

Ashford Borough Council

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL  
(SA/SEA)  
ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT**

**UPDATE REPORT**

**NOVEMBER 2017**



# 1. INTRODUCTION

## Summary

- 1.2 This update report is an Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Environmental Reports of May 2016, published and consulted upon (under Regulation 13 of the 2004 Regulations<sup>1</sup>) alongside the Regulation 19 Version Ashford Local Plan 2030 and the July 2017 SA Addendum, published to accompany the Local Plan 'Main Changes'. Consultation on the May 2016 SA took place over an eight week period between June and August 2016. Consultation on the July 2017 SA Addendum took place for a further 8 week period during July and August 2017.
- 1.3 This update report provides factual updates only. These are considered necessary to address specific issues or new sites raised in formal representations made either during the consultation in 2016 or 'Main Changes' consultation 2017. It is published alongside the Submission Version of the Local Plan 2030 (Dec 2017).
- 1.4 This report should therefore be read in conjunction with the original Local Plan SA/SEA Report May 2016, including the Planning for Gypsies and Travellers in the Local Plan Report May 2016, and the July 2017 SA/SEA Addendum.

## National Policy and Guidance

- 1.5 The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides guidance on whether the SA report should be updated if the draft Local Plan is modified following responses to consultations.
- 1.6 The NPPG provides the following relevant guidance in this respect:
- 'the sustainability appraisal report will not necessarily have to be amended;
  - modifications should only be considered 'where appropriate and proportionate to the level of change being made to the Local Plan';
  - 'a change is likely to be significant if it substantially alters the Plan and/or is likely to give rise to significant effects';
  - 'further assessment may be required if the changes have not previously been assessed and are likely to give rise to significant effects'
- 1.7 The NPPG also advises that further consultation on the SA may be required in such circumstances; however this should only be undertaken where necessary.<sup>2</sup>

# 2. UPDATED SITE ASSESSMENT SHEETS

## Update to site sheets from May 2016 Gypsies and Travellers SA report

- 2.1 This part includes factual updates to two site SA sheets published within the May 2016 Planning for Gypsies and Travellers in the Local Plan SA/SEA report. The Part 2 Consultation Statement (Response to representations – Appendix G) states that site sheets for DW7 and DW8 would be updated following acknowledgement of factual errors.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> NPPG Paragraph 021 Reference ID: 11-021-20140306 Revised date: 06 03 2014

- 2.2 Amended site assessment for DW7 and DW8 has therefore been undertaken. The sheet can be located in Appendix 1 - sites DW7 and DW8 have been merged together given that they both form site allocation Policy S44.

### **Update to site sheets from May 2016 SA/SEA**

- 2.3 The Part 2 Consultation Statement (Response to representations – Appendix G, page 195) states that the site sheet for WS21 (Kings Head, Shadoxhurst - site allocation S36) would be updated to reflect the correct scoring under the criterion 3.2. There has also been a factual update made to criterion 7.2.

## **3. NEW SITE ASSESSMENT SHEETS**

### **New 'Omission' Sites**

- 3.1 An SA update is required following representations received on the Main Changes public consultation in 2017 which proposed new sites as 'omission' sites to the Local Plan 2030 which had not been previously promoted or assessed through the Local Plan.
- 3.2 Not all new sites have been assessed in this SA/SEA. Only the sites that passed through the 3 assessment stages of the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) have been subject to this stage. Please see SHELAA update November 2017 and Appendix K of the Part 3 Consultation statement (SD05) for more information on this site assessment process.
- 3.2 New Site Assessment Sheets for sites additional submitted at 'Main Changes' consultation can be located in Appendix 2 of this Update for the following new site submissions:
- BD20a - North Street, Biddenden
  - CH37 – Land at Parson's Mead, Charing
  - DW42 – Mill House, Challock
  - SS60 – Land at Calleywell Lane, Aldington
  - SS61 – Land rear of Plough Inn, Brabourne
  - SS62 – Church Road, Smeeth
  - WC95 – Land rear of Red Lion PH, Charing Heath
  - WN24 – Land South of Stone Hill Road, Egerton
  - WS73 – Land adjacent to Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst
  - WS74 – Findon Stables, Shadoxhurst

## **4. STRATEGIC AND TOPIC POLICIES**

- 4.1 The strategic development proposals and reasonable alternatives remain unchanged and therefore no changes are made in this update report to Section 3 of the May 2016 SA/SEA Report.
- 4.2 In addition, no significant changes have been made to Topic Policies, including the Strategic Policies, and therefore no update on Section 5 of the May 2016 SA/SEA Report is required.

