



## Canterbury City Council

# Sustainability Appraisal of the Canterbury District Local Plan

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Appraisal of Omission Housing Sites (June 2016)



#### Report for

Karen Britton Planning Policy Manager Canterbury City Council Military Way Canterbury CT1 1YW

#### Main contributors

Pete Davis Alex Melling Sean Nicholson

#### Issued by



#### Approved by



#### Amec Foster Wheeler

Gables House Kenilworth Road Learnington Spa Warwickshire CV32 6JX United Kingdom Tel +44 (0) 1926 439 000

Doc Ref. 37340-04

h:\projects\37340 sa and hra support to canterbury\post examination support\housing sites sa addendum\final report\37340 omission housing sites sa report\_june final.docx

## Copyright and non-disclosure notice

The contents and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by Amec Foster Wheeler (© Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited 2015). save to the extent that copyright has been legally assigned by us to another party or is used by Amec Foster Wheeler under licence. To the extent that we own the copyright in this report, it may not be copied or used without our prior written agreement for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in this report. The methodology (if any) contained in this report is provided to you in confidence and must not be disclosed or copied to third parties without the prior written agreement of Amec Foster Wheeler. Disclosure of that information may constitute an actionable breach of confidence or may otherwise prejudice our commercial interests. Any third party who obtains access to this report by any means will, in any event, be subject to the Third Party Disclaimer set out below.

#### Third-party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Amec Foster Wheeler excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

#### Management systems

This document has been produced by Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited in full compliance with the management systems, which have been certified to ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and OHSAS 18001 by LRQA.

#### Document revisions

No.	Details	Date
1	Draft Housing Omission Site SA Report_June 2016	27.6.16
2	Final Housing Omission Site SA Report_ June 2016	30.6.2016

# Non-Technical Summary

#### Introduction

The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) provides an overview of this addendum to the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Sustainability Appraisal Report (June 2014). The addendum presents the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of a further nine omission housing sites submitted to Canterbury City Council (the Council) following consultation on the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft — Proposed Amendments (November 2015) and the reappraisal of one site, Hersden Colliery (SHLAA-041).

The following sections of this NTS:

- provide an overview of the Canterbury District Local Plan including the nine omission housing sites;
- describe the approach to undertaking the SA of the omission housing sites;
- summarise the findings of the SA of the omission housing sites, together with the update of the appraisal for one site (Hersden Colliery); and
- sets out the next steps in the SA of the Local Plan.

## What is the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan?

The draft Local Plan sets out the Council's vision for the Canterbury District up to 2031 and provides the spatial planning response to the challenge of growth. It has been developed taking into account national planning policy and guidance, the objectives of other plans and programmes, assessment (including SA), the findings of evidence base studies and the outcomes of engagement. The Plan comprises of the following core components:

- Vision and Plan Objectives;
- Strategic Policies (relating to the quantum, distribution and location of growth the 'preferred development option'); and
- Thematic Policies.

Following consultation on Core Strategy Options in January 2010<sup>1</sup> and the Preferred Option Draft Local Plan<sup>2</sup> in June 2013, the Local Plan Publication Draft was then issued for consultation from 5<sup>th</sup> June 2014 to 18<sup>th</sup> July 2014 prior to its submission to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

The Examination in Public (EiP) commenced in July 2015 with Stage 1 Hearings taking place between 14<sup>th</sup> July and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015. Stage 1 of the EiP closed at the end of July 2015 and the Planning Inspector then wrote to the Council on the 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015 with his initial findings and comments. The Inspector asked the Council to increase the housing numbers required for the area and to identify sufficient sites to ensure that the District has a 5 year housing land supply. This required amendments to the draft Local Plan. Consultation on the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft – Proposed Amendments (November

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Canterbury City Council (2010) Canterbury District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Options Report for consultation. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Canterbury City Council (2013) *Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Option Consultation Draft June 2013*. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf</a> {accessed November 2015].

2015) began on the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2015 and ended on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016. Nine omission housing sites were submitted during consultation on the proposed amendments and these have been subject to SA.

Further information about the preparation of the Local Plan is set out in Section 1.3 of this addendum and is available via the Council's website: <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/</a>.

## What are the Omission Housing Sites?

**Table NTS1** details the nine omission housing sites that have been appraised in this Addendum.

Table NTS1 Omission Housing Sites

SHLAA Ref	Site	Size	Status
SHLAA-232	Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry	1.2 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-233	Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge	3.3 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-234	Land at Shalloak road, Sturry/Broad Oak, Canterbury	2.5 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-235	Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, Chartham Hatch	17.0 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-236	Land at Roper Road, Canterbury	0.2 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-237	Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr Bridge	140 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-238	Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable	2ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-239	Land adj. to Spires Academy, Hersden	3ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-240	Land South of Aylesham	240ha	Omission housing site

NB: SHLAA-240 is a large site which crosses the Local Authority areas of Canterbury and Dover. It is the Council's view that any development in this location should be limited to an extension of Aylesham, which is outside of the Canterbury Local Authority Area.

The sites listed above in **Table NTS 1** have then been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and the resulting findings compared to the SA of those housing sites included in the Council's preferred development option.

Further information relating to the preferred development option is contained in Section 3.3 of this addendum.

## What is a Sustainability Appraisal?

It is very important that the Canterbury District Local Plan contributes to a sustainable future for the plan area. To support this objective, the Council is required to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Local Plan<sup>3</sup>. SA is a means of ensuring that the likely social, economic and environmental effects of the Local Plan are identified, described and appraised and also incorporates a process set out under a European Directive<sup>4</sup> and related UK regulations<sup>5</sup> called Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

June 2016 Doc Ref. 37340-04

3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The requirement for SA of local plans is set out under section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (statutory instrument 2004 No. 1633).

SA has been undertaken at all of the key stages in the development of the Local Plan. The SA of the submitted draft Local Plan was undertaken in June 2014. To ensure that the final, adopted Local Plan takes into account sustainability considerations, and to meet the Council's responsibilities under the SEA Directive, the nine omission sites have been appraised.

Section 1.4 of this addendum describes in further detail the requirement for SA of local plans and the SA process in respect of the Canterbury District Local Plan.

How Have the Omission Housing Sites Been Appraised?

To support the appraisal of the Local Plan, a SA Framework has been developed. This contains a series of sustainability objectives and guide questions that reflect both the current socio-economic and environmental issues which may affect (or be affected by) the Local Plan and the objectives contained within other plans and programmes reviewed for their relevance to the SA and Local Plan. The SA objectives are shown in **Table NTS 2**.

Table NTS 2 SA Objectives Used to Appraise Sites

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	
1. Economy and Employment: To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone.	9. Access to Services: Share access to services and benefits to prosperity fairly.
2. Rural/Coastal Communities: To sustain vibrant rural and coastal communities.	10. Sustainable Living and Revitalisation: To revitalise town and rural centres and to promote sustainable living.
3. Water Quality: To protect and improve the quality of inland and coastal waters.	11. High Quality Design and Sustainability: To encourage sustainable design and practice.
4. Transport: Reduce road traffic and its impacts, promoting more sustainable modes of transport.	12. Housing: To make suitable housing available and affordable to everyone.
5. Countryside and Historic Environment: To protect and improve landscapes for both people and wildlife and to protect and maintain vulnerable assets (including built and historic).	13. Quality of Life: To improve the quality of life for those living and working in the District.
6. Geology and Biodiversity: To avoid damage to geological sites and improve biodiversity.	14. Use of Land: To deliver more sustainable use of land in more sustainable location patterns.
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality: To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency.	15. Natural Resources: To ensure the prudent use of natural resources and the sustainable management of existing resources.
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion: To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to public well-being, the economy and the environment.	16. Waste: To reduce generation and disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable management of waste.

Each of the sites identified in **Table NTS1** has been appraised against the SA objectives. For each SA objective, an overall 'score' has been provided according to the scoring system in **Table NTS 3**.

Table NTS 3 Scoring System Used in the SA of Sites

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed site contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed site contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed site does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed site detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed site detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	
Uncertain	The proposed site has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.	?

Section 3 of this addendum provides further information in relation to the approach to the appraisal of the omission housing sites.

What are the Findings of the Appraisal of the Omission Housing Sites?

Table NTS 4 summarises the findings of the appraisal of the omission housing sites.

Table NTS 4 Results of the SA of the Omission Housing Sites

Objective Site	Economy	Rural/Coastal Community	Water	Transport	Countryside & Historic Environment	Geology & Biodiversity	Climate Change	Flood Risk	Access to Services	Sustainable Living	Design	Housing	Quality of Life	Use of Land	Natural Resources	Waste
SHLAA-232	+	+	ı	-	/+	ı	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	+	?	?
SHLAA-233	+	+	?	+	/+	-	?	?	+	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-234	+	+	-			-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-235	0/?	+	0			-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-236	+	0/?	0/?	++	-/+	0/?	?	?	++	+	?	+	?	+	?	?
SHLAA-237	+	++	-		/+	-	?	?	+		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-238	+	+		-/?	-	1	?	?	+	+	?	+	?	ı	?	?
SHLAA-239	+	+		-	/++	-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-240	++	++	-	++	/++	-	?	?	++		?	++	?		?	?

**Table NTS 5** sets out the proposed housing sites in the preferred development option. These are the proposed housing allocations in the draft Canterbury District Local Plan 2014.

Table NTS 5 Results of the SA of the Proposed Housing Sites in the Preferred Development Option

Objective	Economy	Rural/Coastal Community	Water	Transport	Countryside & Historic Environment	Geology & Biodiversity	Climate Change	Flood Risk	Access to Services	Sustainable Living	Design	Housing	Quality of Life	Use of Land	Natural Resources	Waste
Site	Есог	Rural/( Comr	Wē	Tran	Countr Hist	Geol	Climate	Flood	Acce	Susta Liv	De¢	Hon	Quality	Use o	Nat Reso	Wa
SHLAA-001	+	+	?	+	-	-	0/?	?	+	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-010	+	++	?	++	-	0/?	0/?	?	++	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-011	++	++	1	+	ı	0/?			+	I	?	++	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-012*	+	+	0/?	+	ı	0	0/?	?	+	+/-	?	+	?	i	?	?
SHLAA-013	+	+	-	0	ı	1	0/?	?	+	ı	?	++	?	1	?	?
SHLAA-038	+	?	0	++	-	+	0/?	?	+	+	?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-078*	+	+	-	+		-	0/?	?	+	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-096	+	+	?		++	?	0/?	?	+		?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-129	++	++	?		-1	•	+	?	++	-1	?	++	?	-1	?	?
SHLAA-130*	++	+	-	+		-			+	+	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-148*	++	++	0	++		-	+	?	++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-171*	+	+	0	-		-	0/?	?	0	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-177	++	++		++	-1	-1	+	?	++	-1	?	++	?	-1	?	?
SHLAA-186*	+	+	0	++	-1	•	0/?	?	++	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-199*	+	+	0	+	-	-	0/?	?	+	+/-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-206	++	?	0			++	++	?	++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-208	++	++							++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-210*	++	?	0				+	?	++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-211	0	+	?	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-220*	+	?	-			-	?	?	++/-	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-226	+	+	0/?	+	-	-	0/?	?	+	1	?	+	?	ı	?	?
SHLAA-228	++	?		-	1		0/?	?	++/	+	?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-230	+	?		++	-	-	-	-	++	+	?	+	?	-	?	?

<sup>\*</sup> Proposed Amendment to the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2014)

Based on the findings of the appraisal of omission housing sites contained in this addendum and other evidence, the Council is not proposing to revise further the suite of site allocations that comprise the preferred development option. Whilst the number of significant positive and negative effects across the SA Objectives is broadly similar between the omission sites and those that comprise the preferred development option, the omission housing sites do not form part of the preferred development option for a number of reasons, including insufficient highway capacity and infrastructure, potential impacts on ecology (including designated sites and protected species) and landscape, land contamination, poor sustainability, need, viability and deliverability.

The appraisal has demonstrated that the preferred option would have a significant positive effect in relation to housing availability and affordability as well as access to services and rural/coastal communities. However, development of the scale proposed would have likely negative effects on SA objectives relating to, in particular, geology and biodiversity, land use and countryside and the historic environment. Notwithstanding the negative effects identified during the appraisal, it should be noted that where there is the

potential for adverse effects, these could be mitigated through the application of draft Local Plan policies and at the planning application stage.

Detailed appraisal pro forma for each of the omission housing sites are contained at Appendix A to this addendum and an appraisal summary has been produced for each site at Appendix B. The appraisal findings are summarised in Section 3 of the addendum.

The SA for the Hersden Colliery site (SHLAA-041) that has been previously appraised has also been updated. The site has been reappraised on the basis that it is a mix of previously developed land and greenfield land. No other changes have been considered. Although the change produces a mixed score against the use of land objective where previously it was negative, the change is not material to the overall findings for the site, and the Council does not proposed to allocate the site as the reasons given previously for rejecting the site stand (Section 3.6 of the main report has more details).

## **Next Steps**

This addendum to the SA Report is being published as an addendum to the SA submitted to the Inspector and which will be subject to examination at Stage 2 of the EiP later in the year. The Council will then consider the sustainability implications of any subsequent changes to the Local Plan and whether any further assessment is needed in accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive.

# Contents

1.	Introdu	ction	1
1.1	Backgrour	nd	1
1.2	•	f this Report	1
1.3	The Cante	erbury District Local Plan to Prepare a Local Plan nterbury District Local Plan in Public	2 2 2 3 3
1.4	The Require	ility Appraisal ment for Sustainability Appraisal / Appraisal of the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan	4 4 5
1.5	Structure	of this Addendum	6
2.	Approa	ch to the Sustainability Appraisal	7
2.1	Introduction	on	7
2.2	Sustainab	ility Appraisal Framework	7
2.3	Appraisal	of Omission Housing Sites	10
2.4	When the	SA was Undertaken and by Whom	11
2.5	Technical	Difficulties	11
3.	Apprais	sal of Effects	13
3.1	Introduction	on	13
3.2	Summary of	Site Appraisal SA of Omission Housing Sites of the Omission Housing Sites	13 14 15
3.3	Appraisal	of the Housing Sites in the Preferred Development Option	16
3.4	Compariso	on of Effects	18
3.5	Justification	on for the Rejection of the Housing Sites	20
3.6	SHLAA/04	1 Hersden Colliery Site Reappraisal	21
4.	Conclu	sions and Next Steps	25
4.1	Conclusion	ns	25
	Table 1.1 Table 2.1	Omission Housing Sites SA Framework	3 7
	Table 2.2 Table 2.3	The SA Objectives Compared Against the SEA Directive Topics Scoring System Used in the SA of Sites	10 11
	Table 3.1	Results of the SA of the Omission Housing Sites	14
	Table 3.2 Table 3.4	Relative Performance of the Omission Employment Sites Results of the SA of the Housing Sites in the Revised Preferred Development Option	15 17
	Table 3.5	Comparison of the Significant Effects of the Housing Sites in the 2014 Submission Draft Local Plan Preferred Development Option and the Omission Housing Sites	18
	Table 3.6	Reasons for the Rejection of Potential Housing Sites by the Council	20

Appendix A Site Appraisal Pro Forma
Appendix B Site Appraisal Summaries
Appendix C SA Matrix for Hersden Colliery

## 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Canterbury City Council (the Council) submitted the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2014)<sup>6</sup> (the draft Local Plan) to the Planning Inspectorate on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2014, in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012<sup>7</sup>. The draft Local Plan sets out the vision, plan objectives, planning policies and proposed site allocations that will, once adopted, guide development in the District to 2031. Amec Foster Wheeler Environment and Infrastructure UK Limited (Amec Foster Wheeler) was commissioned by the Council to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), incorporating Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA), of the draft Local Plan. A SA Report<sup>8</sup> presenting the findings of this assessment was submitted alongside the draft Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Examination in Public (EiP) into the draft Local Plan commenced in July 2015 with Hearings taking place between 14<sup>th</sup> July and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015 (Stage 1 Hearings). In the Inspector's letter to the Council<sup>9</sup> detailing the main outcome of the Stage 1 Hearings, he concluded that there were no legal compliance matters that should delay the progress of the Examination. He did, however, highlight concerns relating to the appropriate level of objectively assessed housing need and the likelihood that, on adoption, the Local Plan as submitted would not have a 5-year housing land supply. As a consequence, he proposed postponing the further (Stage 2) Hearings until work to address his concerns had been completed.

