open aspect out into the surrounding countryside which includes the Stour Valley and foreground to the North Downs AONB. There would therefore be some impact on the surrounding landscape. The site also includes higher grade agricultural land. The site scores well in terms of being close to community facilities, the edge of the urban area and existing infrastructure.			Total: -1

Site Ref: KE4

Date Survey Completed:05/11/2014

Site Name: Land east of A28

Site Description:			
<p>This site is located in the north east of Ashford in the outskirts of Kennington. It is a large site between Canterbury Road and the Ashford to Canterbury railway line. It is flat, featureless and currently cultivated for agricultural use and has far reaching views over the Stour Valley towards the North Downs AONB.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	The Great Stour, Ashford to Fordwich is adjacent to the site to the east, however it is located the otherside of the railway line and as such would have limited impact.	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?	Featureless cultivated field no losses of trees or hedgerows would result.	1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access to green space.	0
1.5	Does the site present opportunities for protecting and enhancing the green corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining North Downs AONB, but may affect setting.	-1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is within the countryside, any development in this location would have a detrimental impact upon the landscape and setting of the AONB.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This part of Kennington is very rural in nature development would 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?*	There is an area of archaeological importance adjacent to the site to the north around The Mill House.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain listed buildings, SM or registered Park/garden.	0
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	No impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Very small section of the northern parts of the site (approx.. less than 10% coverage) within 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?	Site has less than 10% risk from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year and 1 in 30-year event.	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Southern quarter of site within groundwater source protection zone.	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, site submission refers to 1,000 dwellings and associated uses.	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?	Site submission refers to additional onsite services / facilities provision likely to be required.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The nearest shop is approximately 1km away.	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is the closest surgery 1.8km away.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kennington Primary School is located 1km west 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).	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 600m west of site. Ashford Hockey / Cricket Club is located adjacent the site the other side of Canterbury Road.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Spearpoint public open space with play facilities located 600m west of site.	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW along the northern boundary and through the southern part of the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Proposal would include open space as indicated within site submission.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Landfill site within site also appears not to be in active use, remediation might be required	-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?	Does not currently have direct access although this could be achieved off A28 Canterbury Road.	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 17 (A251) 2km west of the site, however there are local routes along Ulley Road, and A28.	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 Route 1 with bus stops at Bell Lane / The Old Mill, and East Mountain Lane opposite the 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?	Yes, Junction 10a	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	New Hayesbank Surgery, Cemetery Lane, Bybrook is currently accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	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 mineral reserves, however most of the site is a Mineral Safeguarded Area (silica sand construction sandstone Folkestone, river terrace deposits 1, 2 & 3) within the submission KCC Mineral and Waste Local Plan 2013-30.	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 1, 3 agricultural land	-2
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/employment space?	Promoted for housing, no impact.	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?	Site submission refers to on site primary school and expansion of existing secondary school likely to be needed.	1
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, but would be required to provide one due to size of proposed development	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 greenfield sites scores poorly as it is located some distance from main services. It is a large site and if developed as a whole would have a significant impact on the surrounding countryside which includes far reaching views of the North Downs AONB. Some northern parts of the site are within flood zones 2 and 3 and there is grade 1 agricultural land. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -7

Site Ref: WE4

Date Survey Completed:08/11/2014

Site Name: Land at Finn Farm

Site Description:			
<p>A large area of land that lies to the south of Church Hill and Finn Farm Road and to the south of Park Farm East development. The land is used primarily for grazing but there are trees and hedgerows along field boundaries. There is one small pond on the site. To the south-eastern boundary are two large ponds (not on the site). The southern boundary of this site adjoins a ribbon development of detached housing, with large gardens. To the east is the A2070 and Hastings Railway Line. Adjacent to the north-west corner of the site is Stumble Woods. Whilst the site is quite close to the built development of Park Farm, it has a very rural setting as it is separated from this development by the Country Park.</p>			
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?	No, not within 100m	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 features on the site, however due to the size of it, it is considered that they could be maintained through any development	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential improvements possible through a development and linkages to open space to the north	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 this site would significantly alter the rural character of the site. Within Betherden Farmland Landscape Character area.	-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, the A2070, and would change the view from existing residents in Steeds Lane	-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?*	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?	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?	Size of site would probably require on site provision of facilities	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Park Farm	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth	-2

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Park Farm	-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)	Park Farm	-2
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Park Farm	-2
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, access to Bridgefields	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Due to size of site, provision would be required as part of development	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Main road of A2070 and railway line adjacent to 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	1
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No existing access	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes, Bridgefields	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, Park Farm	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?	Junction 10a	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, Kingsnorth	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0

Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	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. The site is open countryside beyond the existing urban boundary and development here would be a significant intrusion into open countryside. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -7