## Appendix 1 – Update to original site assessments

**This site assessment replaces the original 2 assessments included in the May 2016 Planning for Gypsies and Travellers in the Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Report**

**Site Ref: DW7 and DW8 (site allocation S44) Date Survey updated: August 2017**

**Site Name: Sunnybridge Farm / Watery Lane, Westwell**

**Site Description:**

**DW7 - This site currently contains a temporary single gypsy pitch. It is bounded to the north by the M20 motorway and to the east by Watery Lane in Westwell. There is a mature tree boundary along the road frontage and woodland to the north of the site, separating it from the M20. The existing pitch is located north east of the house and buildings in commercial use of Sunnybridge Farm, but separated by an agricultural field.**

**DW8 - This site forms the wider area to the east the existing single pitch identified as DW7. It is bounded to the north by the M20 motorway and to the east by Watery Lane in Westwell. The site itself forms part of the wider agricultural field which is currently in an arable rotation and extends to the railway line in the southern direction.**

**When viewed from Watery Lane the site is well screened due to the mature tree and hedgerow boundary. However, it is visible from the M20 motorway and the railway line to the south.**

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a internationally/ nationally designated site	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Would not have any known impacts, as site not within or near a LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No, the site is currently an arable field so it would not be a loss of habitat network	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site will not improve linkages or enable managed access	0

1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	The site is within the Kent Downs AONB (but sandwiched between the motorway and railway, which alters the landscape significantly in this area)	-2
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	Due to the site being located between the CTRL and M20 motorway, the landscape setting of this site has been changed considerably. There is also an existing temporary site adjoining this site. There would therefore be a neutral impact on the landscape	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	This site is currently adjoining a single pitch which has temporary permission. It is not visible when viewed from Watery Lane. There would be no cumulative impact of developing the site further.	0
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is not located within an area of Archaeology importance, but it is located in an area of archaeological potential. The site is not located near to a Conservation Area.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No, the site is not located near to any listed buildings.	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
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	Not in Floodzone	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	No constraint	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Not applicable to gypsy and traveller site	0

4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes, the site is located in an area of groundwater vulnerability	0
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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)	Not applicable to gypsy and traveller site	0
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
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?	No – however the site is located 4km from the edge of the Ashford Urban Area with good access from the A20.	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, more than 1.6km. However, due to the sites close proximity to the urban area of Ashford there are 9 surgeries located within 5.5km of the site and all but 1 are accepting patients.	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No, more than 1.6km. There are schools located within 3km of the site.	-2
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	No, there are numerous areas such as Hothfield Common. Westwell Recreation ground and Hoads Wood but these are slightly more than 1.6km	-2
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	No, more than 1.6km. The nearest play area is located in the main village of Westwell, which is 1.8km from the site	-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, the site is located near to the motor way.	-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?	Yes, the site has a IMD decile of 2 (where 1 is the most deprived 10%of Lower Super Output areas)	1

<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
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	0
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes, the nearest surgery at Cemetery Lane, Kennington is accepting new patients	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
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
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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 2	-1
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No impact on business units/significant employment.	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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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, not applicable	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<b>Conclusion:</b>			<b>Total:</b>
<p><b>Although this site is located in the AONB it is considered suitable to make the existing temporary pitch permanent and extend it, as the AONB in this part of the borough has been significantly altered by the M20 motorway and the Railway lines, meaning this site would not have detrimental impact on the landscape.</b></p> <p><b>It is also located within a relatively short distance, by car, from the edge of the urban area of Ashford. The site is not visible from Watery Lane due to the mature tree and hedgerow along the frontage and by making the pitch permanent issues of screening and audio protection could also be looked into in more detail.</b></p> <p><b>Although this site does not have a high score on the SA, the scoring should not be considered in isolation, particularly when considering the proposed use. A small number of pitches could be accommodated leaving the remainder of the field undeveloped. Site considered suitable for allocation in the Local Plan</b></p>			<b>-9</b>

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

**Site assessment replaces the original assessment included within the  
May 2016 SE/SEA Report – Appendix 3**

**Site Ref: WS21**

**Date Survey updated – July 2017**

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

<b>Site Description:</b>			
<p>The site wraps behind the southern boundary of the Kings head Public House in Shadoxhurst. It is a flat site that is currently unmanaged and overgrown grassland with trees and hedges around most boundaries. It is separated from the PH by a car park and a single track private access road to a new 4 house development in Maytree Place, which is within the site boundary on the western edge. The site spreads in a southern direction from the PH and joins housing in Nairne Close, although it is bounded by hedges and trees so is well screened. Open countryside is to the South East.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have a significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	No	0
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?	No	0

2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This site is an open area at present which does contribute to the rural character and setting of this part of the village. Development on this site would change the character of the area and the existing built form and landscape.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	This site is well screened from the wider landscape by the existing properties in the close and the tree boundary around the site and therefore the visual impact on the wider landscape would be minimal. The main impact would be the views of the landscape from properties opposite the site, and from the road and PH.	-1
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is 400m from an Archaeological site to the north which is a Roman Road. It is over 500m from the CA.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	<i>Yes – the PH is listed</i>	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Not applicable	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1

<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Site is 1.2ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Gain. The proposal includes a potential gain in onsite community facilities.	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.6km, However the site is proposing a Shop as part of development which would benefit the village as a whole for access to services	0
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a bus from Shadoxhurst	-1
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	There are no areas of green open space that are useable for recreation in this location. The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 800m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	<i>Removed area in Nairne Close (New Proposal includes plans for play area so neutral score)</i>	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Yes	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0