As part of the Council's response to the Inspector's request, it reviewed the existing housing allocations contained in the draft Local Plan to take account of new information and, as a result, additional site allocations were also been identified. These revisions were set out in the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Proposed Amendments (November 2015) (the proposed amendments to the draft Local Plan). Consultation on the proposed amendments to the draft Local Plan began on the 27<sup>th</sup> November 2015 and ended on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016. Nine omission housing sites were submitted during consultation on the proposed amendments and these have been appraised.

Each of the omission housing sites has been subjected to SA in order to ensure that decisions with regard to which sites should be taken forward as allocations in the Local Plan have taken into account all reasonable alternatives. It is also necessary to assess the collective performance of the suite of site allocations (the preferred development option) in terms of its sustainability, when compared to these alternatives to ensure that the preferred option has been assessed against reasonable alternatives.

## 1.2 Purpose of this Report

This document is the June 2016 addendum to the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Sustainability Appraisal Report. This addendum presents the findings of the appraisal of the nine omission

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Canterbury City Council (2014) *Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft 2014*. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941559/CDLP-11-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Publication-Draft-June-2014-with-maps-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941559/CDLP-11-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Publication-Draft-June-2014-with-maps-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 767 *The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012*. Available from http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/pdfs/uksi\_20120767\_en.pdf [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> AMEC Environment and Infrastructure UK Ltd (2014) *Sustainability Appraisal of the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Sustainability Appraisal Report.* Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Letter of the Inspector (Mike Moore) to Canterbury City Council dated 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015 concerning the Main outcomes of Stage 1 Hearings. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/local-plan/</a> [Accessed November 2015].

housing sites submitted to the Council following consultation on the proposed amendments to the draft Local Plan and also compares the sustainability performance of the Council's preferred development option against the omission housing sites.

This report also provides an update to the appraisal of a site that has previously been considered by the Council and has been re-appraised to reflect the comments of the Inspector in relation to that site. The site in question is Hersden Colliery (SHLAA site reference 041).

This addendum is being submitted to the Inspector and will be subject to examination at Stage 2 of the EiP later in the year. In consequence, this report should be read in conjunction with the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Sustainability Appraisal Report which can be accessed through the Council's website, <a href="https://canterbury.gov.uk/media/942192/CDLP-106-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLPPublication-Draft-June-2014-Amec.pdf">https://canterbury.gov.uk/media/942192/CDLP-106-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLPPublication-Draft-June-2014-Amec.pdf</a>.

## 1.3 The Canterbury District Local Plan

#### Requirement to Prepare a Local Plan

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (March, 2012)<sup>10</sup> sets out (at paragraphs 150-157) that each local planning authority should prepare a local plan for its area. Local plans should set out the strategic priorities and policies to deliver:

- the homes and jobs needed in the area;
- the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
- the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
- climate change mitigation and adaptation and conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

Planning Practice Guidance (2014)<sup>11</sup> clarifies (at paragraph 002 'Local Plans') that local plans "should make clear what is intended to happen in the area over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered".

#### The Draft Canterbury District Local Plan

The draft Local Plan sets out the Council's vision for Canterbury District up to 2031 and provides the spatial planning response to the challenge of growth. It has been developed taking into account national planning policy and guidance, the objectives of other plans and programmes, assessment (including SA), the findings of evidence base studies and the outcomes of engagement.

The Council consulted on the Core Strategy Options Report<sup>12</sup> in January 2010 and this represented the first formal stage in the preparation of the Local Plan. The Options Report set out for consultation the emerging

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) *National Planning Policy Framework*. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf [Accessed June 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Department for Communities and Local Government (2014) *Planning Practice Guidance*. Available from <a href="http://planningguidance.planninggortal.gov.uk/">http://planningguidance.planninggortal.gov.uk/</a> [Accessed June 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Canterbury City Council (2010) *Canterbury District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Options Report for consultation.*Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

vision, objectives, development requirements and the spatial strategy and associated strategic development options alongside outline core policies. The Options Report was accompanied by a SA Report<sup>13</sup> prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler which considered the sustainability strengths and weaknesses of the plan options.

In accordance with guidance contained in the NPPF, preparation of the Core Strategy was halted and the Council determined that it should work towards the preparation of a Local Plan. To inform the Local Plan, the Council commissioned a number of important evidence base studies. These studies included (inter alia) the Canterbury Futures Development research report<sup>14</sup> and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)<sup>15</sup> which together supported the identification of development options for the District including the Council's preferred development option that was set out in the Preferred Option Draft Local Plan<sup>16</sup> and subject to consultation in June 2013.

The Preferred Option Draft Local Plan was revised to reflect representations received during consultation and the recommendations of the accompanying SA Report<sup>17</sup>. The draft Local Plan was then issued for consultation from 5<sup>th</sup> June 2014 to 18<sup>th</sup> July 2014 prior to its submission to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

#### **Examination in Public**

The EiP into the draft Local Plan commenced in July 2015 with Stage 1 Hearings taking place between 14<sup>th</sup> July and 29<sup>th</sup> July 2015. Stage 1 of the EiP closed at the end of July 2015 and the Planning Inspector then wrote to the Council on the 10<sup>th</sup> August 2015 with his initial findings and comments. He highlighted that further work was required relating to the appropriate level of objectively assessed housing need and to identify sufficient sites to ensure that the District has a 5 year housing land supply. As a consequence, he proposed postponing the further (Stage 2) Hearings until work to address his concerns had been completed.

As part of the Council's response to the Inspector's request, it proposed amendments to the draft Local Plan. These revisions were set out in the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft: Proposed Amendments (November 2015). Nine omission housing sites were submitted during this consultation.

### **Omission Housing Sites**

**Table 1.1** provides an overview of the nine omission housing sites being appraised in this Addendum.

Table 1.1 Omission Housing Sites

SHLAA Ref	Site	Size	Status
SHLAA-232	Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry	1.2 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-233	Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge	3.3 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-234	Land at Shalloak road, Sturry/Broad Oak, Canterbury	2.5 ha	Omission housing site

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Entec (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Development Options, January 2010.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (2012) Canterbury Development Requirements Study: Final Report, February 2012 Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/examination-documents/</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Canterbury City Council (2013) *Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Option Consultation Draft June 2013*. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> AMEC (2013) Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Local Plan. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/942200/CDLP-107-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLP-Preferred-Option-Amec-May2013.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/942200/CDLP-107-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLP-Preferred-Option-Amec-May2013.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

SHLAA Ref	Site	Size	Status
SHLAA-235	Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, Chartham Hatch	17.0 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-236	Land at Roper Road, Canterbury	0.2 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-237	Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr Bridge	140 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-238	Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable	2 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-239	Land adjacent to Spires Academy, Hersden	3 ha	Omission housing site
SHLAA-240	Land South of Aylesham	240 ha	Omission housing site

NB: SHLAA-240 is a large site which crosses the Local Authority areas of Canterbury and Dover. It is the Council's view that any development in this location should be limited to an extension of Aylesham, which is outside of the Canterbury Local Authority Area.

## 1.4 Sustainability Appraisal

#### The Requirement for Sustainability Appraisal

Under Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council is required to carry out a SA of the Local Plan to help guide the selection and development of policies and proposals in terms of their potential social, environmental and economic effects. In undertaking this requirement, local planning authorities must also incorporate the requirements of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, referred to as the SEA Directive<sup>18</sup>, and its transposing regulations the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004<sup>19</sup>.

The SEA Directive and transposing regulations seek to provide a high level of protection of the environment by integrating environmental considerations into the process of preparing certain plans and programmes. The aim of the Directive is "to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development, by ensuing that, in accordance with this Directive, an environmental assessment is carried out of certain plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment."

At paragraphs 150-151, the NPPF sets out that local plans are key to delivering sustainable development and that they must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 165 reiterates the requirement for SA/SEA as it relates to local plan preparation:

"A sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors."

The Planning Practice Guidance also makes clear that SA plays an important role in demonstrating that a local plan reflects sustainability objectives and has considered reasonable alternatives. In this regard, SA will help to ensure that a local plan is "justified", a key test of soundness that concerns the extent to which the plan is the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives and available and proportionate evidence.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Available from http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001L0042&from=EN [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633 *The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004*. Available from <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/pdfs/uksi/2004/1633\_en.pdf">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/pdfs/uksi/2004/1633\_en.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

## Sustainability Appraisal of the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan

SA has been an integral part of the preparation of the draft Local Plan with each stage of the Plan's development having been accompanied by a SA, as follows:

- Core Strategy Options Report (2010)<sup>20</sup>;
- Development Requirements Study (2012)<sup>21</sup>;
- ► SHLAA (2012)<sup>22</sup>;
- Preferred Option Draft Local Plan (2013)<sup>23</sup>;
- ▶ Publication Draft Local Plan (2014)<sup>24</sup>; and
- Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft Proposed Amendments (November 2015)<sup>25</sup>.

The SA of the submitted draft Local Plan was undertaken in June 2014. The SA Report was prepared to meet the reporting requirements of the SEA Directive and assessed:

- the Canterbury vision and plan objectives;
- the preferred development option (including an individual appraisal of site allocations and of the suite of sites to be allocated to deliver the Council's preferred spatial strategy):
- proposed policies; and
- the cumulative, synergistic and secondary effects of the draft Local Plan, both alone and incombination with other plans and programmes.

A comprehensive overview of the relationship between the development of the Local Plan and the SA process is contained in Amec Foster Wheeler's response to the Inspector's pre-hearing questions<sup>26</sup>.

To ensure that the final, adopted Local Plan takes into account sustainability considerations, and to meet the Council's responsibilities under the SEA Directive, appraises of the omission housing sites as detailed in **Section 1.3** has been undertaken. This addendum presents the findings of this appraisal.

<u>S</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Canterbury City Council (2010) *Canterbury District Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Options Report for consultation.*Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941672/CDLP-21-Core-Strategy-Options-Report-Jan-2010-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> AMEC (2012) Sustainability Appraisal of Development Scenarios, Technical Note, June 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> AMEC (2012) Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: Technical Note.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Canterbury City Council (2013) *Canterbury District Local Plan Preferred Option Consultation Draft June 2013.* Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/941567/CDLP-12-Canterbury-District-Local-Plan-Preferred-Option-Draft-June-2013-with-maps-CCC.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> AMEC (2013) *Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Local Plan*. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/942200/CDLP-107-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLP-Preferred-Option-Amec-May2013.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/942200/CDLP-107-Sustainability-Appraisal-CDLP-Preferred-Option-Amec-May2013.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Amec Foster Wheeler (2015), *Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft:*Appraisal of Proposed Amendments (November 2015). Available from: <a href="https://canterbury.gov.uk/media/1094161/CDLP-182-SA-Report-Addendum-FINAL-26-11-15-latest.pdf">https://canterbury.gov.uk/media/1094161/CDLP-182-SA-Report-Addendum-FINAL-26-11-15-latest.pdf</a> [Accessed June 2016]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Amec Foster Wheeler (2015) *Sustainability Appraisal of Canterbury Local Plan: Response to Inspector's Pre-hearing Questions*. Available from <a href="https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/1008160/16903-26-Pre-Hearing-SA-Technical-Note-for-Inspector.pdf">https://www.canterbury.gov.uk/media/1008160/16903-26-Pre-Hearing-SA-Technical-Note-for-Inspector.pdf</a> [Accessed November 2015].

## 1.5 Structure of this Addendum

The remainder of this addendum to the draft Local Plan SA Report is structured as follows:

- Section 2: Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal Outlines the approach to the SA of the omission housing sites including the SA Framework;
- ▶ Section 3: Appraisal of Effects Summarises the findings of the appraisal of the omission housing sites. Section 4 also includes an update to the SA of Hersden Colliery (SHLAA 240);
- ➤ Section 4: Conclusions and Next Steps— Presents the conclusions of the SA and the next steps in the SA process.

# 2. Approach to the Sustainability Appraisal

## 2.1 Introduction

This section outlines the methodology used to appraise the draft Local Plan and sets out the objectives against which the omission housing sites have been appraised. The SA objectives used for this appraisal are consistent with those developed to appraise the draft Local Plan and were consulted on in the 2010 Scoping Report<sup>27</sup>. The appraisal objectives reflect an analysis of baseline conditions, review of plans and programmes and the subsequent identification of key sustainability issues which are contained in the draft Local Plan SA Report.

## 2.2 Sustainability Appraisal Framework

The SA Framework comprises sustainability objectives and guide questions to inform the appraisal. Establishing appropriate SA objectives and guide questions is central to appraising the sustainability effects of the employment sites. Broadly, the SA objectives define the long term aspirations for the plan area with regard to social, economic and environmental considerations and it is against these objectives that the performance of the omission employment sites identified in **Section 1.3** have been appraised.

**Table 2.1** presents the SA Framework including the SA objectives and associated guide questions. The SA objectives and guide questions reflect the analysis of the key objectives and policies arising from the review of plans and programmes, key sustainability issues identified through the analysis of the socio-economic and environmental baseline conditions and comments received during consultation on the Scoping Report. The SEA Directive topic(s) to which each of the SA objectives relates is included in the third column.