Site Ref: WE5

Date Survey Completed: 17/12/2015

Site Name: Land to the South of Park Farm East

Site Description:			
<p>The site is currently in cultivated agricultural use. The site lies to the south of the existing Park Farm East development with Cheeseman's Green Lane forming the northern boundary. The Hastings to Ashford railway line is close to the western boundary of the site where a bridge crossing the railway line meets at a three-way traffic light junction joining Finn Farm Road, Brockman's Lane and Cheeseman's Green Lane. The site rises up from the north to higher ground in the south. A third of the site area along the eastern boundary is floodplain.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Adjoins South Willesborough Dykes Local Wildlife Site at the north eastern boundary. Development may provide an opportunity to provide ecological enhancements and a protective buffer to the LWS.	1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site is bounded by trees and hedgerows to the north and west. Providing a suitable access onto the site will mean the minor loss of trees and hedgerows.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	The site is capable of delivering an extension to the green corridor and may provide opportunities for managed access to green space.	2
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Adjoining green corridor to the north east.	-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	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/	Currently greenfield site so any development will have a negative impact on the character	-2

	townscape?	and quality of the landscape	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be an extension to existing new development. The topography of the site requires careful attention to the developable area to prevent intrusive development into the wider 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?*	Site adjoins area of archaeological potential, but not archaeological importance or conservation area.	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 applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	The eastern boundary of the site is that of the boundary with flood zones 2 and 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?	Yes – less than 10% both 1 in 100-year and 1 in 30-year event	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Yes	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 major site	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?	Tesco's Park Farm approx. 1.8km	-2

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth GP Surgery approx. 2km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Furley Park Primary School less than 0.4km	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)	Park Farm East Sports Area Scheme is not yet built but will be approx. 0.5km away. Kingsnorth recreation ground and Park Farm play area are also close-by.	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Park Farm play area approx. 1.2km	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Pedestrian pavement facilitating Park Farm East along northern boundary of site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	A large site that would be required to deliver an element of public open space.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No, although the Hastings to Ashford railway line is close to the western boundary and so careful design needed to prevent noise pollution.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No, a new access point would need to be created	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	3km to Route 18 which runs past Ashford International Station	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, stagecoach route b which serves Park Farm.	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, Kingsnorth medical practice	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 3	0
Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No impact on business units	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, Park Farm East	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No direct impact	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site adjoins existing development at Park Farm East (Bridgefield), Ashford and presents an opportunity to enhance and extend the green corridor and deliver facilities associated with a large site. The site is not particularly well related to existing services. Development of the site would intrude into the open countryside but by dealing with the topography of the site sympathetically the impact could be mitigated. The site is considered to be suitable for development.			Total: -2

Site Description:			
<p>The site is currently in cultivated agricultural use. The site lies to the south of the existing Park Farm East development with Cheeseman’s Green Lane forming the northern boundary. The Hastings to Ashford railway line is close to the western boundary of the site where a bridge crossing the railway line meets at a three-way traffic light junction joining Finn Farm Road, Brockman’s Lane and Cheeseman’s Green Lane. The site rises up from the north to higher ground in the south. Brockman’s Lane forms the southern boundary of the site. A third of the site area along the eastern boundary is floodplain.</p> <p>NB. WE5 is included within this overall site boundary.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Adjoins South Willesborough Dykes Local Wildlife Site at the north eastern boundary. Development may provide an opportunity to provide ecological enhancements and a protective buffer to the LWS.	1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site is bounded by tress and hedgerows to the north and west. Providing a suitable access onto the site will mean the minor loss of trees and hedgerows.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	The site is capable of delivering an extension to the green corridor and may provide opportunities for managed access to green space.	2
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Adjoining green corridor to the north east.	-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	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Currently greenfield site so any development will have a negative impact on the character and quality of the landscape	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be an extension to existing new development the topography of the site requires careful attention to the developable area to prevent intrusive development into the wider 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?*	Site adjoins area of archaeological potential, but not archaeological importance or conservation area.	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?	Not applicable	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	The eastern part of the site lies within flood zones 2 and 3.	-2
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Yes – less than 10% both 1 in 100-year and 1 in 30-year event	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Yes	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 major site	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 effect	0