<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes. Not a designated cycle lane, but the High Weald Route 18 goes through the village as well as regional route 11.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No (with the exception of the already developed area)	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0

12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	unknown	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No. Shadoxhurst is a small village without many services. Nearest District centre would be Park Farm/Kingsnorth.	0
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?		n/a
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<b>Conclusion:</b>			<b>Total:</b>
<p><b>Overall this site scores well in the environmental, heritage and biodiversity sections as there are no constraints on the site. The site is also located in the centre of the village, ensuring that the development does not extend into the countryside beyond. However, this site scores poorly on the access to services as Shadoxhurst is a small village, spread out into 3 different areas, and relies on nearby villages and the Town Centre for services. This proposal, if taken forward is proposing a gain in community facilities and services as part of the development, which would benefit the wider community. However, these would not necessarily need to be delivered to make the site a suitable allocation in the Local Plan as it is suitable for housing in its own right.</b></p>			<b>1</b>

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

## Appendix 2 –Site Assessments of new sites, promoted during ‘Main Changes’ consultation

Site Ref: BD20a

Date Survey Completed: 20/10/2017

Site Name: North Street, Biddenden

<p>This is a substantial site located to the north of the main settlement of Biddenden, east of North Street. This site is bounded by existing residential properties on its south-western side. The former Kent &amp; East Sussex railway line runs along the eastern boundary beyond which is open countryside/agricultural land. The western boundary partly fronts North Street, which is sporadically enclosed by existing listed and unlisted dwellings and further parcels of countryside. Currently comprises an extensive area of a patchwork of fields currently used for agricultural purposes, and several ponds, with a number of mature trees and hedgerows within and around the site, particularly along the North west and eastern boundary.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are a significant number of trees and hedgerows within the site and around it, particularly the eastern edge. Many of which are covered by TPO and ponds within the site so there are likely to be losses in the habitat network.	-2
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Site would not improve linkages or enable managed access	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This is an edge of village site in a visually exposed location from the road frontage and where surrounding low density dwellings have well large established gardens with mature	-2

		trees. Whilst some screening exists along the road, this is minimal and development on this site would lead to a visual protrusion into the countryside that would be difficult to relate to existing low density and intermittent built forms on this side of the village.	
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Any development on this site would be visible from surrounding area owing to the level and open nature of the western edge. The tree boundary on the east would screen from the wider countryside so a minor negative impact would result.	-1
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The site is less than 50m from the conservation area and is only separated by the eastern end of a garden, of which the western end is within. Development on the southern part of this site would have a negative impact on the CA setting in this location.	0
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Yes – In the same location as the CA, there are 2 listed buildings in the south west corner (Tow House and The Forge House) and 3 listed buildings on the West side of North Street which directly overlook the site and there is likely to be negative impacts on the setting of these heritage assets.	-1
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1

<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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 – 10.8ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Shops less than 400m away in Biddenden village centre	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No. Nearest GP is 3.8 miles away in Headcorn	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Primary school within 500m of site.	0
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Using PROW through Mansion House Close it is within 500m of recreation ground	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Using PROW through Mansion House Close it is within 500m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	A PROW footpath bounds the southern edge of the site, and the A274 adjacent to the site has an existing pavement.	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
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Route 18 High Weald Ride – Canterbury to Royal Tunbridge Wells is 2.7km away	0

8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
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
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No impact	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Site is within 400m of the local High Street	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0

13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<p>This site benefits from proximity to the local centre of Biddenden, with a range of local services available within walking distance. However, development on this large site, would extend the built settlement substantially to the north-east with the potential for negative impacts to on-site biodiversity, ponds /TPO's and the landscape setting of the wider countryside. Development would not be in keeping with the current low density and intermittent built form. The visibility of the site from the main road would create a negative impact due to the lack of screening here, and particularly on the setting of the Conservation Area and the neighbouring listed buildings. Therefore, this site is not considered suitable for allocation.</p>			<b>Total:</b>  -2

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

**Site Ref:** CH37 (although larger – this site is made up partly from CH9 which had been assessed in Appendix 3 of May 2016 report)

**Date Survey Completed:** 23/10/2017

**Site Name:** Land at Parsons Mead, Charing

<p>The site is relatively level but slopes slightly upwards away from the A20. It is bordered by tall deciduous trees fronting the A20 and there is an additional line of conifers within the site, providing screening from the A20. A footpath runs along the north western boundary of the site and the site can be viewed more easily from here. In the southern portion of the site is an area set aside for allotments and stables, with the remainder being in equestrian use as a paddock. The KCC road depot joins the site to the south, with residential properties to the north and east.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site is bounded by mature trees and has a small stretch of mature hedgerow. The north western edge and centre of the site contains TPO's Development could potentially result in damage or loss of these.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This is a key green gap site on the entrance to the village of Charing. Development here would urbanise a relatively low density and open area of the village.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The south eastern boundary of the site abuts open fields and is visible from long distance views and the site is visible from the A20.	-2
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	The majority of the site is within the Conservation area and 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?*	Listed buildings adjacent to the site at Moat House and The Firs. These buildings are characterised as detached dwellings set in substantial mature gardens.	-1
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	The northern section of the site is within the Conservation Area and area of Archaeological potential. A development of dwellings with an extensive frontage within the Conservation area would harm the sensitive characteristics of the historic environment.	-1
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
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?	Infiltration likely to be suitable	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
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 – Charing village centre is less than 400m	1