Table 2.1 SA Framework

**SEA Dir. Topic SA Objective** Key questions/guidance Sustainable innovative and productive economy that delivers high levels of employment 1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local Material assets 1. Economy and **Employment** To achieve a strong and stable economy 1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long which offers rewarding and well located employment 1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District? opportunities to everyone. 1.4 Will it help diversify the economy? 1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments? 1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy? 1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism? 1.8 Will it meet the employment needs of local people? 1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links? 2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy? N/A 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To sustain 2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses? vibrant rural and coastal 2.3 Will it retain village/coastal services and local trading schemes? communities. 2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Canterbury City Council (2010) Sustainability Appraisal of the LDF: Agreed Scope of the Sustainability Appraisal (following consultation on the Scoping Report), Entec UK Ltd, London.

SA Objective	Key questions/guidance	SEA Dir. Topic						
Protect and enhance the ph	Protect and enhance the physical and natural environment							
<b>3. Water Quality</b> To protect and improve the quality of inland and coastal waters.	<ul><li>3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?</li><li>3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?</li><li>3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?</li></ul>	Water						
<b>4. Transport</b> Reduce road traffic and its impacts, promoting more sustainable modes of transport.	<ul><li>4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?</li><li>4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?</li><li>4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?</li><li>4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?</li><li>4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?</li></ul>	Air, Climatic factors						
5. Countryside and Historic Environment To protect and improve landscapes for both people and wildlife and to protect and maintain vulnerable assets (including built and historic).	<ul> <li>5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?</li> <li>5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?</li> <li>5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?</li> <li>5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?</li> <li>5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?</li> <li>5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?</li> <li>5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?</li> </ul>	Landscape, Cultural Heritage Including Architectural and Archaeological Heritage, Soil						
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid damage to geological sites and improve biodiversity.	<ul> <li>6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?</li> <li>6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?</li> <li>6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?</li> <li>6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?</li> <li>6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?</li> </ul>	Biodiversity, Flora & Fauna						
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency.	<ul> <li>7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?</li> <li>7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?</li> <li>7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?</li> <li>7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?</li> <li>7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?</li> <li>7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?</li> </ul>	Air, Climatic factors						
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment.	<ul> <li>8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?</li> <li>8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?</li> <li>8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?</li> <li>8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?</li> </ul>	Climatic factors, Water						
Just society that promotes	social inclusion, sustainable communities and personal wellbeing							
9. Access to Services Share access to services and benefits to prosperity fairly.	<ul><li>9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?</li><li>9.2 Will it increase economic activity?</li><li>9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?</li><li>9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?</li></ul>	Human health, Population						

SA Objective	Key questions/guidance	SEA Dir. Topic
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalisation To revitalise town and rural centres and to promote sustainable living.	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets? 10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres? 10.3 Will it improve provision of shops or services within town centre? 10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive? 10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Population, Human health, material assets
11. High Quality Design and Sustainability To encourage sustainable design and practice.	<ul><li>11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?</li><li>11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?</li><li>11.3 Will it minimise light and noise pollution?</li></ul>	Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage
<b>12. Housing</b> To make suitable housing available and affordable to everyone.	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing? 12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing? 12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes? 12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes? 12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	Population, Human health
13. Quality of Life To improve the quality of life for those living and working in the District.	<ul> <li>13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime?</li> <li>13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?</li> <li>13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?</li> <li>13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?</li> <li>13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?</li> <li>13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?</li> </ul>	Population, Human health
Use resources as efficiently	as possible	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sustainable use of land in more sustainable location patterns.	<ul><li>14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?</li><li>14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded &amp; underused land?</li><li>14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?</li><li>14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?</li><li>14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?</li></ul>	Soil, Material Assets, Landscape
<b>15. Natural Resources</b> To ensure the prudent use of natural resources and the sustainable management of existing resources.	<ul> <li>15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?</li> <li>15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?</li> <li>15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?</li> <li>15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?</li> <li>15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?</li> <li>15.6 Will it protect water resources?</li> <li>15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?</li> </ul>	Material Assets, Soil
16. Waste To reduce generation and disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable management of waste.	<ul><li>16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?</li><li>16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?</li><li>16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?</li><li>16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?</li></ul>	Material Assets

**Table 2.2** shows the extent to which the SA objectives encompass the range of issues identified in the SEA Directive.

Table 2.2 The SA Objectives Compared Against the SEA Directive Topics

SA Objective	SEA Directive Topic
6	Biodiversity
9, 10, 12, 13	Population *
9, 10, 12, 13	Human Health
6	Fauna
6	Flora
5, 14, 15	Soil
3, 8	Water
4, 7	Air
4, 7, 8	Climatic Factors
1, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16	Material Assets *
5, 11	Cultural Heritage including architectural and archaeological
5, 14	Landscape

<sup>\*</sup> These terms are not clearly defined in the SEA Directive.

## 2.3 Appraisal of Omission Housing Sites

The SA of the omission housing sites has considered a total of nine omission housing sites that had not previously been put forward for consideration in the draft Local Plan and had not therefore been subject to SA.

Consistent with the approach adopted to the appraisal of sites in the draft Local Plan SA Report (and the appraisal of SHLAA sites in 2012<sup>28</sup>), the same tailored SA matrix has been used to support the appraisal of the nine sites. This matrix uses the 16 SA objectives and guide questions taken from the 2010 Scoping Report; however, the objectives and guide questions have been modified to take into account the following:

- ► The appraisal includes objectives that will not be applicable to site level appraisal e.g. those objectives/questions that require a level of detail that is unavailable at this stage, such as matters that relate to design, energy use and carbon emissions. For these objectives and/or guide questions, a comment of 'not applicable' is recorded;
- Where insufficient information is available to make an assessment of the effects of the proposed site, an 'uncertain' effect is recorded;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> AMEC (2012) Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: Technical Note.

- The need to include additional questions (such as proximity to community infrastructure) to aid the appraisal process; and
- The need to provide guidance on interpretations of significance to aid consistency in the appraisal process.

For each SA objective, an overall 'score' was provided according to the scoring system in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Scoring System Used in the SA of Sites

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant Positive Effect	The proposed site contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed site contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral	The proposed site does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective.	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed site detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	-
Significant Negative Effect	The proposed site detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	-
Uncertain	The proposed site has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.	?

The appraisal pro forma for each site is contained at **Appendix A** and an appraisal summary has been produced for each site (**Appendix B**). The objective of the summary is to detail the following information:

- a description of the site characteristics such as size, location and surrounding uses;
- an overview of the development proposed for the site; and
- an outline of the likely sustainability effects.

The appraisal findings are summarised in **Section 3**. This section includes an appraisal of the configuration of sites to be allocated in the Local Plan and concludes with the Council's justification for rejecting the housing sites.

## 2.4 When the SA was Undertaken and by Whom

This SA of the omission housing sites to the draft Local Plan was undertaken by Amec Foster Wheeler in May/June 2016, informed by the input of Council officers (particularly in respect of the justification for the omission of employment sites), sustainability specialists and additional contributions from technical experts.

#### 2.5 Technical Difficulties

The SEA Directive requires the identification of any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of knowledge) encountered during the appraisal process. These uncertainties and assumptions are outlined below in respect of the appraisal of sites.

#### Uncertainties

The exact composition of the developments is uncertain;

The exact characteristics of sites (in terms of, for example, the presence of buried archaeological remains or protected species) is uncertain and will be subject to further, detailed analysis at the project stage;

#### Assumptions

- ► The term 'Key drainage channels' has been interpreted to mean coastal brooks, rivers, streams, lakes and ponds but not surface water drains;
- ► The identification of Flood Zones is based on the Flood Maps available on the Environmental Agency's website<sup>29</sup>;
- ▶ The assessment of the likelihood of protected species on site is based on a range of factors including: the current use and condition of the site; the sensitivity of surrounding areas; and records of species identified on site, or nearby to the site. The assessment is not based on a detailed site survey such as a Phase 1 Habitat Survey;
- ▶ The term 'designated landscape features' is construed to include land identified in the Canterbury District Local Plan (2006) as in the Green Gap. However, throughout the appraisal, sites within 1 km of the Green Gap are not deemed to be within 1 km of designated or non-designated landscape features. The rationale for this position is based on Policy R8 of the Canterbury District Local Plan (2006) which seeks to resist development in the Green Gap to prevent coalescence between existing settlements rather than protected landscape features;
- Sites that are characterised as 'Mixed' comprise both greenfield and previously developed land (PDL). The scoring of such sites against the SA objectives reflects a numbers of factors, including the ratio of greenfield to PDL and the previous and extant uses of the site, in order to ascertain the overall effect of development on the site. Where it is not possible to make this determination, the effect has been noted as 'Uncertain';
- ► The scoring in the site appraisals has taken into account proposals where they have been detailed and specific, such as a site masterplan or a site layout; and
- The score of 'No Impact' does not always mean that there is no impact/effect predicted on the SA objective. In some cases, the score 'No Impact' has been adopted where the positive effects and the negative effects balance each other out, or where the effect does not contribute or detract from the achievement of the objective. For some objectives, such as Geology and Biodiversity (SA Objective 6), protected species and habitats issues may emerge at the project stage as further research is completed on sites.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> See <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37837.aspx">http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/37837.aspx</a> [Accessed November 2015].

# 3. Appraisal of Effects

## 3.1 Introduction

The submitted draft Local Plan presents the preferred development option for the District, identifying the quantum of growth to be accommodated in the area up to 2031 and the key housing and employment land allocations to meet this requirement. In broad terms, this is based on a spatial strategy that seeks to concentrate development at Canterbury, Herne Bay and Whitstable with some development located at the larger, well-serviced rural centres

The preferred development option has been informed by engagement, the evidence base and the ongoing appraisal of options as part of the SA process and at key stages in the preparation of the draft Local Plan, including the appraisal of:

- Core Strategy Development Options;
- alternative development scenarios identified in the Development Requirements Study;
- individual SHLAA and employment sites;
- the preferred development option and alternatives considered in the preparation of the Preferred Option Draft Local Plan; and
- the draft Local Plan including new site submissions received following consultation on the Preferred Option Draft Local Plan.

Section 3.3 of the draft Local Plan SA Report describes each of the key stages listed above, documenting the process of the selection and refinement of the preferred development option leading up to the submission of the draft Plan. This overview is therefore not repeated here.

As highlighted in **Section 1.3** of this addendum, the Council needs to appraise the contribution to sustainability implications of a number of housing sites that have not previously been subject to a SA to ensure that decisions with regard to which sites should be taken forward as allocations in the Local Plan have taken into account sustainability considerations. It is also necessary to assess the collective performance of the suite of site allocations (the preferred development option) in terms of its sustainability to ensure any likely significant effects of the Local Plan have been identified, described and assessed.

This section summarises the findings of the appraisal of these sites (**Section 3.2**) before presenting the appraisal of the Council's preferred configuration of housing site allocations which form the preferred development option for the Local Plan (**Section 3.3**). **Section 3.4** compares the sustainability performance of the omission housing sites with those housing sites in the preferred development option contained in the submitted 2014 draft Local Plan. **Section 3.5** then concludes with the justification for the Council's selection of the preferred development option and rejection of housing sites.

## 3.2 Omission Site Appraisal

The nine omission housing sites detailed in **Section 1.3** have been appraised against the SA objectives in accordance with the approach set out in **Section 2.3**. The performance of these sites against the 16 SA objectives has been recorded in the site appraisal pro forma at **Appendix A** and summaries are contained at **Appendix B**. **Table 3.1** summarises the findings of the site appraisals.

Table 3.1 Results of the SA of the Omission Housing Sites

Objective Site	Economy	Rural/Coastal Community	Water	Transport	Countryside & Historic Environment	Geology & Biodiversity	Climate Change	Flood Risk	Access to Services	Sustainable Living	Design	Housing	Quality of Life	Use of Land	Natural Resources	Waste
SHLAA-232	+	+	-	-	/+	-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	+	?	?
SHLAA-233	+	+	?	+	/+	-	?	?	+	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-234	+	+	-			-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-235	0/?	+	0			-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-236	+	0/?	0/?	++	-/+	0/?	?	?	++	+	?	+	?	+	?	?
SHLAA-237	+	++	-		/+	-	?	?	+		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-238	+	+		-/?		-	?	?	+	+	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-239	+	+		-	/++	-	?	?	0/?	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-240	++	++	-	++	/++	-	?	?	++		?	++	?		?	?

**Table 3.1** shows that the performance of the sites is mixed.

Significant positive and positive effects are recorded for one or more of the sites against the SA objectives for the economy, rural/coastal community, transport (although for three sites significant negative effects were identified), access to services and housing.

Significant negative or negative effects and uncertainties were identified for the majority of sites against the SA objectives for water, transport (although for two sites, significant positive effects were identified), the countryside and historic environment (some positive effects were also identified under this objective), geology and biodiversity, sustainable living (again some positive effects identified under this objective) and use of land.

Against the remaining SA objectives, the appraisal concluded either neutral or uncertain effects. More detailed commentary on the performance of the sites is provided below.

## **Summary of SA of Omission Housing Sites**

The nine omission housing sites have been appraised as having a positive effect on the economy (SA Objective 1) because of their accessibility to employment via public transport. Land South of Aylesham, Womenswold (SHLAA-240) scores a significant positive effect against this objective (with uncertainty against some questions) because of the size of the scheme and the assumption that some employment land would be provided as part of the development.

The majority of sites are appraised as having a positive effect (with uncertainty against some questions) on rural/coastal communities. Two sites have significant positive effects because of the size of the proposed scheme, Land at Highland Court Farm, Nr Bridge (SHLAA-237) and Land South of Aylesham, Womenswold (SHLAA-240).

A range of effects are identified in relation to the objective on water, uncertainties are also acknowledged in the matrices reflecting the proximity of sites to existing surface water bodies.

A range of potential effects are identified in relation to transport. Those sites that score a significant positive effect (Land at Roper Road, Canterbury (SHLAA-236) and Land South of Aylesham, Womenswold, (SHLAA-240) do so on the basis of their proximity to existing services. Where sites score less well this reflects their lack of proximity to existing services. Uncertainties are recorded for all sites in terms of the use of sustainable transport, traffic congestion and reducing the need to travel.

A range of potential effects are identified at the site level in relation to countryside and the historic environment. Sites where potential significant negative effects are identified include the Former Highways Depot, Sturry (SHLAA-232) which is within the Sturry - Hersden Green Gap. At the same time the SA also acknowledges that a minor positive effect would arise from re-use of this previously developed site.

The majority of sites are judged to have a minor negative effect on geology and biodiversity. No likely effects (with some uncertainties) are anticipated against this topic at two sites, Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge (SHLAA-233) and Land at Roper Road, Canterbury (SHLAA-236).

Performance against objective 9 varies across the sites. Significant positive effects are anticipated at two sites (with some uncertainties). The sites are:

- SHLAA-236 Land at Roper Road, Canterbury;
- SHLAA-240 Land South of Aylesham.