6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Tesco's Park Farm approx. 1.8km.	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth GP Surgery approx. 2km	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Furley Park Primary School less than 0.4km	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)	Park Farm East Sports Area Scheme is not yet built but will be approx.. 0.5km away. Kingsnorth recreation ground and Park Farm play area are also close-by.	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	The quantum of development proposed on this site meets the threshold to deliver a new children's and young persons play space.	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Pedestrian pavement facilitating Park Farm East along northern boundary of site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	A large site that would be required to deliver an element of public open space.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No, although the Hastings to Ashford railway line is close to the western boundary and so careful design needed to prevent noise pollution.	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No, a new access point would need to be created	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	3km to Route 18 which runs past Ashford International Station	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, stagecoach route b that serves Park Farm.	1
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it	Yes, Junction 10a	-1

	deliverable?		
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	-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 impact on business units	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, Park Farm East	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No direct impact	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: This site adjoins existing development at Park Farm East (Bridgefield), Ashford and presents an opportunity to enhance and extend the green corridor and deliver facilities associated with a large site. The site is not particularly well related to existing services. Development of the site would intrude			Total: -2

<p>into the open countryside but by dealing with the topography of the site sympathetically the impact could be mitigated. The site is considered to be suitable for development.</p>	
--	--

Site Name: Waterbrook Park, Sevington

Site Description:			
<p>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.</p>			
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?	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?	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	-2
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 land is between built development, so impact on landscape would be minor.	-1
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 which relatively poorly because a part of the site falls within the flood plan and also the green corridor. 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. The site is suitable for development.			Total: -7

Site Name: Land East of Highfield Lane, Mersham

Site Description:			
<p>This site is a large area of open land currently used for agriculture. It is bounded on the north by the M20 and to the west joins the allocated site of Sevington. To the east of the site lies the village of Mersham, and to the south is currently the railway line and open fields.</p>			
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?	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?	Site is mainly agricultural land, with some features such as trees and hedgerows along field boundaries. Assume could be retained/replaced through development.	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?	Site is open countryside and development would have negative impact on landscape	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Site adjacent to Mersham village and development would impact on visual amenity of residential properties to north and east boundary	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation	Ditch and Linear feature of archaeology within	-1

	Area?*	site. Area of archaeological potential	
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site adjoins Grade II Listed buildings along eastern boundary	-1
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Potential impact on setting of Listed Buildings	-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?	Less than 10% coverage 1 in 30 and 1 in 100	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Unknown, not in SFRA	
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, 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)	N/a proposed for commercial	0
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Gain	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Tesco	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Willesborough Health Centre	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Mersham/Willesborough	-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)	Mersham	0

7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Mersham	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW through site, rural lanes have no footpaths	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?	Railway and motorway	-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?	Yes, Route 10	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?	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, Limestone Hythe	-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?	More	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 is a large site that is currently in agricultural use. The site is currently isolated from local services and direct access to the site would be difficult at this stage. The development of the adjoining site at Sevington will change the setting of this site. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -11

Site Name: Land South of Kingsnorth

Site Description:

The site borders and adjoins the south of Kingsnorth Village. It covers the whole area south of church Hill and north of Steeds Lane and Magpie Hall rd. The site includes Mill Hill. 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. As the site is so large and includes various parcels of land it has been broken into 6 sections for assessment labelled (a-f)

WE16a: This area is located south of Pound Lane in Kingsnorth and west of the Ashford Road. It is currently in agricultural use, mainly used for crops. There is limited housing around the site and that which is on the site border is semi detached or detached with large gardens. There is a pond within the site and a mature tree boundary along the western edge, and a hedge around the remainder. There is access from Pound Lane, where an electricity sub station is located on the north west corner.

WE16b: This part of the site is located to the east of Mill Hill, behind the ribbon development along this road. To the south of the site is the cricket club and Steeds Lane. Bond Lane a very narrow rural lane runs along the eastern boundary. There is an electricity sub station and a reservoir in the north west corner. The site is agricultural and has mature tree and hedge boundaries.

WE16c: This area is located west of Mill Hill (Ashford Rd) and north of Magpie Hall Rd. It is an agricultural field used for crops and grazing. There are some ponds/bog areas along the Magpie Hall Rd Boundary, and mature trees screening the large detached properties that do adjoin the site.

WE16d: This area is located to the south of Kingsnorth village and joins the recent cul-de-sac development of Myrtle Court. It is divided into two fields which are separated by a mature tree and hedge line. The western edge of the site joins Ashford Road, and this part has housing opposite, south and north and is used for grazing. The remainder of the site to the east is open countryside and used for crops. There are mature trees along the eastern edge of the site and a pond located on the south eastern corner.

WE16e: This site is located along Bond Lane, a narrow rural road. There is very little development in this area and it is open countryside used for crops There are a number of mature trees scattered along the field boundaries.

WE16f: This site is located north of Steeds Lane, South of Bond Lane and West of Stumble Lane. To the north east is a woodland (Isaac Wood). The area is a number of agricultural fields, with scattered trees and hedgerows along these boundaries.