6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Yes less than 400m	1
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes less than 400m	1
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, within 400m of a recreational area	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes, within 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	A pavement is available adjacent to the A20	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Development on this site would result in the loss of allotments to the south of the site.	-1
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The adjacent depot has unrestricted B8 use which has the potential to generate noise disturbance.	-1
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – Main road	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – Bus stop to east of site and railway station within 400m.	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			

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
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Southern tip of sub alluvial river terrace 3	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 2	-1
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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
While this site is particularly sustainable, within reach of a number of local services and transport links in the main local centre of Charing, it is situated wholly within one of the more sensitive Conservation Areas in the borough, containing a number of listed buildings and scheduled monuments. There is potential for substantial negative impact on these heritage assets, along with on the TPOs within the site which contribute greatly to the landscape and visual quality of the area. Due to the suitability of a number of other sites in Charing delivering housing, this site is not considered suitable for development.			<b>Total:</b> <b>2</b>

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

Site Ref: DW42

Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2017

Site Name: Mill House, Challock

This site is located in the village of Challock, on the northern side of the A252 Canterbury Road behind existing residential properties on the road frontage (Mill House). The site is located wholly within the AONB. To the north is the AE118 public bridleway - Mill Lane track. To the east of the site is a private track linking Sunnyside with Mill Lane, the lane itself running the whole length of the northern boundary of the applicant's ownership connecting with Faversham Road. The area is characterised by mixed character and style housing development along the road frontage, with some small cul-de-sacs.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No – not within a designated habitat area	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No – not close to a LWS	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Would necessitate the removal of mature hedgerow	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	Potential for improvement of connectivity to wider landscape area from Carvet Wood through adjacent site.	1
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	Yes – wholly within the Kent Downs AONB	-2
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	No – the site is some way behind the main frontage to Canterbury Road, and is wholly behind existing development	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Unlikely – this site is well bounded by landscape features and existing development.	0

<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No – 75m from curtilage of a listed building	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford’s historic and/or cultural assets?	Unlikely to have significant impact if low-rise	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event or 1 in 30-year event	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes (3)	0
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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 – in isolation, this site does not meet the size threshold for allocation.	0
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	Neutral.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Yes, the site is less than 100m from the village shop.	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No, there is no GP surgery in Challock. The nearest surgery is in Charing	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, the site is less than 500m from Challock Primary School	0
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			

7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, the site is within 150m of the Challock Green	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Site is 700m from equipped play area	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a public footpath at the rear of the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	No – site would have to cross adjacent plot for access to Canterbury Road via Old Clockhouse Green	0
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes - Frequent bus service between Ashford and Faversham	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	The nearest doctors surgery is in Charing and it is accepting new patients	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No - greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			

11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	No	0
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	The site is located on Grade 2 agricultural land	-1
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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?	N/A	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
This site is adjacent to locally-established settlement confines and within reach of a reasonable number of local services, and would have limited potential for landscape impact given its bounded location. However, given its limited size as a standalone parcel for delivery, and questionable capacity for vehicular access which would be required through the adjacent site, it is not suitable for allocation at this time.			<b>Total: 0</b>

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

## Site Name: Land at Calleywell Lane, Aldington

<p>This former quarry site has been cultivated and is now to be regarded as greenfield. This site is used as agricultural land, bordering other agricultural land (which is LWS designation) to the west. The site is located on the frontage of Calleywell Lane, is bounded by woodland to the north and a wooded LWS to the west. Linear development characterises the southern edge of the site with detached dwellings running along Roman Road (these also form part of the village conservation area). There is some uneven land in the centre of the site.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Adjoining LWS to west; close to AW and TPO to south	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	Yes – The site adjoins a designated LWS the whole length of its western edge. (AS18 – Aldington Sand Pit) and is therefore very likely to have a significant negative effect	-1
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are streams and ponds on site, although the site is substantial and development may be able to mitigate/avoid	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
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 development along the road frontage is historic linear form, but on the opposite side of Calleywell Lane are 2 recent developments of a care home and residential cul-de-sac. Development of this site would not be out character.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The site is located in a prominent position at the top of a ridge line. Houses built in this location would be clearly visible from the	-2

		open countryside to the north and east unless well screened.	
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Adjoins Aldington Clap Hill Conservation Area to the south; in an Area of Archaeological Potential for prehistoric finds, and adjacent to a Roman road.	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	Adjacent to a terrace of Grade II listed buildings on Roman Road.	-1
3.3	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Potential for negative impacts on the rural setting of the Clap Hill Conservation Area	-1
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration likely to be suitable.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes – site is 2.98ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No change.	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Local shop 230m; adjacent to Post Office	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	More than 1.6km away – nearest is in Sellindge	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Aldington Primary - around 630m	0
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			

