Canterbury City Council Sustainability Appraisal of SHLAA Sites New Site Submissions Worksheets (2014)

SHLAA228

SHLAA229

SHLAA230

| SHLAA212 | Land at Bushy Close Wood, Westbere |
|-------------|---|
| SHLAA213 | Land at Folly Farm, Canterbury |
| SHLAA214 | Durite Manufacturing Plant, Fordwich |
| SHLAA215 | Lucketts Farm, Blean |
| SHLAA216 | Land at Chartham Mill, Chartham |
| SHLAA217 | Land at Blean Common, Blean |
| SHLAA218 | Great Bossingham Farm, Bossingham |
| SHLAA219 | Gowan, Stodmarsh Road |
| SHLAA220 | K&C Hospital, Ridlands Farm and Langton Field |
| SHLAA221 | Land at Patrixbourne Road, Bridge |
| SHLAA222 | Land at Moat Lane, Rough Common |
| SHLAA223 | Riverside Youth Centre, Kingsmead, Canterbury |
| SHLAA224 | Vulcan Close, Whitstable |
| SHLAA225 | Longfield Close, Swalecliffe |
| SHLAA226 | Land at Bakers Lane, Chartham |
| SHLAA227 | Joseph Wilson Industrial Estate |
| CHI A A 220 | Harris Brancha Carta harr |

Howe Barracks, Canterbury

Land at Bekesbourne Lane, Littlebourne

Land at Stonebridge Road, Kingsmead, Canterbury

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/212: Land at Bushy Close Wood, Westbere

| Susta | ainability Objectives and line Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| 1. Ec empl | onomy and Employment To ach oyment opportunities to everyo | nieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| (| Canterbury district were economically active (2011) | 1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy? | uncertain |
| • 77 () | | 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 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. |
| f v t r | n 2011 median gross weekly earnings or employees in Canterbury District vas almost £361.00, which is lower han 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: Assessed units.Take account of existing uses and I | on a potential development of 225 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? | 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 im | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | 's |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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: | |
| . 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 | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m walkin distant of a convenience store, G and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyon 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 but 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 oth local services. Sites beyond 800 walking distance of these service 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 not within 800m walking distance of a coor GP. [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | nvenience store, primary school |

| 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 asse | ets (including built and historic) | or both people and whalle 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 | |
| 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* | 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] | |
| 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? | 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? | Minor Negative [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: The site is within 1km of the Stodmarsh Marshes. It is also known to contains a number of saxon burials - archaeological survey would be required. | | |
| | | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|
| 6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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). 15 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? | Significant 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 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? 6.5 Will it avoid damage to and protect geologically | Not applicable No Impact |
| | important sites? | [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 Marshes, which are designated as SSSI, | within 250m of the Stodmarsh RAMSAR, SPA and SCA. |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C | 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 '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 itself. 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. | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain Uncertain Uncertain 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 within a flood risk area. |
| 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental 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 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 itself. | 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? Discussion and Assumptions: | Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3] Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|---|--|
| 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] |
| 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? | 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. Score loss of employment land as a negative score] |
| Some schools such as Herne Bay high school over subscribed and others 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%). | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? Discussion and Assumptions: Assessed units based on 30 dwellings per hectare. walking distance of a convenience store, | The site is not within 800m |
| 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 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 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 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: The site is centre. | further than 5km from a town | |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | inability To encourage sustainable design ar | nd practice | |
| Material assets, Landscape, Cultural leritage | 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 | sing available and affordable to everyone | | |
| | oning aranabic and antorabbic to over joine | | |
| Canterbury had a population of | 12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable | Significant Positive Impact | |
| | | [All sites of 15 units or over or ½ | |
| 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 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 | |
| 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] Significant Positive Impact | |
| 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino 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 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] Significant Positive Impact [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] Significant Positive Impact [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 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] Significant Positive Impact [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? | [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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable | |
| 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] Significant Positive Impact [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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 | 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 | 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 | Significant Negative Impact | |
| | 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? | 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? | Significant Negative Impact [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: The site halland. | as been assessed as greenfield | |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure th existing resources | e 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 | Uncertain | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | |
|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | efficiency in water use? | | |
| | | 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 | |
| • | 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. | | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/213: Land at Folly Farm, Canterbury