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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known impact.	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 along all boundaries of most sites 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?	Potential, would be required due to size of site	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or adjoining an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining AONB.	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site is open countryside, located on the edge of a rural settlement. Development would impact on the rural setting.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be very visible from the Ashford Road, Pound Lane, Magpie Hall Rd, and Steeds Lane and would be a change of view for the existing residents located around the edges the site.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	CA adjoins the site at one point – to the north of (e) Site has no Archaeological designations but is in an area of potential on (a) and (c)	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain a listed building but there are some within 100m, there are no SM on or near the site, and it does not contain or is near registered Park/garden.	1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic or cultural assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Northern tip of (a) site in Flood Zone 2	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 at risk of less than 10% from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The southern tip of this site is within a groundwater protection zone.	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)	This site is over 100ha	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?	Site is large and would provide its own services	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Nearest current Local Centre is Park Farm, however a site this large would need to provide it own facilities	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth Medical Practice is located 400m from northern point of site, however, a site this size would likely generate the need for new facilities	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kingsnorth Primary School is located in Church Hill, however, a site this size would likely generate the need for new facilities	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).	Church Hill recreation field however, a site this size would likely generate the need for new facilities	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Church Hill Play area, however, a site this size would likely generate the need for new facilities	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs along various points of sites (e) (f) (b). There are few footpaths around the area as it is countryside and many of the rural roads have no footpaths.	-1

7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential gain due to size of site	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Various due to site size.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Local routes start from Church Hill that link to Town Centre	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 stop in Mill Hill by Magpie Hall Rd Junction and in Kingsnorth village	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?	Junction 10a	-1
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	1
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Small areas of (f) (a) and half of (c) are located on mineral sites	-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?	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?	Park Farm and Kingsnorth. If whole site developed it would create a new district centre	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<p>Conclusion: This site is a very large area. Much of the site is open countryside and development would have a negative impact on this rural setting, landscape and character. A site of this size would be able to provide its own services and therefore scores well on access to services and in any event the site is relatively close to existing local services. Bearing in mind the extent of the site some parts are suitable for development but the critical relationship to existing development and topography mitigates against development of the site in its entirety.</p>			Total: 9

Site Name: The Retreat, Taylor Farm, Bond Lane, Kingsnorth

Site Description:			
<p>This site is located on Bond Lane, a rural lane. The site is a detached residential property with outbuildings and a large garden area. To the west of the site is a cul-de-sac of 10 detached dwellings and beyond those is the cricket ground.</p> <p>On all other boundaries the site is surrounded by open countryside and farmland. To the north east is a woodland (Isaac Wood). The area is a number of agricultural fields, with scattered trees and hedgerows along these boundaries.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known impact.	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 along all boundaries of most sites 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, unless part of broader site area.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or in setting of AONB.	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site is located within open countryside, outside of a rural settlement but there is housing adjacent. Development would impact on the rural setting in a minor way.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be visible from Bond Lane and would be a change of view for the existing residents located opposite the site.	-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?*	Taylor's Farmhouse is a listed building. There are no SM on or near the site, and it does not contain or is near registered Park/garden.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic 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 at risk of less than 10% from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The southern tip of this site is within a groundwater protection zone.	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No – the development of the site individually would not meet the affordable housing threshold. If part of broader area, it would.	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, not independently.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Nearest current Local Centre is Kingsnorth/Park Farm	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth Medical Practice more than 1.6km	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kingsnorth Primary School is located in Church Hill	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).	Church Hill recreation field	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Church Hill Play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW is opposite the site. There are few footpaths around the area as it is countryside and many of the rural roads have no footpaths.	-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?	Not close to any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Local routes start from Church Hill that link to Town Centre	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 in Mill Hill by Magpie Hall Rd Junction and in Kingsnorth village	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?	Junction 10a	-1
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?	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?*	Large part within mineral reserve.	-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?	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?	Park Farm and 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
<p>Conclusion: This site is a small area located in open countryside with few dwellings around and development would have a negative impact on this rural setting, landscape and character and on the existing residents.</p> <p>Assessed in isolation, this site alone is unsuitable for development due to its location and relative distance from local services, however, the site is suitable for development as part of a consideration of the wider development area.</p>			<p>Total: -5</p>