Minor positive effects in relation to access to services (with some uncertainties) are anticipated at three sites:

- SHLAA-233 Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge;
- SHLAA-237 Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr Bridge;
- SHLAA-238 Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable.

Negative and significant negative effects are anticipated in relation to the use of land for the majority of sites, reflecting their greenfield status. Where sites score a positive effect this reflects the potential for the use of previously developed land and buildings and/or their position within the urban area.

Minor positive effects are therefore anticipated for the following sites:

- ▶ SHLAA-232 Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry;
- SHLAA-236 Land at Roper Road, Canterbury;

There are uncertain effects for all of the sites assessed in relation to objectives 7 climate change, 8 flood risk, 11 design, 13 quality of life, 15 natural resources and 16 waste.

#### **Performance of the Omission Housing Sites**

**Table 3.2** summarises the performance of the nine omission housing sites against the 16 SA objectives by highlighting the number of significant positive and significant negative effects attributed to each site. It reveals two of the nine sites are likely to have more significant positive than significant negative effects on the 16 SA objectives (SHLAA sites 236 and 240) whilst seven sites have been assessed as having more significant negative than significant positive effects on the SA objectives.

Table 3.2 Relative Performance of the Omission Employment Sites

SHLAA Ref	Site	No. of Significant Positive Effects	No. of Significant Negative Effects
SHLAA-232	Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry	0	1
SHLAA-233	Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge	0	1
SHLAA-234	Land at Shalloak road, Sturry/Broad Oak, Canterbury	0	2
SHLAA-235	Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, Chartham Hatch	0	2
SHLAA-236	Land at Roper Road, Canterbury	2	0
SHLAA-237	Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr Bridge	2	4

SHLAA Ref	Site	No. of Significant Positive Effects	No. of Significant Negative Effects
SHLAA-238	Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable	0	2
SHLAA-239	Land adj. to Spires Academy, Hersden	1	2
SHLAA-240	Land South of Aylesham	6	3

It should be noted that where potentially negative and significant negative effects have been identified during the appraisal, these effects could be mitigated through the application of Local Plan policies and at the planning application stage, when detailed design and mitigation measures will also be considered.

## 3.3 Appraisal of the Housing Sites in the Preferred Development Option

The preferred development option contains housing sites, employment sites and those sites that will contain proposed mix development. To support the subsequent analysis in this SA, **Table 3.3** presents the strategic allocations identified in the draft Local Plan (including those sites added through the Proposed Amendments (2015)) where housing land forms part of the mix of uses; as well as the dedicated housing allocations.

Table 3.3 Housing Sites in the Preferred Development Option

SHLAA/ELR Ref	Site	Housing	Employment (ha)*
Canterbury		6,175	23.75 – 26.75
SHLAA-206	South Canterbury	4,000	17 - 20
SHLAA-220	Ridlands Farm and Langton Fields, Canterbury	310	
SHLAA-228	Howe Barracks	500	
SHLAA-038	St Martin's Hospital	200	
SHLAA-210	Land at and adjacent to Cockering Farm, Thanington	1,150	1.4
SHLAA-230	Kingsmead	15	
Herne Bay		3,242	28.6
SHLAA-129	Land at Hillborough	1,300	9.5
SHLAA-011	Land at Strode Farm	800	4
SHLAA-012	Herne Bay Golf Driving Range	80**	
SHLAA-199	Land adjacent to Herne Bay Golf Driving Range	0**	
SHLAA-010	Land at Greenhill	300	
SHLAA-208	Herne Bay Golf Club	572	1 (mixed commercial)
SHLAA-013	Bullockstone Road	190	
Whitstable		700	7
SHLAA-001	Land North of Thanet Way	400	
SHLAA-130	Land South of Ridgeway (Grasmere Pasture), Chestfield	300	1.1

SHLAA/ELR Ref	Site	Housing	Employment (ha)*
Larger Villages		1,979	4.2
SHLAA-177	Land between Sturry Hill (A291) and Shalloak Road	1,000	
SHLAA-148	Land North of Hersden	800	1
SHLAA-096	Spires Academy, Hersden	80	
SHLAA-211	Barham Court Farm, Barham	25	
SHLAA-226	Land at Bakers Lane, Chartham	20	
SHLAA-171	Land adjoining Cranmer & Aspinal Close, Bekesbourne	14	
SHLAA-186	Brickfield Farm, Bridge	40	
Smaller Villages		28	
SHLAA-078	Land to the Rear of 51 Rough Common Road	28	
TOTALS		12,124	63.55 – 66.55 ha

<sup>\*</sup>In some instances, the employment land area cited differs from that presented in the draft Local Plan SA Report. This reflects additional work undertaken by the Council regarding employment floorspace but has not resulted in a material change to the assessment.

The collective performance of the preferred development option against the 16 SA objectives is summarised in **Table 3**.4 below.

Table 3.4 Results of the SA of the Housing Sites in the Revised Preferred Development Option

Objective	omy	oastal	ter	sport	rside & oric	gy & ersity	Change	Flood Risk	ss to ices	nable ing	ign	sing	of Life	Land	ıral ırces	ste
Site	Economy	Rural/Coastal Community	Water	Transport	Countryside & Historic Fnvironment	Geology & Biodiversity	Climate Change	Flood	Access to Services	Sustainable Living	Design	Housing	Quality of Life	Use of Land	Natural Resources	Waste
SHLAA-001	+	+	?	+	•	-	0/?	?	+	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-010	+	++	?	++	-	0/?	0/?	?	++	-	?	++	?	-1	?	?
SHLAA-011	++	++	-1	+	ı	0/?	1		+		?	++	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-012*	+	+	0/?	+	-	0	0/?	?	+	+/-	?	+	?	ı	?	?
SHLAA-013	+	+	1	0	-	1	0/?	?	+	-	?	++	?	1	?	?
SHLAA-038	+	?	0	++	-	+	0/?	?	+	+	?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-078*	+	+	ı	+		ı	0/?	?	+	-	?	+	?	ı	?	?
SHLAA-096	+	+	?		++	?	0/?	?	+		?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-129	++	++	?			-	+	?	++		?	++	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-130*	++	+	-	+		-			+	+	?	++	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-148*	++	++	0	++		1	+	?	++	-	?	++	?	1	?	?
SHLAA-171*	+	+	0	ı		-	0/?	?	0	-	?	+	?	ı	?	?
SHLAA-177	++	++		++		-1	+	?	++		?	++	?	-	?	?

<sup>\*\*</sup>Note that the combined capacity of sites SHLAA-012 and SHLAA-199 has been calculated as 90 dwellings.

Objective	omy	oastal unity	er	port	side & ric	gy & ersity	Change	Risk	s to ces	nable ng	gn	ing	of Life	Land	ral rces	ite
Site	Economy	Rural/Coastal Community	Water	Transport	Countryside & Historic Fryironment	Geology Biodiversi	Climate (	Flood Risk	Access to Services	Sustainable Living	Design	Housing	Quality of Life	Use of Land	Natural Resources	Waste
SHLAA-186*	+	+	0	++		-	0/?	?	++	-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-199*	+	+	0	+	ı	ı	0/?	?	+	+/-	?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-206	++	?	0	1	1	++	++	?	++	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-208	++	++							++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-210*	++	?	0				+	?	++		?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-211	0	+	?	+		-	-	-	+		?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-220*	+	?	-			-	?	?	++/-	-	?	++	?		?	?
SHLAA-226	+	+	0/?	+	-	-	0/?	?	+		?	+	?	-	?	?
SHLAA-228	++	?		-			0/?	?	++/	+	?	++	?	++	?	?
SHLAA-230	+	?		++	ı	ı	-	-	++	+	?	+	?	-	?	?

<sup>\*</sup> Proposed Amendment to the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2014)

The housing sites in the revised preferred development option would deliver a total of 12,124 dwellings and have been appraised as having a significant positive effect on the economy and housing in particular as well as access to services and rural/coastal communities. However, the findings of the appraisal indicate that development of the scale proposed would have likely negative effects on SA objectives relating to, in particular, countryside and the historic environment, geology and biodiversity, sustainable living and land use. Notwithstanding the negative effects identified during the appraisal, it should be noted that where there is the potential for adverse effects, these could be mitigated through the application of draft Local Plan policies and at the planning application stage.

The range and type of effects associated with the implementation of the revised preferred development option are very similar to the preferred development option contained in the submitted 2014 draft Local Plan. This reflects the fact that the majority of sites that would come forward under both options are the same, focusing the majority of growth in Canterbury, with smaller scale growth at Herne Bay, Whitstable and in larger villages. However, commensurate with the increased scale of development under the revised preferred development option, the expected magnitude of significant positive and significant negative effects are likely to be greater.

It should be noted that where potentially negative and significant negative effects have been identified during the appraisal, these effects could be mitigated through the application of Local Plan policies and at the planning application stage, when detailed design and mitigation measures will also be considered (such as site layout, design and access and the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)).

## 3.4 Comparison of Effects

To support the appraisal of the omission sites, a comparison of the significant effects of the omission housing sites and the housing sites within the Council's preferred development option (as outlined in Table 3.3) on the 16 SA objectives has been undertaken. The findings of this comparison of effects are presented in **Table 3.5** and discussed below. **Table 3.5** provides a supplementary analysis to that contained within the draft Local Plan SA Report when considering sites in order to clarify and compare the likely significant sustainability effects of both options.

Table 3.5 Comparison of the Significant Effects of the Housing Sites in the 2014 Submission Draft Local Plan Preferred Development Option and the Omission Housing Sites

Objective	Preferred Development Option		Omission Housing Sites	
	No, of Significant Positive Effects	No, of Significant Negative Effects	No, of Significant Positive Effects	No, of Significant Negative Effects
1. Economy and Employment	9	0	1	0
2. Rural/Coastal Communities	6	0	2	0
3. Water Quality	0	5	0	2
4. Transport	6	6	2	3
5. Countryside and Historic Environment	1	13	2	8
6. Geology and Biodiversity	1	4	0	0
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality	1	3	0	0
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion	0	3	0	0
9. Access to Services	11	1	2	0
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalisation	0	10	0	2
11. High Quality Design and Sustainability	0	0	0	0
12. Housing	15	0	2	0
13. Quality of Life	0	0	0	0
14. Use of Land	3	12	0	2
15. Natural Resources	0	0	0	0
16. Waste	0	0	0	0
Total	53	57	11	17

**Table 3.5** highlights that the preferred option performs better in relation to: SA Objective 1 economy and employment; SA Objective 9 access to services; and SA Objective 12 housing. It also highlights the relatively poor performance of the preferred option in relation to: SA Objective 5 on countryside and historic environment; SA Objective 7 on climate change, energy and air quality; and SA Objective 8 flood risk and coastal erosion.

Both sets of sites include the potential for significant negative effects on water quality (SA Objective 3) reflecting the proximity of sites to existing water bodies.

The preferred option has a proportionately higher number of significant negative effects in relation to SA Objective 10 on sustainable living and revitalisation.

## 3.5 Justification for the Rejection of the Housing Sites

Commensurate with the scale of the omission housing sites and those within the preferred development option, the number of significant positive and negative effects across the SA Objectives is broadly similar. The omission sites perform better in relation to SA Objective 7 on climate change, energy and air quality and SA Objective 8 in relation to flood risk and coastal erosion as no significant negative effects are anticipated, in contrast significant negative effects are associated with the preferred option. However, the omission housing sites do not form part of the preferred development option for a number of reasons that were identified through the SHLAA site assessments, and are summarised in **Table 3.6**, including insufficient highway capacity and infrastructure, potential impacts on ecology (including designated sites and protected species) and landscape, land contamination, poor sustainability, need, viability and deliverability. This reasoning has been provided to Amec Foster Wheeler by the Council, informed by the SA and other studies and consultations with interested parties.

Table 3.6 Reasons for the Rejection of Potential Housing Sites by the Council

SHLAA Ref	Site	Justification for Rejection by the Council
Rejected Hou	sing Sites	
SHLAA-232	Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply; furthermore, no additional traffic can be accommodated at this point without the construction of the Sturry Relief Road.  The site is located on the periphery of Sturry and is considered to be unsustainable in regard to its distance from local services.  Whilst PDL, the site is positioned in the Sturry – Hersden Green Gap, which has been designated to prevent the convergence of the two villages. Development would therefore have townscape and landscape impacts. There are also land contamination issues given its previous uses as a landfill.
SHLAA-233	Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply. Located to the north of Bridge, it is considered that development of the site would have significant landscape impacts being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). It is also positioned in the Canterbury – Bridge Green Gap, which has been proposed to prevent further convergence of the two settlements.
SHLAA-234	Land at Shalloak road, Sturry/Broad Oak, Canterbury	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply, however this would be a natural extension to the Sturry / Broad Oak Strategic Allocation (Site 2).
SHLAA-235	Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, Chartham Hatch	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply. The local highway is formed of a series of narrow country lanes unsuitable for additional traffic generated from a residential scheme here. It is also considered to be unsustainable in terms of its remoteness from local services.  Development would have significant landscape impacts on the Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV).  There would also be potential impacts on the areas of Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Sites; as well as the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monuments (Bigbury Camp).
SHLAA-236	Land at Roper Road, Canterbury	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply. There are land contamination issues as well as noise and air quality issues due to the proximity to the railway line and the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). There is a high probability of archaeology.
SHLAA-237	Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply.  The site is centred on the Highland Court Farm employment site. Its location in the

SHLAA Ref	Site	Justification for Rejection by the Council
	Bridge	open countryside makes it unsustainable in terms of its remoteness from local services.
		It is considered that development of this site would have significant landscape impacts being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). There would also be significant impacts on the Highland Court (Bekebourne with Patrixbourne) Conservation Area and the setting of a Grade 2* listed building.
SHLAA-238	Land at Millstrood Road,	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply.
	Whitstable	The site is designated as Protection of Existing Open Space (PEOS), the purpose of which is to act as a buffer between the Thanet Way and the Whitstable residential area. There would be noise and air quality issues associated with situating any new development in this location.
SHLAA-239	Land adj. to Spires Academy, Hersden	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply; furthermore, no additional traffic can be accommodated at this point without the construction of the Sturry Relief Road.
		The site is located on the periphery of Hersden and is considered to be unsustainable in regard to its distance from local services.
		The site is positioned in the Sturry – Hersden Green Gap, which has been designated to prevent the convergence of the two villages. There are also land contamination issues given its previous use as landfill.
SHLAA-240	Land South of Aylesham	The Council has identified sufficient sites to meet the 5-year housing land supply.
		The site crosses the Local Authority areas of Canterbury and Dover. It is the Council's view that any development in this location should be limited to an extension of Aylesham, which is outside of the Canterbury Local Authority Area (Dover District Council). Any development of the south western part of the site (towards Womenswold) would have significant landscape impacts being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV)
		There would also be potential impacts on the areas of Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Sites; as well as the Womenswold Conservation Area.