| Sus | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | | | |
|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. E emp | 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 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: Assessed on a development proposal for 15 units. Take account of existing uses and loss of employment | | |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | 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 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: | | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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 east of the site, which appears to feed in | a minor drainage channel to the far to the River Stour. |
| 4. Transport Reduce road traffic and | l its impacts, promoting more sustainable | |
| 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 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 is a well services bus route and a convenience of are slighly further. [Make a particular reference to any particulation as bus links.] | ence store. A primary school and |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|---|
| 5. C | ountryside and Historic Environ | ment To protect and improve landscapes f | or both people and wildlife and to |
| pro | tect and maintain vulnerable ass The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO | ets (including built and historic) 5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and open space? | Uncertain |
| • | listed buildings, 798 locally important buildings, 94 conservation areas, 53 Scheduled Ancient Monuments and 2 historic parks or gardens in the Canterbury district. | 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 Negative [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? | 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? | 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 Landscape Value (AHLV). The scheme pr as part of the proposals. Folly Farmhouse building. | ovides a couple of playing pitches |

| 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 to 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? 6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or restoration and link existing habitats as | 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'] |
| | creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process? | [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 this is on the opposite side of the railway | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air G quality and promote energy efficience | 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? | 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 |
| 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 | 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? | Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless |
| 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). | | 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: | |
| 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 Tourishers to the public well-being, | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e | erosion 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 coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| ĺ | Coastal elosion: | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 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] |
| 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 currently undersubscribed. | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? | Uncertain |
| 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.)? | No 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] |
| 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: Assessed units. The site is only within 800m walkin store. A primary school and GP are sligh | g distance of a convenience |
| 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? | 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: The site is has been assessed as urban fringe. | just outside the urban area and |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | inability 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 |
| | | |
| Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | 10 1 Mills | |
| 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] |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| 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? | [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: 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 mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 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 | |
| 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 | 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 | Minor Negative | |
| | 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: The site has been assessed as greenfield land. | | |
| | e 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 | |
| | 15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase | Uncertain | |
| | • | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | efficiency in water use? | |
| | 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: The site is | greenfield agricultural land. |
| 6. Waste To reduce generation ar | nd disposal of waste, and achieve sustainabl | e management of waste |
| In 2009/10 Canterbury produced 61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste. | 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: | 1 |
| KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~~ | | 1 |
|-------|-----------------------------|-----|------|----------|------|
| ()) | \prime \vdash \bowtie | ΔII | (-() | 11/11/11 | NTS. |
| | | | | | |

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/214: Durite Manufacturing Plant, Fordwich

| Sustainability Objectives Baseline Information | and | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Economy and Employremployment opportunities | Economy and Employment To achieve a strong and stable economy which offers rewarding and well located employment opportunities to everyone | | | | | | |
| The economic performance Canterbury is below the Er Wales average and notable | ngland and | 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) 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). | g age within conomically st employer public sector yers | 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 wee for employees in Canterbu was almost £361.00, which than average county, regionational levels (£382.10, £405.70 respectively) | kly earnings ry District n is lower nal and | 1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District? | Minor Negative [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 Negative [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: Assessed 18 units. The development proposal work employment site. Take account of existing the state of the | uld result in the loss of an |
| . Rural/Coastal Communities To | sustain vibrant rural and coastal communiti | 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 rural/coastal businesses? | Minor Negative [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: The deve positive impact on rural housing and se employment site. | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | ers |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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 |

| 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: The site is | s within 10m of a lake. |
| 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 | 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 is of a well serviced bus route, convenience [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.] | e store, primary school or GP. |

| Sus | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-------------|--|---|---|
| | | | |
| 5. (pro | Countryside and Historic Environ tect and maintain vulnerable ass | 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 |
| • | 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. | 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 |
| | Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* | | 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 Negative [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? | 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? | Minor Negative [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: The site is the site is considered brownfield, it has a Stodmarsh SSSI. A housing development than its current industrial use. Roman are recorded in the adjacent area. | n important location within the tould become more prominent |