Site Ref: WE18

Date Survey Completed: 14/01/2015

Site Name: Taylor Farm, Bond Lane, Kingsnorth

Site Description:			
<p>This site is located on Bond Lane, a small rural lane. The site consists of 2 residential dwellings and outbuildings associated with farming uses. There is a large pond on the site and open fields. To the west of the site is a cul-de-sac of 10 detached dwellings and beyond those is the cricket ground.</p> <p>On all other boundaries the site is surrounded by open countryside and farmland.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known impact.	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 along all boundaries of most sites 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, unless part of broader site area.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining AONB.	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site is located within open countryside, outside of a rural settlement but there is housing adjacent. Development would impact on the rural setting in a minor way.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be visible from Bond Lane and would be a change of view for the existing residents located opposite the site.	-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?*	Taylor's Farmhouse is a listed building. There are no SM on or near the site, and it does not contain or is near registered Park/garden.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic 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 at risk of less than 10% from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The southern area of this site is within a minor groundwater protection zone.	-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, not independently.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Nearest current Local Centre is Kingsnorth/Park Farm	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth Medical Practice more than 1.6km	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kingsnorth Primary School is located in Church Hill	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open	Church Hill recreation field	0

	space, accessible by the public).		
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Church Hill Play area, however, a site this size would likely generate the need for new facilities	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW is opposite the site. There are few footpaths around the area as it is countryside and many of the rural roads have no footpaths.	-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?	Not close to any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Local routes start from Church Hill that link to Town Centre	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 in Mill Hill by Magpie Hall Rd Junction and in Kingsnorth village	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	Yes, Junction 10a	-1
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?	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?*	Southern part within mineral reserve.	-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?	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?	Park Farm and 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
<p>Conclusion: This site is a small area located in open countryside with few dwellings around and development would have a negative impact on this rural setting, landscape and character and on the existing residents.</p> <p>Assessed in isolation, this site alone is unsuitable for development due to its location and relative distance from local services, however, the site is suitable for development as part of a consideration of the wider development area.</p>			<p>Total: -5</p>

Site Name: Land adjoining Finn Farm, Finn Farm Road, Kingsnorth

Site Description:			
<p>A small site adjoining Finn Farm a large detached property in residential curtilage. The site is surrounded by fields and countryside to the south, the development of Bridgefield is 150m away to the north. The site is overgrown with trees and hedgerows.</p>			
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?	No, not within 100m	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 majority of site is covered in trees and or/hedgerows. These would need to be lost in order to develop due to the shape of the site.	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Unlikely due to limited size of site	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 the site would have some negative impact upon the rural character of the area, however due to the limited size of the site, this would not be significant	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Very limited	0
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation	No	0

	Area?*		
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?*	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?	Unknown, not in SFRA	
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Unknown, not in SFRA	
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No	0
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?	Park Farm	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Park Farm	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open	Park Farm	-2

	space, accessible by the public)		
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Park Farm	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, access to Bridgefields	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, Bridgefields	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, Park Farm and Kingsnorth	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?	J10a	-1
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, Kingsnorth	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Part mainly 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	No	0

	Geological site (RIGS)?		
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?	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 site is relatively poorly related to existing local facilities and separate from the main built up part of the Ashford urban area. The site is on the edge of open countryside beyond the existing urban boundary and development here would be an intrusion into open countryside. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -7

Site Name: The Park, Cheeseman's Green

Site Description:			
<p>The site is arable farmland which has been used for low intensity farming and includes existing hedgerows. There are no farm buildings or other structures on the site.</p> <p>Part of the site is vacant following the completion of civil engineering works. The remainder of the site is in a short term farm business tenancy.</p> <p>The site lies adjacent to the Finberry Development which is under construction. There is a new access road from the A2070 to this development.</p>			
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?	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?	Yes potential linkages to green corridor and open space through development	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Yes part is within	-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?	Site is open agricultural land, located adjoining a new housing development.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Would be a visual impact from development of site	-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?	n/a	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Edges of site are within Flood Zones 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?		
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Yes	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes	1
Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes 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?	On 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)	On site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	On site	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	On site	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	On site	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?	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?	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?*	Small part of site	-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?	Less	-1
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?	N/a	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
<p>Conclusion: The site is currently greenfield land detached from the the Ashford urban area but in close proximity to development at Finberry and Bridgefield that is currently under construction. The context of the site has changed as a result of those adjoining developments. The site is directly adjoining and is part of the wider Finberry development that is providing a range of accessible local services and whilst the whole site is some distance from the main urban area the site scores relatively well. The site is suitable for development.</p>			<p>Total: 4</p>

Site Name: Land adjacent to Stumble Lane/Church Hill and including Stumble Wood

Site Description:

The site is divided by Stumble Lane. The eastern side of the site is the area of Stumble Wood.