7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Less than 400m from Quarry Wood open space and Reynolds Playing field	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	360m from Play Area	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No – there is no pedestrian footway along Calleywell Lane, nor any PROW connecting with or across the site.	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Neither	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	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
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – direct access from Calleywell Lane	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes – within 400m of bus stop	0
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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, but nearest surgeries are in Sellindge and Hamstreet	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No – although former quarry is now Greenfield.	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			

11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes - Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone)	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Grade 2/3	-1
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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	1
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes – Aldington village	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><b>While this substantial site is located within close walking distance of a number of local services in Aldington, it is particularly vulnerable for a number of reasons. The site does not benefit from suitable pedestrian walking routes along main roads or across the site to connect it with the settlement and, indeed, it is very much an edge-of-settlement site having been used in the past as a quarry. The site is greenfield and development in this location would constitute an encroachment into the surrounding countryside and, furthermore, given the topography of the site would be more prominent than other locations locally. The heritage context of this location is particularly sensitive, with the site adjoining the Aldington Clap Hill Conservation Area to the south, with an area of archaeological potential relating to the Roman Road across the site also. Given this extensive number of constraints, the site is considered inappropriate for allocation in this Local Plan.</b></p>			<p><b>Total:</b> -4</p>

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

## Site Name: The Plough Inn, Brabourne Lees

The site is located to the rear of residential properties fronting Lees Road and is located on the northern edge of the Brabourne/Smeeth built settlement form which goes into open countryside. This site is currently in use as a pub and associated garden land. Adjacent to the western boundary is a substantial allotment; to the north are residential gardens, and to the south is the access track to the allotments and a continuation of the settlement form which on this side of the road is largely linear frontage with pockets of small backland cul-de-sacs.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site has hedgerows and TPOs on site and adjoins allotments/countryside so may have negative effects	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This northern area of the settlement on western side of the road is characterised by spaciouly laid out dwellings which are set in substantial grounds. The proposed use of the site for four dwellings would not be at odds with the existing character, however it would extend beyond the typical ribbon style layout in this area.	0
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	No long distance views afforded of the site from public points.	0

<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
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?*	Large curtilage of a listed building adjacent but listed building itself is 90m from the site separated by the allotment.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	A traditional style building occupies the forward part of the site however this is not listed.	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration likely to be suitable.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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 – site measures 0.45ha	0
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
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?	Village centre/store less than 400m	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	Nearest GP is at Sellindge more than 1.6km away	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Nearest school is 600m away.	0
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			

7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Less than 400m at The Warren	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Greater than 800m at Smeeth	-1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Bridge Road is served by a pedestrian walkway along its length to the centre of the village. A Public right of way is located to the south of the site.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	The pub within the site has the potential to generate late night noise.	-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
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	Yes	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	No. Site is mainly greenfield	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			

11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Yes Silica and construction sandstone lie in the north 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 2	-1
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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
This site is within close proximity of the local village centre of Brabourne/Smeeth with a number of services. There are so significant constraints on the site, but it would change the settlement form on this side of the road, on this countryside edge location. Given the relatively small size of the site, this is considered unsuitable for allocation at this time.			<b>Total: 1</b>

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

Site Name: Land at Church Road, Smeeth

Site Description:			
<p>This agricultural land site lies off Church Road, one of the main entrances to the village of Smeeth. It is flat, and occupied by a large agricultural building with associated hardstanding, along with a small area of grazing land. The field is currently a gap between built development along Church Road with a site allocated for housing in the draft Local Plan to the north (S38) and The Rectory to the South. The site is well screened from Church Road by an established hedgerow and trees, however the southeastern edge is bounded by a fence, giving substantial visibility into the site. There is access to the site via the existing access to the agricultural storage site. A PROW runs along the south western boundary of the site. Adjacent to the site is a recreation field and scout hut. The area is very rural in character and the road narrows to a single lane at points close to this site with high hedges along the road either side. A cluster of TPOs and a pond lie within the northern corner of the site.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within 100m of a nationally designated site? (SSSI, National Nature Reserve, Special Area of Conservation)	No	0
1.2	Is the site located within 100m of a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of trees/hedgerows?	Some limited clearance may be necessary to create a safe access point.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or green linkages?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the green corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or adjoining an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Would development of the site respect the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	The area is rural in character with linear development mainly consisting of detached 2 storey housing. Development of the site would alter the rural character of this part of the village.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development?	The site is relatively exposed to the countryside to the south east. The site is well screened from Church Road and the playing fields opposite by mature hedging, however	-1

		this may need to be removed to make a clear access point and as such the site will be more visible.	
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Area of archaeological importance 150m to the south west  A conservation area lies approximately 60m to the south west, however there is the opportunity to mitigate impact on the setting of the Conservation Area through design and landscaping.	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
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event. Less than 10% of the site is at risk of surface water flooding from the 1 in 30-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests permeability at this site, a site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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 approximately 1.94 ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0