| 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 | d damage to geological sites and improve 6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats? | Significant 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 |
| Woods and Stodmarsh). 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) | | 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 |
| 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 'minor negative']. |
| | 6.2 Will it minimise habitat fragmentation? | Significant 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 | Uncertain |
| | creation or restoration and link existing habitats as part of the development process? | [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 | 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 is SCA and SPA and will be extremely sens | s situated in a SSSI, RAMSAR, itive regarding biodiversity. | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Q quality and promote energy efficience | tuality To reduce the causes and impacts or | 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? | Significant Negative 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 | |
| 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). | 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 within a flood Risk Zone 3. | |
| 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 To 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? | Significant Negative Impact [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 | |
| at risk of flooding particularly areas 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 | |
| | | | |
| section which runs through Canterbury itself. | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|---|--|
| 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] |
| 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? | Minor Negative [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. 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 | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? Discussion and Assumptions: Assessed 18 units. However, the development prop | |
| 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%). 10. Sustainable Living and Revitalise | employment site. ation To revitalise town and rural centres a | |
| The closest A&E services are in | 10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and | Uncertain |
| 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. | physical assets? 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: The site hat town. | as been assessed as being out of |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | inability To encourage sustainable design ar | nd practice |
| Material assets, Landscape, Cultural leritage | 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: | |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | aing available and affordable to averyone | |
| Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing 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 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in |
| 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 units or over in rural areas score as |
| 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 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 |
| 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] |
| 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 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 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? | [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 |
| 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 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 |

| 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 |
| 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 | Minor Positive |
| | 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 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 | 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: The site is | brownfield land. |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 |
| | | |

| | stainability Objectives and seline 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. | 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. | | |

| OVERALL | COMMENTS. |
|---------|-----------|
|---------|-----------|

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/215: Lucketts Farm, Blean

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every | 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) 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). | 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 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: Assessed units. Take account of existing uses and | on a development proposal for 6 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | 'S |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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 the Sarre Penn River. | | |
| 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 on the city) | 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: The site is within 800m walking distance of a well serviced bus route, a convenience store, primary school and GP. It should be noted that there is no footpath on the left hand side. [Make a particular reference to any particular known transport improvements, such as bus links.] | | |

| 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. 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 | 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] | |
| 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? | Minor Negative [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 situated within an AHLV. It is also adjacent to a Conservation Area and an Scheduled Ancient monument. An archaeological survey would be required. | | |
| | | | |

| Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Geology and Biodiversity To avo | id damage to geological sites and improve | 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). 15 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? | Significant 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? | 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 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|---|---|
| | | negative where feature is designated] |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is Scientific Interest, International Wildlife S a Local Wildlife Site. | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Q 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 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 | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain Uncertain Uncertain 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] |
| 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 To | 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 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 | 8.1 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] |
| | 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 |
|--|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | | |
| 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 currently undersubscribed. | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? | Uncertain |
| 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 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: The site is from a convenience store, primary school | s within 800m walking distance ol and GP. |
| 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 | 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: | |
| 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 |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing 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 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] |
| 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 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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 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 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 score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 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] 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 |

| 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| | 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: The site is land. | assessed as being greenfield |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 | Uncertain |
| | • | |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/216: Land at Chartham Mill, Chartham

| Sustainability Ol Baseline Informa | bjectives and ation | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|---|
| 1. Economy and employment opp | Employment To ach portunities to everyo | nieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| Canterbury is be | Canterbury is below the England and Wales average and notably below the South East. 73.9% of people of working age within 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 Canterbury distractive (2011) Service sector is in Canterbury (8 and tourism relacontributing the | | 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 100 units score as no impact, 100 - 400 minor positive, >400 significant positive. |
| for employees in was almost £36 than average con national levels (| | 1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District? | Minor Negative [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 Negative [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: Assessed 115-133 units. If developed for housing irural employment site. It is suggested th operations could be moved onto another existing uses and loss of employment | t would result in the loss of a large at some of the buildings / |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | ustain 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 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: If develop the loss of a large rural employment site some of the buildings / operations could | ed for housing it would result in ; although it is suggested that |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and imp | prove the quality of inland and coastal wate | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality? | 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 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| | 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 |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | within 10m of the River Stour. |
| 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 | 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? Discussion and Assumptions: The site is a well services bus route, a convenience is slightly further. [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | store and a GP. A primary school |