Following a review of the omission sites and a reflection on the suite of sites that comprise the preferred development option, the preferred development option has been retained as it is considered to be consistent with the overall spatial strategy in the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft (June 2014) and to achieve the preferred growth scenario identified in the CDLP 1.6 Development Requirements Study (2012), based on concentrating new development at the urban areas of Canterbury, Whitstable and Herne Bay as well as some at the larger well-served local centres.

## 3.6 SHLAA/041 Hersden Colliery Site Reappraisal

The Council has indicated that it wishes to update the SA results for Hersden Colliery (SHLAA/041) in relation to SA objective 14 on the use of land. The previous appraisal of the site contained in the SA of the SHLAA sites<sup>30</sup> treated the site as greenfield land. This approach was considered to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. The SA worksheet for SHLAA-041 notes that:

"Although previously industrialised land, the site now has a diverse vegetation, including nationally important lichen heath vegetation on the colliery waste' and in this instance, judgement was used to amend the scoring to reflect the naturalisation of the site and the LWS, in line with the guidance outlined within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)<sup>31</sup>."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> AMEC (2012) Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: Technical Note.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Paragraph 111, National Planning Policy Framework, DCLG 2012

In his note on the main outcomes of the Stage 1 Hearings, the Inspector commented:

"The definition of previously developed land in the [National Planning Policy] Framework is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. However, land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time is excluded. The 2006 Local Plan Inspector concluded that the land was previously developed and likely to remain so for many years to come. Nonetheless, the colliery operation ceased over 40 years ago. On my visit to the site I saw that there are parts that are now significantly overgrown. There is only one small building on the main part of the site. On the other hand, there are areas of hardstanding and considerable parts have a degraded quality with rubble or waste evident. Overall, in my view it can still be considered as brownfield land."

In light of the Inspector's comments as well as those made by Inspector Hoile at the Local Plan Inquiry 2005; and following receipt of legal advice that the greenfield / brownfield issue was a matter of planning judgement, the Council requested that Amec Foster Wheeler reappraise the site on the basis that it is a mix of previously developed and greenfield (i.e. naturalised) land. The revised score for the site against question 14.1 (Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?) and 14.4 (Will it promote the use of previously developed land?) of the site SA form is a mixed one (significant negative/significant positive) rather than previously, when it was a significant negative effect.

Other aspects of the scoring of the site, particularly against the biodiversity and geology SA objective have also been queried by submissions to the Stage 1 Hearing. For example, MHP Partnership stated in their submission to the Housing Matter (MHP-Partnership-M2-382913-0096-M7-0097):

'Development would have no significant impacts on either local or internationally designated wildlife sites. A Habitat Screening Report was undertaken to assess the impact that the development may have on the protected ecological sites south of the railway line, being: the Stodmarsh Ramsar, SPA and SAC, the SSSI designation of the Great Stour River, south of the railway line and Local Wildlife Site designation. The Screening was assessed by Natural England and confirmed that the development would have no significant effect on the protected sites.'

However, the Natural England opinion that was provided to Amec Foster Wheeler by Canterbury City Council (Natural England letter, dated 6.2.13 to Romney Environmental) identifies a number of concerns, that require resolution in order to conclude that the development proposal would avoid impacts upon the interest features of Stodmarsh (SSSI, SPA, SAC, Ramsar). Concerns were:

- a. Cat predation
- b. Surface water run off
- c. Recreational pressure
- d. Lighting
- e. Potential impacts of construction.

The NE opinion concludes 'In principle, the generic conclusions appear to be sound and it does not appear unreasonable to exclude the possibility for impact / likely significant effect once mitigation has been considered. However, there is very limited detail upon which it would be possible, with confidence, to state that the mitigation could be delivered as stated.

Furthermore, Natural England do not confirm or otherwise the potential for or significance of any effects on the LWS and in fact state that "Local wildlife or geological sites are a material considerations in the determination of planning applications."

Given the emphasis on the precautionary approach within the Habitats Directives and that under Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, likely significant effects can only be ruled out on the basis of objective information, the provisional and conditional opinion provided by Natural England is not inconsistent with the site SHLAA SA score.

No other amendments to the appraisal of the site are therefore proposed and the reasons for rejecting the site, as recorded in the SHLAA Summary: Methodology and Assessment of Sites June 2013 stand:

"The site is adjacent to the village of Hersden, north-west of Canterbury. The scale of the proposed development (600 units) is thought would have significant negative effects on sustainable living but a positive effect on housing and the economy. It is judged that the effect on transport would be significantly positive as the A28 has adequate capacity (although A291 junction does experience problems) and the site is in walking distance of public transport, and whilst access to local services within 800m is assessed as very poor (none), there is scope for this to be improved by the proposals. Development may also have significant negative effects on the countryside; biodiversity (adjacent to NNR, SPA and Ramsar Site; SSSI & LWS); and the historic environment. Excluded in respect of environmental effects on international wildlife sites, under the Habitat Regulations. Site also identified as LWS and RIGS site."

The updated SA matrix for the site is attached at **Appendix C**.

# 4. Conclusions and Next Steps

#### 4.1 Conclusions

This addendum has presented the findings of the SA of nine omission housing sites submitted to the Canterbury District Local Plan Publication Draft – Proposed Amendments (November 2015). It has appraised the omission housing sites and in doing so has considered the sustainability performance of the Council's preferred development option.

Based on the findings of the appraisal of omission housing sites contained in this addendum and other evidence, the Council is not proposing to revise further the suite of site allocations that comprise the preferred development option.

The appraisal has demonstrated that the preferred option would have a significant positive effect in relation to the economy, housing availability and affordability as well as access to services and rural/coastal communities. However, development of the scale proposed would have likely negative effects on SA objectives relating to, in particular, countryside and the historic environment, geology and biodiversity, sustainable living and land use. Notwithstanding the negative effects identified during the appraisal, it should be noted that where there is the potential for adverse effects, these could be mitigated through the application of draft Local Plan policies and at the planning application stage.

Whilst the number of significant positive and negative effects across the SA Objectives is broadly similar between the omission housing sites and those within the preferred development option, the omission housing sites do not form part of the preferred development option for a number of reasons, including insufficient highway capacity and infrastructure, potential impacts on ecology (including designated sites and protected species) and landscape, land contamination, poor sustainability, need, viability and deliverability.

This addendum to the SA Report will be subject to examination at Stage 2 of the EiP later in the year. The Council will then consider the sustainability implications of any subsequent changes to the Local Plan and whether any further assessment is needed in accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive.

#### Appendix A Site Appraisal Pro Forma

# STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/232: Former Highways Depot, Sturry

Sustainability Objective Baseline Information	es and	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
Economy and Emploemployment opportuni	yment To acl ties to everyo	nieve a strong and stable economy which one	offers rewarding and well located	
Canterbury is below the	Canterbury district were economically active (2011)	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain	
South East.  73.9% of people of work Canterbury district were active (2011)  Service sector is the larg in Canterbury (88%) with and tourism related emp contributing the greatest		1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.	
<ul> <li>In 2011 median gross w for employees in Canter was almost £361.00, wh than average county, re- national levels (£382.10</li> </ul>		1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]	
		1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain	
		1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain	
		1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain	
		1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain	
		1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]	
			1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed ha x 35 units / ha) Take account of existi	site capacity of 42 dwellings (1.2 ng uses and loss of employment
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	es
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of	Minor Positive
	rural/coastal businesses?	[Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by	Minor Positive
	stimulating demand?	[Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites i Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. Site boundary.	e located outside of urban
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal wate	rs
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme lor flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns</li> </ul>		Minor Negative  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: There is a opposite side of the A28)	a pond within 25m of the site (on
4. Transport Reduce road traffic and	l its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad     Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site i store (1,500); Primary School (1,500m); (Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.]	GP Surgery (980m)

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ protect and maintain vulnerable asset	ment To protect and improve landscapes for ets (including built and historic)	or both people and wildlife and to
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II*</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).  In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Positive [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
compendium.	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	No Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is Gap. Brownfield land (former highways d Conservation Area. Archaeological poten road.	epot). Adjacent to Westbere No.2

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve l	biodiversity
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  To Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  Local Nature Reserves (LNR)  All Local Wildlife Sites	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?  6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	Not applicable  No Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site is in t Bay Zone of Influence. Potential for prote	
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air G quality and promote energy efficienc	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then scor as positive]  a not in a Flood Risk Area.
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment  8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area wher score as negative. Significant if
Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	flood zone 3]  Not applicable
	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	matin a Fland Biole Avan

	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Access to Services Share access eryone	to services and benefits of prosperity fair	ly and improve wellbeing of
•	Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]
•	5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017  Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]
•	Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain
•	currently undersubscribed.  Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.  Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]
•	26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%). percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).	Discussion and Assumptions: In Sturry dwellings (1.2 ha x 35 units / ha). The site convenience store; Primary School; or G	ward. Assumed site capacity of 42 e is not within 800m of a
10.	Sustainable Living and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living
•	The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services. Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?  10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Uncertain  Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site >
		10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]  Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable	
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site assessed as being out of town.		
11. High Quality Design and Susta	ainability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice	
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural neritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain	
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain	
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain	
12. Housing To make suitable hou	ising available and affordable to everyone		
Canterbury had a population of	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	M. D. W.	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010)	housing?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion		[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  site capacity of 42 dwellings (1.2	
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed tha x 35 units / ha).	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  site capacity of 42 dwellings (1.2	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Positive [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded	Minor Positive
	and underused land?	[PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Positive
		[PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously	Minor Positive
	developed land?	[PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact
		[Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Brownfield	d land (former highways depot).
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
	15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain

	ainability Objectives and eline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain	
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable	
		Discussion and Assumptions:		
16. V	Vaste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste	
	n 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain	
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain	
(	n 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household, 45.3% of which was recycled, reused	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain	
	or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain	
( (	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:		
r	CCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.			

		JENTS.

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

# STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/233: Land north of Conyngham Lane, Bridge

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
Economy and Employment To ach employment opportunities to everyo	nieve a strong and stable economy which one	offers rewarding and well located
The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain
<ul> <li>South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> <li>In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)</li> </ul>	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.
	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Development proposals are for 30 dwellings. Take account of existing uses and loss of employment		
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s	
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain	
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. Site boundary.	e located outside of the urban	
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs	
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	No Impact  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]	
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable	
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site not within 25m of any key drainage channels or surface water bodies.	
	its impacts, promoting more sustainable	
<ul> <li>Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad</li> <li>Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge on the city)</li> </ul>	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Minor Positive [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Minor Positive [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is a bus stop; convenience store and prima beyond (850m).  [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.]	ary school. A GP surgery is just

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ protect and maintain vulnerable ass	ment To protect and improve landscapes feets (including built and historic)	or both people and wildlife and to
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).</li> <li>In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Negative [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Minor Positive [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site in proposed Canterbury - Bridge Green Gap A WW2 civil defence wardens post is listed archaeological finds have been recorded an evaluation would be required.	In the Bridge Conservation Area. ed as being on site and

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoi	d damage to geological sites and improve l	biodiversity
<ul> <li>Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit</li> <li>Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA).</li> <li>Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> <li>10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)</li> <li>49 Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul>	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	No Impact No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?  6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]  Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically	No Impact

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	important sites?	[No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site does any recognised biodiversity features. Ho that as the site is surrounded by hedgerd there is the potential for protected species present. Site has been assessed according to the control of the c	owever, Council Ecologist advise ows and adjoins the countryside, es (dormice or nesting birds) to b
. Climate Change, Energy and Air ( juality and promote energy efficien	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts o	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.  Water resources in the area are also	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury  City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO).	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Uncertain  [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then scoras positive]
Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	not in a Flood Risk Area.
. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T etrimental to the public well-being.	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e	rosion which would be
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area where score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and	Uncertain

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts		
		coastal erosion?			
		Discussion and Assumptions: The site is not in a Flood Risk Area.			
9. <i>A</i>	Access to Services Share access eryone	to services and benefits of prosperity fair	y and improve wellbeing of		
•	Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]		
•	37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools		That a cigning and a cite a ci		
•	5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017  Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]		
•	Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain		
•	currently undersubscribed.  Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Minor Positive [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m		
•	Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.		walking distance of primary scho convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of of 3 services score minor positive No negative scores]		
•	26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).	Discussion and Assumptions: In Bridge of 30 dwellings. The site is within 800m wall convenience store and primary school.	e ward. Development proposals for alking distance of a bus stop;		
•	percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).				
10.	Sustainable Living and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living		
•	The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain		
•	Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services. Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]		

10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?

Minor Negative

[Sites located within town centre

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable	
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: site assess	sed as being out of town.	
11. High Quality Design and Sustain	ability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice	
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain	
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain	
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain	
12. Housing To make suitable housi	ng available and affordable to everyone		
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)  64,070 units (April 2010)  Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?	Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]	
	12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?	Uncertain	
	12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Not applicable	
		Not applicable  Not applicable	
	homes?		

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
13. Quality of Life To improve the qu	uality of life for those living and working in	the District
For 2010/11, the number of notifiable offences in Canterbury recorded by the police for violence against a person	13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime?	Uncertain
	13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?	Uncertain
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	stainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise	Minor Negative
	development on greenfield land)?	[PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative  [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield	land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	e prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
		15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
		15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16.	Waste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
•	In 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
•	In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household, 45.3% of which was recycled, reused	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
•	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
•	KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

/ERA		

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

### STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/234: Land at Shalloak Road, Broad Oak

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts				
Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every	1. Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone					
The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain				
South East.  73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than				
Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).		100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.				
In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]				
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain				
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain				
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain				
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain				
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]				
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]				

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Development proposals are for 50 dwellings. Take account of existing uses and loss of employment		
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s	
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain	
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites ir Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. Site boundary.	e located outside of urban	
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs	
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme lov flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	Minor Negative  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]	
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable	
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain	

Su Ba	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		Discussion and Assumptions: Site within	n 10m of a drainage channel.
4.	Fransport Reduce road traffic and	its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
•	Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad  Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
		4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
		4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
		4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
		Discussion and Assumptions: The site i of a convenience store, primary school adjacent to Strategic Site Allocation 2 (Sexpected to provide these services as p [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.]	or GP surgery. The site is directly Sturry / Broad Oak), which is art of their development proposals.