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

<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
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
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	Yes. The site is in Smeeth and Brabourne Lees which offer a variety of services	1
13.2	Would the site contribute to the regeneration and revitalisation of Ashford town centre?	No	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	No	0
<p><b>Conclusion:</b> The main settlements of Brabourne Lees and Smeeth have been considered conjoined for some time reliant on many of the same services, but this part of the settlement is a green gap between the Smeeth CA and main settlement area. The site, while not adjacent, is closer to the Smeeth Conservation Area and has more potential to impact the setting of this asset. Furthermore, allocation would further erode the rural feel of the settlement. While this site does not offer any particular constraints to development, the presence of the adjoining allocation on Church Road means that cumulative impacts of development on this part of the village if both sites were allocated would be quite significant. Therefore this site is not considered suitable.</p>			<p><b>Total:</b> <b>3</b></p>

## Site Name: Land to Rear of Red Lion, Charing Heath

This is a rectangular site is the garden of the Red Lion PH, situated within the small settlement of Charing Heath. To the NW, beyond the site's tree screen, is Tile Lodge Road which is enclosed on its other side by mid-20th century rural residential development. The Wind Hill residential estate marks the site's NE boundary. To the SW is the Red Lion Public House, while there is an area of open space to the SW with a PROW running close to the site boundary.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	The site is fringed by established trees and hedgerows, and it would be likely necessary to remove part of this hedgerow to establish access, however most could be retained.	-1
1.4	Would development of the site enable the creation of new habitat and/or components in the habitat network?	No	0
1.5	Is the site located within or adjoining the Green Corridor?	No	0
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
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?	Whilst most development in a rural setting will impact on the landscape, the built form in the vicinity is characterised by inter-war and post war dwelling houses. As such, any development on this site would not adversely impact on the character of the townscape/landscape.	-1

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	The site is elevated from the highway and as such development on this site could appear prominent.	-1
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
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. Though the building is adjacent there would be a substantial gap between this and the site to the risk of impact on setting is minimal.	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	N/A	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration may be suitable. Further site investigation should be carried out to assess potential for drainage by infiltration.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	Yes	0
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	No – 0.45ha	0
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No impact	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	No. Nearest centre/shop is 2.4km away in Charing	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No. Nearest GP is 2.4km away in Charing	-2

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No. Nearest primary school is 2.4km away in Charing	-2
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes. Playing field less than 400m away.	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes. Playing field within 400m	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	There is a public footpath approximately 100m to the north however Tile Lodge Road is a single width lane with no pedestrian footway along this stretch. Whilst any development could incorporate the provision of pedestrian footways, these footways would not connect to any existing footways.	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to land-use/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No	0
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			

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
<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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?	N/A	0
13.3	Would the site result in the loss of shops/services?	N/A	0
This site, while well within the built area of Charing Heath, is constrained firstly by its size – given that it is smaller than 0.5ha and the settlement in general is unsuitable for dense development, it would be unable to deliver much housing. Secondly, it is constrained by the relative distance to local services, which are absent in Charing Heath, and that pedestrian routes are patchy. Not appropriate for allocation in this Local Plan.			<b>Total:</b> -4

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

Site Ref: WN24

Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2017

Site Name: Land south of junction of Stone Hill Road and New Road, Egerton

<p>This is a substantial fallow field adjacent to the eastern edge of the settlement of Egerton (Harmers Way), beyond Stone Hill Road. The land falls from its boundary with New Stonehill Farm down to New Road (and immediately opposite the existing proposed allocation in Egerton). As mentioned, the site is adjacent to New Stone Hill Farm - now in purely residential use - to the south-west. To the north-west is the mid-1990s cul-de-sac residential development of Harmers Way; to the north-east across New Road is a sheep pasture, the northern part of which would be allocated for housing development in the emerging Local Plan; and to the south-east is open countryside.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	Some removal of the mature hedgerow around the site may be required for access	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
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
2.1	Is the site within or in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?*	No	0
2.2	Could development of the site respond effectively to the existing character and quality of the landscape/ townscape?	This part of the village is very rural in character and is the start of open countryside. Development of this green field will have a negative impact on the character of this key entrance to the village.	-2

2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – given topography of the land, built form would be visible from further afield, resulting in a potentially substantial visual impact from the east.	-1
<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	Area of Archaeological Potential, area of early prehistoric potential. W of site has a sliver of Area of Archaeological Potential around pre-medieval windmill	-1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Given archaeological potential watching brief would be necessary. Otherwise, few constraints.	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Infiltration likely to be suitable.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes – site is 1.3ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
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 – close to services in Egerton	1
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – 2.97 miles away (Charing)	-2