| 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 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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 Positive 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? | 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 is scheme proposes to refurbish the mill wo listed. However, the wider development p setting. | orkers cottages, which are locally |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------|---|--|---|
| 6. (| Geology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | biodiversity |
| | | | - |
| • | Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit | 6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats? | Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised |
| • | Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). | | biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant |
| • | Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). | | impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant |
| • | Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh). | | impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, |
| • | 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). | | score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be |
| • | 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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: The River through the site is designated as a Local | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Q 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? | Significant Negative 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 |
| 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). | 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. • Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. | Discussion and Assumptions: Small part Risk Zones 2 & 3. The majority of the site flooding. | s of the site are covered by Flood is not considered at risk of |
| , | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e | rosion which would be |
| detrimental to the public well-being, | the economy and the environment | |
| 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? | Significant Negative Impact [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 |

| 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: | |
| 9. Access to Services Share acceveryone | cess to services and benefits of prosperity fa | irly and improve wellbeing of |
| Seasalter, Greenhill and Eddington Gorrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton a Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England | nd 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 referr units and two special schools | al | warar organicant ii ono y 100 ariik |
| 5,665 secondary places for years 7 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 2017 Canterbury is a net importer of | 9.2 Will it increase economic activity? | Minor Negative [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] |
| secondary students (from neighbou districts). Some schools such as Herne Bay I school over subscribed and others | | Uncertain |
| currently undersubscribed. Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet. Canterbury Christ Church Universit main campus is based in Canterbur in addition the University of Kent ar 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.)? y ry, nd | Minor Positive [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 thar the South East (33.9%) and Great Britain as a whole (31.3%). percentage of the population with n qualifications at all is 7.2% of the working age population which is lot than as the South East (8.5%) and Great Britain as a whole (11.3%). | the loss of a large rural employment sit some of the buildings / operations cou The site is within 800m walking distant convenience store and GP. A primary s | te; although it is suggested that Id be moved onto another local site se of a well serviced bus route, a |
| 10. Sustainable Living and Revi | talisation To revitalise town and rural centres | s 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 | 10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres? | Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within town centre |
| Estuary View Medical Centre in Seasalter, Whitstable. | | 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 |

| 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 fu centre but is in a rural local centre. | irther than 5km form a town |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | nability 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 hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| Canterbury had a population of | 12.1 Will it encourage more access to affordable | Significant Positive Impact |
| | | 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] |
| 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 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 |
| 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] |
| 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] Significant Positive Impact [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] Significant Positive Impact [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 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] Significant Positive Impact [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 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable |

| Su: Ba | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|---|--|
| 13. | Quality of Life To improve the qu | ality 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). The 2001 census data reports that of | 13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity? | Uncertain |
| • | 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 | , Material Assets, Landscape | 14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)? | Significant Positive 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? | Significant Positive Impact [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: The site is land. | assessed as being brownfield |
| | Natural Resources To ensure the sting resources | e prudent use of natural resources and the | sustainable management of |
| | erial 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 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, 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. | | |

| OVERALL C | OMMENTS. |
|-----------|----------|
|-----------|----------|

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/217: Land at Blean Common, Blean

| Sustainability Objective Baseline Information | es and | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employment opportunit | yment To ach ties to everyo | ieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| The economic performar Canterbury is below the I Wales average and notal | England and | 1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy? | uncertain |
| South East. 73.9% of people of working Canterbury district were active (2011) Service sector is the large in Canterbury (88%) with and tourism related empleontributing the greatest | South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 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 we for employees in Canterb was almost £361.00, whi than average county, regnational levels (£382.10, | | 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: Assessed 65 units. Take account of existing uses a | on development proposals for 45- nd 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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 |

| Su: Ba | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| | 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 | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Minor Positive [Sites located within 800m walking distant of a convenience store, Gi and primary school to score significant positive. If site is within 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyon 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 buroute 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 othelocal 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? Discussion and Assumptions: The site i | Uncertain |
| | | a well serviced bus route, a convenience is slightly further. [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.] | e store and a GP. A primary schoo |