The western side of the site is open fields/agricultural land. Stumble Lane is a rural road with ribbon development along both sides that consists mainly of large detached or semi-detached properties, set back from the road with large gardens. The site is level grassland managed as grassland pasture for livestock. To the north of the site is Finn Farm Road and the open space/buffer zone provided between Park Farm and Kingsnorth 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?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	No, not within 100m	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?	Ancient woodland on half of site, but this is proposed to be retained as part of development	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site could create linkages between two areas of ancient woodland and open space to the north	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 site would have a negative impact upon the rural character of the area	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	There would be 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?*	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 impact	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	Less than 10% of 1 in 100 and 1 in 30	-2
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Unknown, not in SFRA	
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 loss, unlikely to be a gain due to limited size of site	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Park Farm	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kingsnorth	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open	Kingsnorth	0

	space, accessible by the public)		
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Kingsnorth	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs through site, but no public footpath on adjacent rural roads	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Woodland to be retained and proposed as community woodland	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?	Site access onto Stumble Lane	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes, Local Route into Park Farm	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 routes from Park Farm and Kingsnorth	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	No	0

	Geological site (RIGS)?		
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?	None	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?	Kingsnorth and Park Farm, more than 400m away	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: The site is relatively poorly related to existing local facilities and separate from the main built up part of the Ashford urban area. The site includes a substantial area of ancient woodland which could be retained but development of the remainder of the site would intrude into open countryside. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: 0

Site Name: Kiln Farm, Bond Lane, Kingsnorth

Site Description:			
<p>This site lies in the countryside, south of Church Hill and Bond Lane. It is partly an open field used for grazing, and partly woodland. There are pockets of trees within the site and along the boundary. To the west is a farm and associated outbuildings, and then fields and woodland beyond. To the south east is a small ribbon development residential area along Stumble Lane. To the north is open countryside with intermittent large detached properties and beyond this the residential area of Kingsnorth</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known impact.	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, nearly half of the site is Ancient Woodland Isaac Wood which is protected by TPO.	-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?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining AONB.	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site is open countryside, located on the edge of a rural settlement. Development would impact on the rural setting.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be very visible in the rural landscape and will change the view for the existing residents located around the edges the site.	-1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			

3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	CA adjoins the site at one point – to the north Site has no Archaeological designations	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain a listed building but there is one within 100m, there are no SM on or near the site, and it does not contain or near registered Park/garden.	1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic 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 at risk of less than 10% from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The southern tip of this site is within a groundwater protection zone.	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)	Developable area is 4ha	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?	Nearest current Local Centre is Park Farm	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Kingsnorth Medical Practice is located 1300m from northern point of site.	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Kingsnorth Primary School is located in Church Hill	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).	Church Hill recreation field	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Church Hill Play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs from Bond Lane to the wood The rural roads have no footpaths.	-1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No loss or gain of open space.	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Not close to any	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Various due to site size.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Local routes start from Church Hill that link to Town Centre	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 stop in Kingsnorth village	0
Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	Yes, Junction 10a	-1
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral	No	0

	reserves?*		
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?	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?	Park Farm and Kingsnorth are 1km	-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 open countryside and ancient woodland. It is remote from existing services and accessed by narrow rural road network. The site is not large enough to provide services on site, if it came forward on its own. The site is not suitable for development.			Total: -6

Site Name: Land at Sevington

Site Description:			
<p>This area lies at a key entrance to the town by road and rail and has an open aspect when viewed from the A2070. The topography of the landscape includes a gentle ridge aligned in an east - west direction through the middle of the site. The site is currently allocated under Urban Sites policy U19, for commercial development, and is subject to a current planning application. To the south-western boundary of the site is the railway line, and Highfield Lane runs along the majority of the south-eastern boundary.</p>			
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?	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?	Site is mainly agricultural land, with some features such as trees and hedgerows along field boundaries. Assume could be retained/replaced through development.	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?	Very open site, with rural aspect. Development would have negative impact, although is located adjacent to the motorway	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes	-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?*	Yes, Sevington Church is a Grade 1 Listed Building	-1
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Potential impact on church setting	-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	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Unknown, not in SFRA	
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, 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)	n/a proposed for commercial	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?	Potential gain	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Tesco	-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?	Mersham/Willesborough	-2
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open	Highfield	1

	space, accessible by the public)		
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)?	PROW through and around site. Access to footways on adjoining A2070.	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?	Motorway, dual carriageway, railway	-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?	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, Limestone Hythe	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important	No	0

	Geological site (RIGS)?		
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?	More	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 in a prominent location next to the M20 motorway, development here would impact upon the landscape but this could be mitigated where possible. The site is suitable for development.			Total: -5