6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	Yes, within 400m	1
<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	Yes, within 400m	1
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Yes – within 400m of play area and skate park in the recreation field	1
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No pedestrian footway on or near site	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	No	0
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	No – bus infrequent	0
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
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
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
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

<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
11.1	Is the site located on existing, known mineral reserves?*	Entirely located on limestone Hythe formation Kentish ragstone	-1
11.2	Is the site designated as a Regionally Important Geological site (RIGS)?	No	0
11.3	Is the site on high quality grade agricultural land (1,2,3)	Yes – grade 2	-2
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
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
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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
<p><b>There is limited pedestrian access between the site and village services, and long-ranging views/visual impact of development, and highways improvements required to ensure a safe access point. Development of this site would extend the built settlement markedly to the south into what is now countryside. The development to the north at Harmers Way effectively rounds-off the settlement which, while not an unsustainable village by any means, is not as well equipped with local services as others in the borough. The existing Local Plan allocation's south-eastern boundary is opposite Stone Hill Road, and there is a requirement for extensive landscaping to diminish its visual impact. At present, Stone Hill Road provides a suitable village development boundary and, given that the land rises noticeably from its junction with New Road, development on this site would have a major visual impact. Not suitable for development.</b></p>			<p><b>Total:</b> -1</p>

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

## Site Name: Land adjacent to Woodchurch Road, Shadoxhurst

Site comprises two detached bungalows (Brinklow and Rivendell) which both currently front Woodchurch Road, and an extensive area of field expanding out beyond the rear gardens. There road frontage here consists of residential linear development, with only minimal backland development which are agricultural buildings.

There is a pond beyond the site's eastern boundary. The southern boundary is bounded by a substantial tree belt, beyond which is open countryside. The western boundary is the rear of Wymondham, at which frontage development of 4 dwellings is under construction.

No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	No	0
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There are a number of trees within the site (in the gardens) and around the boundaries. There may be a requirement for the removal of some of these. There is a pond on the eastern boundary of this site, although this need not be prejudiced by 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
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
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 would change the current development pattern in Shadoxhurst from its current linear pattern, extending into countryside further than the current built form.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Likely to be a limited visual impact from the south due to the tree boundary	-1

<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
3.1	Is the site within or adjoining an area of archaeology importance or a Conservation Area?*	No	1
3.2	Does the site contain or does it adjoin a listed building, scheduled monument (SM) or registered Park/ garden?*	No	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Unlikely to have significant impact on heritage assets	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is at risk from the 1 in 100-year event.	-1
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement. Infiltration unlikely to be suitable, due to impermeable bedrock geology.	0
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
5.1	Does the site's size and proposed use meet the threshold for the provision of affordable housing? (currently over 15 units/ site area in excess of 0.5 ha)	Yes – site is 1.5ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	The proposal includes suggestions of local shop and pharmacy but no viability evidence presented	1
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.6km,	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a free bus from Shadoxhurst	-1

<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	600m from Playing field/recreation ground	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	Nearest Play area is in Hornash Lane (600m) since Nairne Close has been decommissioned.	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	Direct access to Woodchurch Road	1
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	Neutral	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Direct access to Woodchurch Road (once removal of housing has taken place)	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes – routes 18 and 11 go through the village.	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	The northern part of the site currently comprises two detached bungalows. The southern (majority) of the site is undeveloped.	-1
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0

<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	No	0
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	Yes – 13.65 av. Max.	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
13.1	Is the site within 400m of the nearest district centre?	No – Nearest District centre is Park Farm	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><b>Development of this site would result in a clear encroachment into the countryside to the south of the existing linear line of development in Shadoxhurst and the removal of the properties would also negatively affect the current character and built form which, in combination with other sites coming forward in the vicinity, could result in cumulative visual harm to the settlement in this location.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed redevelopment of this site is proposing a number of benefits to the settlement, increasing the number of services available locally as this is currently not a well served settlement. However, no evidence has been presented that this facilities would be viable or actually provided. The site is not considered suitable for development.</b></p>			<p><b>Total:</b> <b>0</b></p>

Site Ref: WS74

Date Survey Completed: 24/10/2017

Site Name: Land north of Bethersden Road west of Criol Lane (Findon Stables), Shadoxhurst

<p>This site has a number of stables/outbuildings on the eastern part of the site. The western two thirds of the site consists of two long paddocks divided by a linear access road. The Mace Terrace Waste Water Pumping Station is on the eastern boundary of the site. The site is adjacent on its southern boundary to a row of bungalows in generous gardens; to the north beyond the land drain is Little Criol Wood Ancient Woodland, in which there is some limited development. To the east and the west are parcels of agricultural (grazing) land.</p>			
No.	Site Assessment/ Screening Question	Assessment of effects, mitigation, uncertainties, assumptions	SCORE
<b>Objective 1: Biodiversity</b>			
1.1	Is the site located within or adjoining a designated habitat?	Adjacent to Ancient Woodland	-1
1.2	Would development of the site be likely to have significant effect on a Local Wildlife Site?	No	0
1.3	Would development of the site result in the loss of key components in the habitat network, such as woodland, trees/hedgerows, wetland, ponds, streams and ditches or other features supporting protected species or biodiversity?	There is a ditch across the northern boundary of the site, but development would not require its loss.	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
<b>Objective 2: Landscape</b>			
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 extend the built form of the village and domesticate the countryside.	-1
2.3	Would there be an identifiable and cumulative visual impact from the development of the site and related sites?	Yes – development would extend the built area to the north-west and, and would urbanise this rural lane and part of the village especially from public highway.	-2