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. (	Countryside and Historic Environ	ment To protect and improve landscapes f	or both people and wildlife and to
•	tect and maintain vulnerable ass  The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
•	World Heritage site.  In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.  There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).  In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
•		5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Negative  [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative.  Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
		5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	No Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
		5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
		5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
		5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
		Discussion and Assumptions: In an AHL' directly adjacent to Strategic Site Allocat is expected to provide open space as particles.	ion 2 (Sturry / Broad Oak), which

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve l	biodiversity
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  To Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  Local Nature Reserves (LNR)  All Local Wildlife Sites	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?  6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	Not applicable  No Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	located within 250m of a SSSI.
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Cquality and promote energy efficience	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts o	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
<ul><li>itself.</li><li>Water resources in the area are also</li></ul>	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases</li> <li>One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.</li> <li>Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.</li> </ul>	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain  [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]  not in a Flood Risk Area.
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental to the public well-being,  Particular concern is the increased	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal enthe economy and the environment  8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to	rosion which would be Uncertain
frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	existing and new developments/infrastructure?	[Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
<ul> <li>recommended by the EA.</li> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	not in a Flood Risk Area

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
9. Access to Services Share access everyone	to services and benefits of prosperity fair	y and improve wellbeing of
<ul> <li>Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England</li> <li>37 primary schools, seventeen</li> </ul>	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]
secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools		
<ul> <li>5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017</li> <li>Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).</li> </ul>	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]
Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others     wronth undersubscribed.	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>currently undersubscribed.</li> <li>Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.</li> <li>Canterbury Christ Church University</li> </ul>	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school,
main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.		convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]
<ul> <li>26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).</li> <li>percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions: In Sturry of for 50 dwellings. The site is not within 80 convenience store, primary school or GF	00m walking distance of a
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalis	sation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living
The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain
Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre
<ul> <li>Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.</li> </ul>		will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score

sustainability Objectives and saseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site asses	sed as being out of town.
1. High Quality Design and Sustai	nability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice
Naterial assets, Landscape, Cultural eritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain
12. Housing To make suitable bous	sing available and affordable to everyone	
12. Housing to make suitable hous	sing available and anoldable to everyone	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minopositive. Sites above 100 units
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  Uncertain
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Development	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield	land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
		Uncertain

	ainability Objectives and eline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16. V	Vaste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
	n 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
(	of household waste per household,	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
( (	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
r	CCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

		JENTS.

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

# STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/235: Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, nr Thanington

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts			
1. Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone					
The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain			
<ul> <li>South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> </ul>	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.			
In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]			
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain			
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain			
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain			
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain			
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]			
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	No Impact [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]			

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed account of existing uses and loss of emp	site capacity <100 dwellings Take ployment
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	es
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of	Minor Positive
	rural/coastal businesses?	[Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by	Minor Positive
	stimulating demand?	[Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive  [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. The boundary.	e site is outside the urban
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal wate	rs
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns</li> </ul>		No Impact [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site i channel or surface water bodies.	s not within 25m of a drainage
4. Transport Reduce road traffic and	l its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad  Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site i convenience store, primary school or Gi [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.]	P surgery.

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
<ul> <li>Countryside and Historic Environ protect and maintain vulnerable ass</li> </ul>	ment To protect and improve landscapes for ets (including built and historic)	or both people and wildlife and to
<ul> <li>The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.</li> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).</li> <li>In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.</li> </ul>	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Negative [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Uncertain  [Score positive if the proposed siting within 400m of open space* (+2) hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impact will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features o an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: In an AHLV; Greenfield land. Adjacent to Bigbury Camp Hill Fort and Scheduled Ancient Monument.	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoi	d damage to geological sites and improve	hindiversity
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  Tsites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)  49 Local Wildlife Sites	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is therefore there is potential for protected	s adjcent to Local Wildlife Sites; species to be present.
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C quality and promote energy efficien	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts o	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then scor as positive]  a not in a Flood Risk Area.
detrimental to the public well-being,  Particular concern is the increased	to reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment  8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to	rosion which would be Uncertain
frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	existing and new developments/infrastructure?	[Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area wher score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	not in a Flood Risk Area

Sustainability Objec Baseline Information	tives and	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
9. Access to Services Share access to services and benefits of prosperity fairly and improve wellbeing of everyone				
Seasalter, Greenhill Gorrell, Heron, North Wincheap have LSO most deprived in Eng 37 primary schools, s secondary schools, t units and two specia	ngate, Barton and AS in the 20% gland seventeen wo pupil referral I schools	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]	
<ul> <li>5,665 secondary place will be required by 20 places by 20 17, allow surplus capacity with schools over the dist. These figures sugge remove 275 secondary sears 7-11 by 2012 a 2017</li> <li>Canterbury is a net in secondary students of districts).</li> </ul>	012 and 5,078 owing for 5% inin secondary rirct as a whole. st a need to ary places for and 862 places by mporter of	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]	
Some schools such a school over subscrib	ed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain	
Approximately 700 p     grammar schools in     Canterbury and Thai     Canterbury Christ Ch     main campus is base     in addition the Unive     the University of Cre     have campuses in C	upils attend Faversham, net. nurch University ed in Canterbury, rsity of Kent and ative Arts both	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]	
26.6% of the populat level 4 or above. The the South East (33.9 Britain as a whole (3)     percentage of the populatifications at all is working age population than as the South Eagreat Britain as a whole in the south Eagreat Britain as a wh	is is lower than for %) and Great 1.3%). pulation with no 7.2% of the ion which is lower ast (8.5%) and	Discussion and Assumptions: In Chartha is not within 800m walking distance of a beginning school or GP surgery.		
10. Sustainable Livir	ng and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	nd to promote sustainable living	
The closest A&E ser     Margate and Ashford		10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain	
Canterbury Hospital Accident and Emerg  Newly opened minor Estuary View Medica Seasalter, Whitstable	does not have ency services. injury unit at al Centre in	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
		10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable	
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site asses	sed as an isolated greenfield site	
11. High Quality Design and Sustai	nability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice	
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural eritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain	
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain	
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain	
2. Housing To make suitable hous	ing available and affordable to everyone		
	ing available and affordable to everyone  12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive. Sites above 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed services access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive. Sites above 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain	

Sustainability Objectives and	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
Was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
78.5 years which was also marginally lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield	land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
	15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain

	ainability Objectives and eline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16. V	Vaste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
	<ul> <li>In 2009/10 Canterbury produced 61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.</li> </ul>	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
		16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
(	In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household, 45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
		16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
( (	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
r	CCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

		JENTS.

## STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/236: Land at Roper Road, Canterbury

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts		
1. Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone				
The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain		
<ul> <li>South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> </ul>	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.		
<ul> <li>In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)</li> </ul>	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]		
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain		
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain		
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain		
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain		
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]		
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]		

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed site capacity of 7 dwellings (0.2 hax 35 units / ha) Take account of existing uses and loss of employment	
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s	ustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Uncertain [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Uncertain [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	No Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	in Canterbury
3. Water Quality To protect and imp	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	No Impact  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is not within 25m of any surface water bodies of drainage channels.	
4. Transport Reduce road traffic and	l its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
Highway network is under acute     Acceptable of the control	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Significant Positive Impact
pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad  Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge		[Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is a bus stop; convenience store; primary [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.]	school and GP surgery.

Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
ment To protect and improve landscapes for the sets (including built and historic)	or both people and wildlife and to
5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	No Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Positive [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Minor Positive [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impact will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features of an adjacent site]
5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
Discussion and Assumptions: Site locate landscape. Brownfield land. Within 400m Roman Cemetery. In the Canterbury West	of open space. Adjacent to a
	ment To protect and improve landscapes feets (including built and historic)  5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?  5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?  5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?  5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?  5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?  5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?  5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?  Discussion and Assumptions: Site locate landscape. Brownfield land. Within 400m

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6 Geology and Riodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve	hiodiversity
<ul> <li>Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit</li> <li>Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA).</li> <li>Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> <li>10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)</li> <li>49 Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul>	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site d adjacent to any biodiversity features. It is site.	oes not include and is not s not within 250m of a designated
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air G quality and promote energy efficienc	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then scor as positive]  a not in a Flood Risk Area.
domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.  Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion Tetrimental to the public well-being,  Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when
Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]  Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself.	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
noth.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	not in a Flood Risk Area.

	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
9. <i>A</i>	Access to Services Share access eryone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairly	y and improve wellbeing of
•	<ul> <li>Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England</li> <li>37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools</li> <li>5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017</li> </ul>	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]
•		9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]
•	Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain
	currently undersubscribed.  Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.  Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.  26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).  percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Significant Positive Impact [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]
•		Discussion and Assumptions: In St Stepl of 7 dwellings (0.2 ha x 35 units / ha). The distance of a convenience store, primary	e site is within 800m walking
10.	Sustainable Living and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living
•	The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain
•	Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Positive [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
		10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Minor Positive [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site is in t	he Canterbury wider urban area.
11. High Quality Design and Susta	ainability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions:	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>		
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	No Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this coars as no impact. Sites
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>		[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>		[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion	housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable
<ul><li>149,100 (2009)</li><li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li><li>Average annual housing completion</li></ul>	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain
149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive. Value of the significant positive.  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain  site capacity of 7 dwellings (0.2 heads)
149,100 (2009)  64,070 units (April 2010)  Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed x 35 units / ha).  quality of life for those living and working in	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive. Value of the significant positive.  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain  Not applicable  Uncertain  site capacity of 7 dwellings (0.2 heads)

Sustainability Objectives and	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
Was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
78.5 years which was also marginally lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Positive [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Positive  [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Positive  [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Positive [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	Minor Positive [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Brownfield	l land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
	15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain

	ainability Objectives and eline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16. V	Vaste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
	n 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
(	In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household, 45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
		16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
( (	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
r	CCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

		JENTS.

## STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/237: Land at Highland Court Farm, Nr Bridge

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts		
1. Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone				
The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain		
South East.  73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)	st.  1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people of working age within y district were economically 11)  1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	Minor Positive [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than		
<ul> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> </ul>		100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.		
• In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	Minor Positive [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]		
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain		
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain		
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain		
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain		
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	Minor Positive [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]		
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]		

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Development and 50 acres of commercial / business spuses and loss of employment	
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To se	ustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. The boundary.	site is outside of the urban
3. Water Quality To protect and imp	rove the quality of inland and coastal water	's
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	Minor Negative  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: There is a Coldharbour Farmhouse. However, there	small pond within the ground of is scope to avoid.
	its impacts, promoting more sustainable i	
<ul> <li>Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad</li> <li>Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge</li> </ul>	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the city)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is bus stop but not of a convenience store GP Surgery (2.5km). A local shop forms proposals.  [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.]	(2.4km), primary school (3km) or part of the development

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ	ment To protect and improve landscapes for	or both people and wildlife and to
protect and maintain vulnerable ass	ets (including built and historic)	
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).</li> <li>In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Significant Positive Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is and in an AHLV. Greenfield land. Open sp Archaeological finds recorded across the and Iron Age ditch. In the Highland Court Conservation Area. Adjacent to listed bui Grade 2*; Coldharbour Farmhouse: Grade	pace to be provided on site. site including medieval graves (Bekesbourne and Patrixbourne) ildings Highland Court Hospital:

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve l	piodiversity
<ul> <li>Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit</li> <li>Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA).</li> <li>Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> <li>10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)</li> <li>49 Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul>	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Advised the species on site.	nat there is likely to be protected
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality and promote energy efficience	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts o	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	<ul><li>7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?</li><li>7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?</li><li>7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?</li></ul>	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]  Uncertain  Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself.	<ul><li>7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?</li><li>7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?</li></ul>	Uncertain Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases     One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]  not in a Flood Risk Area.
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
<ul> <li>recommended by the EA.</li> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is not in a Flood Risk Area.		
9. Access to Services Share access everyone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairly	y and improve wellbeing of	
<ul> <li>Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England</li> </ul>	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantage ward. Significant if site > 100 units	
<ul> <li>37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools</li> </ul>		That are originated as a second as a secon	
<ul> <li>5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017</li> <li>Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).</li> </ul>	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	Minor Positive [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 10 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]	
<ul> <li>Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others currently undersubscribed.</li> </ul>	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.</li> </ul>	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m	
<ul> <li>Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.</li> </ul>		walking distance of primary school convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive No negative scores]	
<ul> <li>26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).</li> <li>percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).</li> </ul>	Development proposals are for 300 hous	n and Assumptions: In Little Stour and Adisham ward. ent proposals are for 300 houses and 50 acres of commercial / space. The site is not within 800m walking distance of a	
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalis	eation To revitalise town and rural centres a	nd to promote sustainable living	
The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain	
Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services.  Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or	
		isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5kn from town centre]	

10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?

Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	>5km from a town centre.
11. High Quality Design and Sustain	ability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain
12. Housing To make suitable housi	ng available and affordable to everyone	
Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)  64,070 units (April 2010)  Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]
	12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?	Uncertain
	12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Development and 50 acres of commercial / business sp	ent proposals are for 300 houses pace.

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
13. Quality of Life To improve the q	uality of life for those living and working in	the District
For 2010/11, the number of notifiable offences in Canterbury recorded by the police for violence against a person	13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime?	Uncertain
	13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?	Uncertain
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more su	stainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative  [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield land.	
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	ne prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
		15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
		15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16.	Waste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
•	In 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
•	In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household,	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
•	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
•	KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

/ERA		

## STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/238: Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable

Sustainability Ob Baseline Informat		Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts		
1. Economy and E employment oppo	Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone				
Canterbury is bel	<ul> <li>The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> </ul>	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain		
South East.  • 73.9% of people Canterbury district active (2011)		1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than		
in Canterbury (88 and tourism relat contributing the g	the largest employer 8%) with public sector ded employers greatest proportion of 8.9% respectively).		100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.		
In 2011 median of for employees in was almost £361 than average counational levels (£		1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]		
		1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain		
		1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain		
		1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain		
		1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain		
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]			
		Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]		

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Developm dwellings.Take account of existing uses	nent proposals are for 45 and loss of employment
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites ir Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive  [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Coastal. In	the Whitstable wider urban area
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs .
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>		Significant Negative Impact  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is within 10m of a pond to the North.	
4. Transport Reduce road traffic and	its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
<ul> <li>Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad</li> <li>Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge on the city)</li> </ul>	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the oity)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is a bus stop and convenience store. Howe GP Surgery (1.4km) are further.  [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.]	ver, a Primary School (2.4km) and

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ protect and maintain vulnerable ass	ment To protect and improve landscapes for the comment of the comm	or both people and wildlife and to
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).</li> <li>In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Minor Negative [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Negative  [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Significant Negative Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is land. Loss of Protected Existing Open Sp would be required. Site entrance adjacen Grade 2.	ace. Archaeological evaluations

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit     Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA).      Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh).      Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).      15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).      10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)      49 Local Wildlife Sites	d damage to geological sites and improve I  6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	No Impact [No impact unless site includes

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is therefore it is likely that protected specie Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay and the Estuaries Zones of Influence - potential for the statement of the stat	s will be present. Site also in the Thames, Medway & Swale or protected species.
<ol><li>Climate Change, Energy and Air C quality and promote energy efficience</li></ol>	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.  Water resources in the area are also	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO).	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]
Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	not in a Flood Risk Area.
Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.		
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental to the public well-being,	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment	rosion which would be
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is not in a Flood Risk Area.		
9. Access to Services Share access everyone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairly	y and improve wellbeing of	
<ul> <li>Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England</li> <li>37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools</li> </ul>	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	Minor Positive [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]	
<ul> <li>5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017</li> <li>Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).</li> </ul>	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]	
Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain	
<ul> <li>currently undersubscribed.</li> <li>Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.</li> </ul>	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m	
<ul> <li>Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.</li> </ul>		walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]	
26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).	Discussion and Assumptions: In Gorrel v dwellings. The site is within 800m walking convenience store. However, a primary s	g distance of a bus stop and	
<ul> <li>percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).</li> </ul>			
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	nd to promote sustainable living	
The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain	
Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Positive	
Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	Centres ?	[Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Minor Positive [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable	
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site in the Whitstable wider urban area.		
11. High Quality Design and Susta	ninability To encourage sustainable design a	nd practice	
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain	
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain	
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  uncertain  uncertain	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
offences in Canterbury recorded by the police for violence against a person was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.  Life expectancy for females in Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally lower than the South East (79.4).	13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?	Uncertain
	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
4. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
oil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative.