Site Name: Court Lodge Farm, Kingsnorth

Site Description:			
<p>This site is located south of Pound Lane and the Knights Park area of Kingsnorth and north of Stubbs Cross. Long Length road runs along the western boundary of the site. The Site wraps around the Court Lodge Farm House which is located near the north west corner of the site. Some of the agricultural buildings opposite the farm are included within the site boundary. The southern edge of the site joins Magpie Hall Road and the residential properties in ribbon form along this road. Many of these properties are detached bungalows with large rear gardens. The site is all agricultural land, with various pockets of trees, mainly along field boundaries. The Long Length Boundary has a mature, strong boundary of trees that forms a tunnel along the road. Whitewater Dyke runs north-east to south-west across the site. Electricity pylons run north-west to south-east across the site. The land level rises from central to eastern area of the site, east of the Whitewater Dyke.</p>			
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?	There are no nationally designated sites within 100m of the site.	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Not within or near (100m) of LWS, so no known impact.	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 stream running through the centre of the site. Also various pockets of trees, and along site boundaries. The development proposals include maintain these components in the habitat network and therefore	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network.	Yes, development proposing significant new green spaces and wetland habitat	2
1.5	Does the site present opportunities for protecting and enhancing the green corridor?	Not within or adjoining green corridor.	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Not within or adjoining AONB.	1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The site is open countryside, located on the edge of a rural settlement. Development would impact on the rural setting.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Development here would be very visible in the rural landscape and will change the view for	-2

		the existing residents located around the edges the site, and from long length	
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Part of the site is within the Area of Archaeological designation of Kingsnorth and Shadoxhurst, Most of the site is within an area of potential archaeology	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Site does not contain a listed building but there are some within 100m, there are no SM on or near the site, and it does not contain or near registered Park/garden.	1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Will not affect historic or cultural assets.	0
Objective 4: Water			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Yes, the northern section and a strip southwards is within flood zones 2&3. However proposals involve works to the flood zone and improved flood storage capacity measures through creation of a wetland park	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?	Site at risk of less than 10% from surface water flooding from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Low permeability at this site.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	The southern tip of this site is within a groundwater protection zone.	0
Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is over 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?	Yes – this is a large site that would require on-site facilities	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Shops located in Stubbs Cross and Stanhope. Development is large and would require	1

		additional service	
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Stanhope Surgery 700m	0
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	John Wesley School 800m	0
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public).	Area of open space on the north west corner of the site	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Play area on north east corner of site	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	PROW runs north – south across the site. There are no public footpaths on the rural roads around the site. Provision will be required on site due to the size of the development, and facilities to be provided on site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Potential gain	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No such land uses close to site	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?	Various due to site size.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Local routes start from Church Hill that link to Town Centre	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 stop in Kingsnorth village and Stanhope/Brisley	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, new access road. Flood alleviation, school. Potentially Junction 10a	-1

9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	1
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Parts of the site	-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 and 4	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?	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 – but would create its own centre	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
Conclusion: Site is located on the edge of the urban area, so is close to many services. The site is large enough that development would create a requirement for its own services, and it is located adjacent to the Chilmington Green AAP boundary. Development of this site would create part of a strategic open space, as it would deliver part of Discovery Park strategic park. The site is currently open countryside, with key areas such as the Long Length tree lined avenue and development would change the landscape and setting of this countryside area. The site is also affected by flooding, however flood alleviation			Total: 9

measures are proposed, which could also potentially improve the situation upstream, in south Ashford. The site is considered suitable for development.	
--	--

Site Ref: NW3

Date Survey Completed:13/01/2015

Site Name: Land adjacent to Julie Rose Stadium

Site Description:			
This site forms part of the wider Conningbrook Park policy area, and therefore, originally formed part of the mineral workings here (storing and processing of aggregates, concrete batching plant and associated works), it is being proposed for a second phase of residential development.			
The southern part of the site is located directly adjoining Kennington Road, on the opposing side to the Premier Foods factory. This part of the site is currently utilised as an informal, overflow parking area to the Julie Rose Stadium, to this end this area has been cleared and has a rough shingle surface.			
The northern part of the site is bounded to the northwest by the railway line and consists of an area of woodland.			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
Objective 1: Biodiversity			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Site not within or near a internationally/nationally designated site	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Site located 250m from the Great Stour Local Wildlife Site	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The northern part of the site is an area of long established woodland (not ancient woodland), this would be lost if housing development was agreed on the site	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No, as the site is proposed for residential development. However, site forms part of the wider Conningbrook policy area, where improved access to wildlife lakes has been achieved.	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No the site is currently not adjoining the green corridor	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0