<b>Objective 3: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>			
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 - While the site is within 100m of the Grade II listed Kings Head Pub and Little Criol farmhouse there is existing development in the intervening areas	0
3.2	Will it respect and enhance the character and setting of Ashford's historic and/or cultural assets?	Unlikely to have significant impacts on heritage assets	0
<b>Objective 4: Water</b>			
4.1	Is the site wholly or partially in Flood Zone 2 or 3?*	No	0
4.2	Is the site at risk from Surface Water Flooding: from the 1 in 100-year event and/or from the 1 in 30-year event?	The uFMfSW indicates the site is not at risk from the 1 in 100-year or 1 in 30-year events	0
4.3	Is the site suitable to use SuDs infiltration systems?	Mapping suggests low permeability at this settlement.	1
4.4	Is the site within a groundwater source protection zone?	No	1
<b>Objective 5: Housing and Affordable Housing</b>			
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 measures 2.35ha	1
<b>Objective 6: Access to Services and Social Inclusion</b>			
6.1	Will development of the site result in the loss or gain of onsite services and/ or facilities?	No	0
6.2	Is the site located in close proximity to a Local Centre/ Shop?	Stubbs Cross Shop 1.6km	-2
6.3	Is the site located in close proximity to a GP Surgery?	No – nearest is Hamstreet or Kingsnorth	-2
6.4	Is the site located in close proximity to a Primary school?	No – Hamstreet or Kingsnorth. However, Hamstreet School runs a free bus from Shadoxhurst	-2

<b>Objective 7: Health and Wellbeing</b>			
7.1	Is the site located in close proximity to public green open space? (could include informal open space, accessible by the public)	There are no areas of green open space that are useable for recreation in this location. The sports field is located at the opposite end of the village 750m	0
7.2	Is the site located within close proximity of an equipped play area?	750m	0
7.3	Does the site have direct access to a footway (PROW or pedestrian pavement)?	No – No pedestrian footway from Criol Lane, and no PROW on or close to site.	0
7.4	Would development result in the loss or gain of local and/ or strategic open space?	No	0
7.5	Is the site close to landuse/s which may affect health and amenity?	No	0
7.6	Is the site situated in an area which is in the 20% most deprived nationally when measured against the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010?	No	0
<b>Objective 8: Sustainable Travel</b>			
8.1	Is there direct access to the site from the public highway?	Yes – existing access from Criol Lane	1
8.2	Is the site within 1.6km of an existing designated cycleway?	Yes – routes 11 and 18 run along Woodchurch Road through Shadoxhurst	1
8.3	Is the site within 400m of a Railway station or bus stop that provides an hourly or more frequent bus service?	50m from Bus stop – Bus 2A between Ashford and Tenterden runs every 30 minutes	1
<b>Objective 9: Infrastructure Delivery and Availability</b>			
9.1	Is the site reliant on the delivery of large scale/significant infrastructure to make it deliverable?	No	0
9.2	Is the nearest GP surgery currently accepting new patients?	Yes – Hamstreet Surgery, Woodchurch Surgery and Kingsnorth Surgery all accepting patients	1
<b>Objective 10: Land Use and Geology</b>			
10.1	Is the site on previously developed land?	Part – site is mix of stables and greenfield	0
10.2	Would development involve the reuse or redevelopment of derelict buildings?	No	0

<b>Objective 11: Minerals and Waste and Soil</b>			
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
<b>Objective 12: Sustainable Economic Growth, Employment and Skills</b>			
12.1	Is the site being promoted for greater or less business/ employment space?	Less – currently in operation as employment	-1
12.2	If the site is being promoted for business uses, does it have access to broadband?	No	0
12.3	Does the proposal include an educational component/ learning opportunities?	No	0
12.4	Would it help support sustainable tourism?	No	0
<b>Objective 13: Town and District Centre Vitality</b>			
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
<p><b>This site is not suitable for development, which would spread the built area of the village to the north-west and erode the rural character of this location and the narrow Criol Lane. Development would be visually intrusive and remove the gentle transition provided by the existing site use into the rural area. There is an existing use on site which would be lost. The site is also adjacent to Ancient Woodland. Shadoxhurst in general has limited services and while the site has existing vehicular access, its pedestrian linkages to the village are inadequate.</b></p>			<p><b>Total: -4</b></p>

\* 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.