14. Use of Land To deliver more sustainable use of land in more sustainable location patterns			
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]	
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]	
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]	
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]	
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	Minor Positive [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield land.		

## 15. Natural Resources To ensure the prudent use of natural resources and the sustainable management of existing resources

Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain
	15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
	15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
	Discussion and Assumptions:	
16. Waste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
In 2009/10 Canterbury produced     Control of the control of	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household, 45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.</li> <li>Total of 63 recycling sites across</li> </ul>	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
<ul> <li>KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.</li> </ul>		

$\sim$		LL CO		JTC.
Uν	ENA		IVI IVI 🗀 I	<b>ч і Э.</b>

## STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/239: Land at Island Road and Bredlands Lane, Hersden

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
1. Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every	hieve a strong and stable economy which cone	offers rewarding and well located
<ul> <li>The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> <li>In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)</li> </ul>	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain
	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.
	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain
	Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Minor Positive [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Development proposals are for 90 dwellings. Take account of existing uses and loss of employment		
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s	sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s	
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain	
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Minor Positive [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]	
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Minor Positive [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. The boundary.	site is outside of the urban	
3. Water Quality To protect and im	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs	
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>		Significant Negative Impact [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]	
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable	
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	s within 10m of a pond.
4. Transport Reduce road traffic and	its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad  Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge on the city)	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the only)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Minor Negative [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is a convenience store (1.4km); primary scl [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.]	nool (1.2km); GP surgery (1.3km).

Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
nment To protect and improve landscapes for	or both people and wildlife and to
5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Minor Negative [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Significant Positive Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features or an adjacent site]
5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
Discussion and Assumptions: The site is Gap. Greenfield land. Development propopermanent Green Space for public use. A Conservation Area. Archaeological potentoad.	osals include the provision of adjacent to Westbere No.2
	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?  5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?  5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?  5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?  5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?  5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is Gap. Greenfield land. Development propermanent Green Space for public use. A Conservation Area. Archaeological potential conservation Area. Archaeological potential conservation Area.

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve l	biodiversity
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  To National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)  49 Local Wildlife Sites	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?  6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]  Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically	No Impact

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	important sites?	[No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: It is advis protected species present on site.	ed that there is likely to be
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air quality and promote energy efficier	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts acy	of climate change, improve air
<ul> <li>Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a</li> </ul>	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	Uncertain  [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]  s not in a Flood Risk Area.
roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.  Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.		
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion of detrimental to the public well-being	To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e I, the economy and the environment	erosion which would be
<ul> <li>Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been</li> </ul>	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	s not in a Flood Risk Area.

	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
9. <i>A</i>	Access to Services Share access eryone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairl	y and improve wellbeing of
•	Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]
•	5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017  Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	No Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]
•	Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain
•	currently undersubscribed.  Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.  Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Uncertain [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]
•	26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%). percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).	Discussion and Assumptions: In Sturry v for 90 dwellings. The site is not within 80 convenience store, primary school or GP	0m walking distance of a
10.	Sustainable Living and Revitalisa	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living
•	The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain
•	Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services. Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
		10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Minor Negative [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable	
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site asses	sed as being out of town.	
11. High Quality Design and Susta	inability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice	
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain	
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain	
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain	
	Discussion and Assumptions:		
	ising available and affordable to everyone		
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive. Value of the score as significant positive.  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Developments	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 unit or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  Uncertain	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?  12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?  12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?  12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?  12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?  12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?  Discussion and Assumptions: Developmedwellings.  quality of life for those living and working in	[All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]  Minor Positive [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.]  Uncertain  Not applicable  Not applicable  Uncertain  ent proposals are for 90	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
78.5 years which was also marginally lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Minor Negative [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield	land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
		Uncertain

	ainability Objectives and eline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16. V	Vaste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
	n 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	of household waste per household,	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
(		16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
( (	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
r	CCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

		JENTS.

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

# STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/240: Land South of Aylesham, Womenswold

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts				
Economy and Employment To ach employment opportunities to everyone.	1. Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone					
<ul> <li>The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the South East.</li> <li>73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)</li> <li>Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).</li> <li>In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)</li> </ul>	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain				
	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.				
	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]				
	1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain				
	1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain				
	1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain				
	1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain				
	1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]				
	1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Significant Positive Impact [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]				

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed dwellings (240 ha x 25 units / ha) Take ac of employment	site capacity of >400 dwellings ecount of existing uses and loss
2. Rural/Coastal Communities To su	stain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	s
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Significant Positive Impact [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Significant Positive Impact [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Rural. Ass	essed as isolated greenfield.
3. Water Quality To protect and impr	ove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs
<ul> <li>North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year</li> <li>Stour CAMS area covers much of inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	Minor Negative  [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]
	3.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts on coastal waters, fisheries and bathing waters?	Not applicable
	3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: There is a corner of the site. However, there is sco	
I. Transport Reduce road traffic and	its impacts, promoting more sustainable	·
<ul> <li>Highway network is under acute pressure and as a result, Canterbury suffers from significant peak hour congestion with congestion hot spots particularly along the A28 and the ringroad</li> <li>Large net inflow of commuters into the area as well as an influx of secondary school children and students in higher education (160,000 vehicles per day travel to and from Canterbury along the nine "A" and "B" roads that converge on the city)</li> </ul>	4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
on the only)	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
	4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
	4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
	4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Parts of t distance of a bus stop, convenience sto (all located in Aylesham).  [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.]	re, primary school and GP surgery

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ protect and maintain vulnerable ass	ment To protect and improve landscapes fo	or both people and wildlife and to
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II*</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).  In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
compendium.	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	Significant Positive Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Partly in the and includes areas of Ancient woodland. with 400m of open space. Archaeological therefore an evaluation would be required Conservation Area.	Greenfield land. Part of the site finds recorded across the site

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve l	biodiversity
Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  To National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).  Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).  10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)  49 Local Wildlife Sites	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Minor Negative  No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?  6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]  Not applicable
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically	No Impact

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	important sites?	[No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site in Woodland, some of which are also Local there is potential for protected species to	Wildlife Site. It is advised that
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air G quality and promote energy efficienc	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of	of climate change, improve air
<ul> <li>Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a</li> </ul>	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	Uncertain [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.  Water resources in the area are also	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO).	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Uncertain  [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]
Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.	Discussion and Assumptions: The site is	s not in a Flood Risk Area.
Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.		
3. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion Todetrimental to the public well-being,	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment	rosion which would be
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.		

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
		Discussion and Assumptions: The site is not in a Flood Risk Area.		
	Access to Services Share access eryone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairl	y and improve wellbeing of	
•	Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]	
•	5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017  Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]	
•	Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain	
•	currently undersubscribed.  Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.  Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Significant Positive Impact [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]	
•	26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%). percentage of the population with no	Discussion and Assumptions: In Nailbou of >425 dwellings (240 ha x 25 units / ha)	irne ward. Assumed site capacity	
	qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).			
10.	Sustainable Living and Revitalis	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	and to promote sustainable living	
•	The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and Canterbury Hospital does not have	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?  10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town	Uncertain Significant Negative Impact	
•	Accident and Emergency services.  Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	centres?	[Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]	
		10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Site > 5km capacity of >400 dwellings dwellings (240	from town centre. Assumed site ) ha x 25 units / ha)
11. High Quality Design and Sustair	ability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain
12. Housing To make suitable housi	ng available and affordable to everyone	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	ng available and affordable to everyone  12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites
		above 100 units score as significant]
	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]
	12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?	Uncertain
	12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: Assumed	site canacity of >400 dwellings

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
13. Quality of Life To improve the q	uality of life for those living and working in	the District
For 2010/11, the number of notifiable	13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime?	Uncertain
offences in Canterbury recorded by the police for violence against a person	13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?	Uncertain
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.</li> </ul>	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more su	stainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Minor Negative  [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Greenfield	land.
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	ne prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain
		15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain
		15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain
		15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain
		15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable
		Discussion and Assumptions:	
16.	Waste To reduce generation and	disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable	e management of waste
•	In 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain
	61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain
•	In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household,	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain
	45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain
•	Total of 63 recycling sites across Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
•	KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.		

/ERA		

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

# Appendix B Site Appraisal Summaries

#### Legend

AHLV: Area of High Landscape Value SPA: Special Protection Area

AONB: Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty SAC: Special Area of Conservation

**SAM:** Scheduled Ancient Monument **AAI:** Area of Archaeological Interest

LWS: Local Wildlife Site GCN: Great Crested Newt

SNCI: Site of Nature Conservation Interest

TPO: Tree Preservation Order

PEOS: Protected Existing Open Space

PDL: Previously Developed Land

SSSI: Site of Special Scientific Interest ha: Hectare

### **Omission Housing Sites**

SLA: Special Landscape Area

SHLAA- 232 Former Highways Depot, Staines Hill, Sturry: 1.2ha located on the northern side of the A28 on the eastern periphery of Sturry; approximately 3.5 miles north east of Canterbury. It is an irregular shaped brownfield site, which is currently lying vacant. It consists of a large area of hard standing representing its previous use as a highways depot. Positive effects are anticipated in relation to Rural/Coastal Community reflecting the location of the site but its small scale. Development could also contribute to housing need so a positive effect is acknowledged in relation to SA objective 12 on Housing. The site is previously developed land and a positive effect is recorded against SA objective 14. A significant negative effect is recorded against SA Objective 5 on Conservation and the Historic Environment because of the site's position in the Sturry Hersden Green Gap.

SHLAA- 233 Land at Conyngham Lane, Bridge: 3.3ha site located on the north western periphery of Bridge, approximately 3.5 miles south-east of Canterbury. It is arable farmland. Positive effects are anticipated in relation to Rural/Coastal Community reflecting the location of the site but its small scale. Development could also contribute to housing need so a positive effect is acknowledged in relation to SA objective 12 on Housing. A significant negative effect is recorded against SA Objective 5 on Conservation and the Historic Environment because it is in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, an AHLV and the Bridge Conservation Area.

SHLAA- 234 Land at Shalloak road, Sturry/Broad Oak, Canterbury: 2.5ha of meadow / pasture land. The site is situated approximately 3.2km north east of Canterbury. It is self-contained on three sides by a series of mature trees / woodland. It holds an elevated position with glimpse view across the Stour Valley. The site would form an extension to the Strategic Site Allocation at Sturry / Broad Oak (Site 2). The site gradually rolls downhill north west to south east. A small area of hard standing has recently been created in the north west corner. A minor positive effect is anticipated in relation to Rural/Coastal Community reflecting the location of the site but its small scale. Development could also contribute to housing need so a positive effect is acknowledged in relation to SA objective 12 on Housing. Significant negative effects are anticipated in relation to SA Objective 4 on transport because of a current lack of proximity to local facilities, although the detailed assessment notes that the Strategic Site Allocation 2 is adjacent to this site and anticipated to provide these facilities. A significant negative effect is anticipated against SA Objective 5 on Conservation and the Historic Environment because it is within an AHLV.

SHLAA- 235 Land between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane, Chartham Hatch: 17ha site located in the open countryside, approximately 3.5km east of Canterbury with provision for less than 100 dwellings. The site is comprised of a mixture of agricultural land, orchards and pastures; scattered with trees, wrapped around Bigbury Wood. A series of access tracks cross the site. The site undulates and slopes downwards from north to south between Bigbury Road and Tonford Lane. Minor positive effects are anticipated in relation to SA objectives 2 on Rural/Coastal Community, and 12 Housing. Significant negative effects are

anticipated in relation to SA objective 4 on Transport because of the lack of proximity to local facilities. Significant negative effects are also anticipated in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment because the site is within an AHLV and is also adjacent to the Bigbury Camp Hill Fort. Negative effects are also anticipated in relation to objective 10 in relation to sustainable living and revitalisation because of the distance from a town centre.

SHLAA- 236 Land at Roper Road, Canterbury: 0.2ha site in the urban area of Canterbury, a short distance North West of the City Centre. The site is currently used for car sales and is almost entirely laid out as hardstanding. There are two small buildings on site associated with the car sales activity. Significant positive effects are anticipated in relation to SA objective 4 on transport and objective 9 in relation to access to services. A mixed positive and negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment because the site is adjacent to a Roman Cemetery and in the Canterbury West Station Conservation Area; however, uses PDL and is within 400m of open space. Minor positive effects are acknowledged in relation to SA objective 12 on housing and 14 on the use of land, because of the potential for the use of previously developed land.

SHLAA- 237 Land at Highlands Court Farm, Coldharbour Lane, Nr Bridge: The site is 140 hectares of predominately greenfield land, although the northern part incorporates the Highland Court Farm Business Park, which is comprised of a number of industrial metal sheds and offices. The development on site (as proposed) would comprise 300 dwellings (100 retirement homes and a care facility, 100 starter homes and 100 holiday homes). The site is located approximately 5km south east of Canterbury (south east of Bridge). There is also the farmstead north west of the employment cluster. The remainder of the site is formed of agricultural land, with an expanse of arable fields (mostly utilised for fruit growing) and separated by dense hedgerows and lines of mature trees.

The scoring for the site against SA objectives reflects the scale of development put forward. A significant positive effect is anticipated in relation to Rural/Coastal Community reflecting the location of the site and proposed scale. Significant negative effects are anticipated in relation to SA objective 4 on Transport because of the lack of proximity to local facilities.

A significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment. The site is located in the Kent Downs AONB and in an AHLV and archaeological finds recorded across the site have included medieval graves and an Iron Age ditch. In addition the site is in the Highland Court (Bekesbourne and Patrixbourne) Conservation Area and is adjacent to listed buildings Highland Court Hospital: Grade 2\*; Coldharbour Farmhouse: Grade 2. As open space is to be provided on site and this is also acknowledged under objective 5 as a minor positive effect. Significant negative effects are also anticipated in relation to SA objective 10 (sustainable living and revitalisation) because of the distance from a town centre.