2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Yes, development of this site would have a minor positive impact on the townscape, as the site would form the second phase of housing development and would help to link both residential phases and provide an active frontage to Kennington Road	1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	No, due to the site being directly opposite the Premier Foods site, there is already a visual impact on this part of Kennington Road and this site would help to smooth the transition between the Conningbrook Park development and the Premier Foods development	1
Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	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?*	Does not contain any of list in q3.2	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 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 surface water flooding from a 1 in 100yr event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, the site is within a major groundwater protection zone	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, the site is large enough to provide affordable units	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, as the site forms part of the wider conningbrooks development and park, it will be able to utilise facilities provided as part of this scheme	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	The nearest Local Centre is at Little Burton Farm, which is 900m from the site	-1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	The nearest GP surgery is New Hayesbank Surgery, Bybrook. Which is 1.4 km from the site	-1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	The nearest primary school is Pheonix Community Primary 1.5km 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 is located within the boundary of the Conningbrook Lakes country park development	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes there is a MUGA within 50m of the site and there is an equipped play area planned as part of the Conningbrook Lakes development	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes, the site directly adjoins the footway on the Kennington Road	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	As it forms part of the Conningbrook lakes development, development of this site would improve access to the country park.	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes, the site is on the opposing side of the A28 to the premier foods and Givaudan factories. These sites have prevailing smells	-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?	Decile 8	0
Objective 8: Sustainable Travel			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes the site directly adjoins Kennington Road. There is also access to the site through the main entrance to the Julie Rose stadium.	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes the site is located on the 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	Yes the site is located on the H line bus route, with regular services between the town	1

	bus service?	Centre, Kennington and the Hospital.	
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, New Hayesbank surgery is currently accepting new patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	The site currently formed the overflow carpark for the Julie Rose stadium, but this is not counted as PDL	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, but have been worked out	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)	In Grade 3, but already turned into an informal parking area	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	No	0

	revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<p>Conclusion: The site scores relatively well, being closely related to existing facilities and contained within the wider Conningbrook Strategic Park boundary and the facilities proposed there. The site has good accessibility, located directly on the A28 and adjacent to the existing Julie Rose Stadium entrance. The site is considered suitable as a 2nd phase of residential development for the Conningbrook Policy area. Due to the factories on the opposing side of Kennington Road, the site provides the opportunity to provide increased densities.</p>			<p>Total: 3</p>

Site Name: Woodside, Westwell Lane

Site Description:
 This site is currently a field in agricultural use, surrounded mainly by open countryside. To the south lies a large detached property 'Woodside' with a large curtilage, there are also some small fields that lie between the site and the A20. In the south west corner of the site it adjoins a property with large barns/warehouses and appears to be a working farm. To the east is a narrow lane with ribbon development along its frontage of detached and semi-detached properties with large gardens. To the north west is a small woodland that is irregular in shape and alters the site boundary. To the north the site is bounded by the M20 and CTRL which prevents access to the north. The access to the site would be along Westwell lane, which is narrow rural lane.

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?	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 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 may impact on neighbouring woodland	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or green linkages?	No	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?	No, 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 setting, and that	-2

		of the wider landscape and countryside.	
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	-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 - 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?	No impact on facilities	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local	More than 1.6km	-2

	Centre/ Shop?		
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?	Hothfield	-1
Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	No	-2
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 very close to the motor way and CTRL	-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?	No	-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?	Cemetery Lane, Kennington accepting patients	1

Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No. Site is greenfield but affected by CTRL and motorway.	-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 and used for agriculture	-1
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 site is located some distance from an existing settlement and services and therefore is considered to be an unsustainable location for significant development. The proximity to the CTRL and main roads may impact on residents and the site is in agricultural use and located in the countryside. Access to the site would be via Westwell Lane which is a narrow rural route. The site is not considered suitable for development.			Total: -14

Site Ref: DW12

Date Survey Completed: 5/11/2014

Site Name: Beechbrook

Site Description:			
<p>This site was used as a site for CTRL construction but it is currently in agricultural use. Bounded to the north east by the railway line, and to the east by the A20. To the south east of the site is agricultural land, and buildings which appear to be a working farmyard.</p>			
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?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Potentially – Hothfield lake and potters corner woodland south	-1
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?	Yes Ancient woodland within site	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential but none proposed	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	Not within or adjoining the green corridor	0
Objective 2: Landscape			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	100m from AONB	-1
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No, would have an impact on landscape setting. The site is located on the edge of the urban area. Development of a large site here would change this setting, and that of the wider landscape and countryside.	-2
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	Site would be visible from the wider 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?*	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 low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes – part of the site in Minor	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?	Proposed within site	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Proposed within site	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Proposed within 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- various, Hoads Wood proposed within	2
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No. 1.2km Orchard heights, but would be provided within given size of site	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Proposed within	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Proposed gain of open space	1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	Yes it is very close to the motor way and CTRL	-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?	Bus route likely for development of this size	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 – services on site	-1
9.4	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Cemetery Lane, Kennington accepting patients	1
Objective 10: Land Use and Geology			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No. Site is greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil			

11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes. 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)	Half grade 2, rest grade 3	-2
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?	Yes	1
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 is located some considerable distance from an existing settlement and services – the site has been scored on the basis that it will be of a scale that it will provide services within it. The site is currently in agricultural use and is located in the countryside and is relatively remote from existing built development and is poorly related to the existing Ashford urban area. The site is adjacent to the AONB .The site is not considered suitable for development.			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.