SHLAA- 238 Land at Millstrood Road, Whitstable: 2 hectares of greenfield land – designated as Protection of Existing Open Space, bordered on all sides by mature trees and hedgerows. The site is located on the urban fringe of south Whitstable. It is a thin wedge of scrub land currently used for low key grazing that is sandwiched between residential properties and the Old Thanet Way. Minor positive effects are anticipated in relation to SA objectives 1 and 2 on the Economy and Rural/coastal community and objectives 9 on access to services, 10 on sustainable living and 12 on housing. A significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment because of the impact that development would have on an existing open space.

SHLAA- 239 Land adjacent to Spires Academy, Hersden: 3ha site. The site is located on the northern side of the A28 approximately 3.5 miles north east of Canterbury. The site forms part of a former minerals quarry and refuse tip. The land has regenerated itself and blended back into the landscape and is predominately scrub land with a few trees. It is uneven and undulating and currently being used to graze cattle. Minor positive effects are anticipated in relation to SA objectives 1 and 2 on the Economy and Rural/coastal community and 12 on housing. A significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment because the site is within the Sturry - Hersden Green Gap. It is also adjacent to Westbere No.2 Conservation Area. Development proposals include the provision of permanent Green Space for public use and this is acknowledged in the SA as a significant positive effect.

**SHLAA- 240** Land South of Aylesham: 240ha site, located approximately 10km south east of Canterbury. The site which crosses the Local Authority areas of Canterbury and Dover and it the Council's

view that any development in this location should be limited to an extension of Aylesham, which is outside of the Canterbury Local Authority Area. It is 240 hectares of agricultural land, open countryside and wooded areas between the village of Womenswold (Canterbury District) and Aylesham (Dover District). The site affords long views across the undulating fields, dipping in the middle, towards Aylesham and vice versa. The scale and location of the site means that significant positive effects are anticipated in relation to SA objectives 1 on the Economy 2 on Rural/Coastal Community, 9 on access to services and the benefits of prosperity and 12 Housing. A significant negative effect is identified in relation to SA objective 5 Countryside and Historic Environment because the site is partly in the Kent Downs AONB; in an AHLV and includes areas of Ancient woodland. The site is also adjacent to Womenswold Conservation Area. A significant negative effect is also identified in relation to SA objective 15 on use of land because of the scale of the loss of greenfield land.

## Appendix C SA Matrix for Hersden Colliery

## **STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

Sus	stainability Objectives and seline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
1. E em	Economy and Employment To acl ployment opportunities to everyo	hieve a strong and stable economy which o	offers rewarding and well located
•	The economic performance of Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the	1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy?	uncertain
•	South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011)	1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than
•	Service sector is the largest employer in Canterbury (88%) with public sector and tourism related employers contributing the greatest proportion of jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respectively).		100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive.
•	In 2011 median gross weekly earnings for employees in Canterbury District was almost £361.00, which is lower than average county, regional and national levels (£382.10, £422.00 and £405.70 respectively)	1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
		1.4 Will it help diversify the economy?	Uncertain
		1.5 Will it lead to an increase in the local skill base through recruitment from Canterbury's Higher education establishments?	Uncertain
		1.6 Will it help to foster growth in the knowledge based economy?	Uncertain
		1.7 Will it promote sustainable tourism?	Uncertain
		1.8 Will it help meet the employment needs of local people?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. A significant positive score assumes employment land will be delivered alongside the development, some of which will attract new business. Score loss of employment land as a negative score]
		1.9 Will it improve physical access to jobs through improved location of sites and proximity to transport links?	Significant Positive Impact [Minor positive if the site is within 30mins public transport time of an employment site. Significant positive score for sites >400 units]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: The total p development has not yet been specified Take account of existing uses and loss o	•
	ustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie	
N/A	2.1 Will it assist with the diversification of the rural/coastal economy?	Uncertain
	2.2 Will it support and encourage the growth of rural/coastal businesses?	Significant Positive Impact [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a positive minor effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand?	Significant Positive Impact [Proposed sites in Herne Bay, Whitstable and rural locations should be assumed to have a minor positive effect. Significantly positive if site > 400 units. Sites in Canterbury will be scored as uncertain]
	2.4 Will it assist in the provision of affordable houses in rural/coastal areas?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	Discussion and Assumptions:	
3. Water Quality To protect and imp	prove the quality of inland and coastal water	rs
North Kent and Swale CAMS area is one of the most intensively licensed areas for water abstraction and it is one of the driest areas in the UK with 665mm per year  Stour CAMS area covers much of	3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality?	No Impact [All sites within 10m of surface water body assumed to be significantly negative. Sites between 10 and 25m of key drainage channels (such as coastal brooks) and rivers, lakes
<ul> <li>inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years.</li> <li>Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns.</li> </ul>		and ponds score minor negative. If it is a large site where there is obvious scope to avoid water bodies, also score a minor negative. Sites > 25m score no impact]

3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality?  Discussion and Assumptions: The site is associated with Stodmarsh, an internation Runoff from this site could potentially has wetland.	nally important wetland site.
associated with Stodmarsh, an internation Runoff from this site could potentially ha	nally important wetland site.
its impacts, promoting more sustainable	modes of transport
4.1 Will it reduce travel demand?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within
	800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?	Uncertain
4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites located within 800m of a bus route or train station (2 services per hour min) and within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, GP and primary school score positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. Score negative if the site is beyond 800m of the public transport provision even if within walking distance of the other local services. Sites beyond 800m walking distance of these services score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units score as significantly negative]
4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?	Uncertain
4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?	Uncertain
Discussion and Assumptions:  [Make a particular reference to any particular known transport improvemen such as bus links.]	
	4.2 Will it improve transport of goods/people by more sustainable means?  4.3 Will it encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport?  4.4 Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  4.5 Will it reduce the need to travel?  Discussion and Assumptions:  [Make a particular reference to any particular.]

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
5. Countryside and Historic Environ	ment To protect and improve landscapes fo	or both people and wildlife and to
protect and maintain vulnerable ass	ets (including built and historic)	or both people and miame and to
The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO World Heritage site.	5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district.</li> <li>There are 19 heritage assets at risk in the Canterbury district on the City Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 (9.4%).</li> <li>In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council compendium.</li> </ul>	5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance designated and non-designated landscape features?	Minor Negative [No impact for sites located > 1km from designated landscape. For sites <1km or where there are significant non-designated landscape features, score minor negative. For sites located in or including designated landscape features, score as significant negative]
	5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure throughout the district?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive or negative if > 100 dwelligs]
	5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space?	No Impact [Score positive if the proposed site is within 400m of open space* (+2 hectares in size). Score significant if site > 100 units or if open space or significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urban open space and publicly accessible / managed sites adjacent to the urban edge ]
	5.5 Will it help to protect and enhance sites, areas and features of historic, cultural archaeological and architectural interest?	Uncertain [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if evaluation requested]
	5.6 Will it help to conserve historic buildings, places and spaces that enhance local distinctiveness, character and appearance through sensitive adaptation and re-use?	Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes historic features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated. Score uncertain if designated features on an adjacent site]
	5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions: The site hat former colliery site, but no significant vis Archaeology evaluation required - eviden settlement	ible features remain.

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid	d damage to geological sites and improve b	piodiversity	
<ul> <li>Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit</li> <li>Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA).</li> <li>Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh).</li> <li>15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</li> <li>10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR)</li> <li>49 Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul>	6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats?	Significant/Minor Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative'].	
	6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation?	Significant/Minor Negative Impact No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species is designated. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be protected species on the site score 'minor negative']	
	6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless there are specific proposals for habitat creation or enhancement, where it is scored minor positive]	
	6.4 Will it ensure the sustainable management of natural habitats?	Not applicable	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically important sites?	Significant Negative Impact [No impact unless site includes recognised geological features. Impacts will be significantly negative where feature is designated]
	Discussion and Assumptions: RIGS site. and is adjacenet the the Stodmarsh SSSI	The site is designated as a LWS , SAC, SPA, Ramsar.
7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality and promote energy efficience	Quality To reduce the causes and impacts o	of climate change, improve air
Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a	7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?	No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3]
'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA.	7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas</li> </ul>	7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality?	Uncertain
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy?	Uncertain
itself.	7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy?	Uncertain
Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases  One Air Quality management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NO2) air quality objective (AQO).	7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive]
Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AQMA (AQMA1 Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2.	Discussion and Assumptions: A small pain an area identified at risk of flooding.	art to the south-west of the site is
<ul> <li>Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh.</li> </ul>		
8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To detrimental to the public well-being,	o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal en the economy and the environment	rosion which would be
Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose 'Hold the Line' for most coastline; however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been	8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure?	Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3]
recommended by the EA.  Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas	8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion?	Not applicable
around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury	8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion?	Not applicable
itself.	8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
	Discussion and Assumptions: A small pain an area identified at risk of flooding. T this are, but surface water flooding may be railway are not maintained.	here are no records of flooding in
9. Access to Services Share access everyone	to services and benefits of prosperity fairly	y and improve wellbeing of
Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington, Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England     37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools	9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas?	No Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units]
<ul> <li>5,665 secondary places for years 7-11 will be required by 2012 and 5,078 places by 20 17, allowing for 5% surplus capacity within secondary schools over the district as a whole. These figures suggest a need to remove 275 secondary places for years 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017</li> <li>Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts).</li> </ul>	9.2 Will it increase economic activity?	Significant Positive Impact [Housing and employment land sites could have a positive effect. Where site equivalent to less than 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. Score loss of employment land as a negative score ]
Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others currently undersubscribed.	9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential?	Uncertain
<ul> <li>Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet.</li> <li>Canterbury Christ Church University main campus is based in Canterbury, in addition the University of Kent and the University of Creative Arts both have campuses in Canterbury.</li> </ul>	9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)?	Significant Positive Impact [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, convenience store and GP surgery. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services score minor positive. No negative scores]
26.6% of the population have NVQ level 4 or above. This is lower than for the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%).	Discussion and Assumptions: Hersden h considered as an area of deprivation con perfoming wards	as been historically been
percentage of the population with no qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lower than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%).		
10. Sustainable Living and Revitalis	ation To revitalise town and rural centres a	nd to promote sustainable living
The closest A&E services are in Margate and Ashford. Kent and	10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets?	Uncertain
Canterbury Hospital does not have Accident and Emergency services.  Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable.	10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre?	Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
		will score significantly positive. Sites in the wider urban areas score minor positive. Sites on urban fringe, out of town or isolated greenfield to score negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre]
	10.4 Will it promote responsible tourism which is both ecologically and culturally sensitive?	Not applicable
	10.5 Will it improve physical access to services, such as a GP, a hospital, schools, areas of employment and retail centres?	Uncertain
	Discussion and Assumptions:	
11. High Quality Design and Sustain	ability To encourage sustainable design ar	nd practice
Material assets, Landscape, Cultural heritage	11.1 Will it use architectural design to enhance the local distinctiveness of development?	Uncertain
	11.2 Will it improve the quality of the built environment through high standards of sustainable design and construction of new and existing buildings?	Uncertain
	11.3 Will it affect light and noise pollution?	Uncertain
12. Housing To make suitable housi	ng available and affordable to everyone	
<ul> <li>Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009)</li> <li>64,070 units (April 2010)</li> <li>Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units</li> </ul>	12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable housing?	Significant Positive Impact [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ hectare or over and sites of 5 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than this score as no impact. Sites above 100 units score as significant]
	12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing?	Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive]
	12.3 Will it provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities?	Uncertain
	12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.5 Will it reduce the number of empty homes?	Not applicable
	12.6 Will it reduce the level of homelessness in the District?	Uncertain

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts
13. Quality of Life To improve the qu	uality of life for those living and working in	the District
For 2010/11, the number of notifiable	13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime?	Uncertain
offences in Canterbury recorded by the police for violence against a person	13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime?	Uncertain
was 1,572. For robbery offences and theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively.	13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups?	Uncertain
Life expectancy for females in	13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles?	Uncertain
Canterbury district at birth was 82.4 years, less than for the South East (83.3). Life expectance at birth was 78.5 years which was also marginally	13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together?	Uncertain
lower than the South East (79.4).	13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity?	Uncertain
The 2001 census data reports that of the 135,278 people in Canterbury 67.5% described themselves as being in good health, 23.5% in fairly good health and 9% in not good health.	Discussion and Assumptions:	
14. Use of Land To deliver more sus	tainable use of land in more sustainable lo	cation patterns
Soil, Material Assets, Landscape	14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)?	Significant Negative Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?	Significant Positive Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.3 Will it reduce land contamination?	Uncertain [PDL sites to score positive. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant. Greenfield sites to score minor negative]
	14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land?	Significant Positive Impact [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant]
	14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance?	No Impact [Small urban sites < 400 units score as a minor positive impact. Large urban sites (> 400 units, score as significant positive impact. All other sites score as no impact]
	Discussion and Assumptions: Although previously industrialised land, the site now has a diverse vegetation, including nationally important lichen heath vegetation on the colliery waste. Although development may provide an opportunity to remove any contamination associated with the previous use, the presense of colliery waste benefits its LWS value. It is non-agricultural land in terms of the agricultural land-use classification.	

Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information	Key questions/guidance	Sustainability Impacts	
15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources	ne prudent use of natural resources and the	sustainable management of	
Material Assets, Soil	15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?	Uncertain	
	15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?	Uncertain	
	15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and imported?	Uncertain	
	15.4 Will it increase efficiency in the use of raw materials and promote recycling?	Uncertain	
	15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase efficiency in water use?	Uncertain	
	15.6 Will it protect water resources?	Uncertain	
	15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside?	Not applicable	
	Discussion and Assumptions:		
16. Waste To reduce generation an	d disposal of waste, and achieve sustainabl	e management of waste	
In 2009/10 Canterbury produced	16.1 Will it reduce the amount of waste generated?	Uncertain	
61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste.	16.2 Will it encourage the recycling of waste?	Uncertain	
In 2009/10 residents produced 479kg of household waste per household,     AF 200 of which was accorded roused.	16.3 Will it increase the demand for recycled materials?	Uncertain	
<ul><li>45.3% of which was recycled, reused or composted.</li><li>Total of 63 recycling sites across</li></ul>	16.4 Will it ensure the management of wastes consistent with the waste management hierarchy?	Uncertain	
Canterbury district. Of these 27 are in Canterbury, 16 in Whitstable, 8 in Herne Bay with the remaining 12 in the villages around the district.	Discussion and Assumptions:		
<ul> <li>KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre.</li> </ul>			

O\	/ERAI	1 0	OMA	/EN	23
υv	ERAI	ᄔ		ILEIN	ı o.

**Discussion and Assumptions:** 