| 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 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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 Negative [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? | 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: The site is archaeological survey would be required | |
| | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|
| 6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoi | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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). Ts 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? | Significant 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? | 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: he site is v Scientific Interest, International Wildlife S | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 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. | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain Uncertain Uncertain 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 within a flood risk area. |
| 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental 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 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 itself. | 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? Discussion and Assumptions: | Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3] Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 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] |
| 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 currently undersubscribed. | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? | Uncertain |
| 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 | 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? Discussion and Assumptions: Assessed | Minor Positive [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] on a development proposals of |
| 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%). | 45-65 units. The site is within 800m walki route, a convenience store and GP. A pri | ng distance of a well serviced bus mary school is slightly further. |
| 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? | 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: | |
| 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 |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing 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 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] |
| 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 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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 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 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 score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 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] 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 |

| 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 |
| 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 |
| | 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: The site is land | assessed as being greenfield |
| | 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 | Uncertain |
| | imported? | Uncertain |
| | | Uncertain |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/218: Great Bossingham Farm, Bossingham

| Sustainab Baseline | oility Objectives and Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1. Econor employme | ny and Employment To ach ent opportunities to everyo | nieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| Canter | onomic performance of bury is below the England and average and notably below the | 1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy? | uncertain |
| South I 73.9% Canter active (Service in Cant and tou contrib | Wales average and notably below the South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 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. |
| for emp was alr than av nationa | I median gross weekly earnings bloyees in Canterbury District most £361.00, which is lower verage county, regional and al levels (£382.10, £422.00 and 0 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: Tak loss of employment | e account of existing uses and |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | ustain vibrant rural and coastal communiti | 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 rural/coastal businesses? | No 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? | No 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? | 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and imp | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | ers |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 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: | |
| 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 | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | No 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? | No 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 such as bus links.] | ar known transport improvements, |

| Sustainability Objectives and | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|---|
| Baseline Information | Ney questions/guidance | Sustamability 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| Council's 2010 Heritage at Risk Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* | | 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? | No 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? | 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: | |
| | | |

| Su Ba | stainability Objectives and seline 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). 15 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? | 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? 6.3 Will it provide opportunities for new habitat | 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? | No Impact [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 designated] |

| Sus Bas | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| (| Climate Change, Energy and Air Gality and promote energy efficience | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts | of climate change, improve air |
| ae | 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 |
| | 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. | 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? | No Impact [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 scoas positive] |
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| | Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. | | |
| Fet | Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion Trimental to the public well-being, | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment | erosion 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? | No Impact [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area whe 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: | • |
| | Access to Services Share access | to services and benefits of prosperity fairl | y and improve wellbeing of |
| | <u> </u> | 9.1 Will it improve social and environmental | No Impact |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance Sustainability Impacts | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| • | Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools | | 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 | 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] |
| • | districts). 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 | 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? | No Impact [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] |
| • | 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: | |
| • | 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? | No 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? | No 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] |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| | 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 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: | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing 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? | 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] |
| | 12.2 Will it encourage access to decent housing? | No 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: | |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the | quality 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 th police for violence against a person | 13.2 Will it reduce the fear of crime? | Uncertain |
| was 1,572. For robbery offences and | 13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health | Uncertain |
| theft of a motor vehicle, the number recorded was 92 and 165 respectively | impacts in key vulnerable groups? | - Cricortain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 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 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)? | No 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? | No 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? | No Impact [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? | No 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 un score as a minor positive in Large urban sites (> 400 ur score as significant positive impact. All other sites score impact] | | | |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | | | |
| 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 | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | | | | | |
| 16. Waste To reduce generation and disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable management of waste | | | | | | |
| In 2009/10 Canterbury produced 61,726 tonnes of municipal waste and 55,834 of household waste. | 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: | | | | | |
| KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | | | | | |

| O | VER | ALL | COM | MEN. | TS. |
|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| | | | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/219: Gowan, Stodmarsh Road

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | d Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | vitality and adaptability of the local cooliding. | uncertain | | | | | |
| South East. 73.9% of people of working age Canterbury district were econo active (2011) Service sector is the largest en in Canterbury (88%) with public and tourism related employers contributing the greatest propo jobs (40.3% and 8.9% respecti | 1.2 Will it encourage investment in businesses, people and infrastructure for the long term? ployer a sector | 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) | arnings strict pwer and 1.3 Will it increase the number of businesses in the District? | [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 loca 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 Negative [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: Assessed is unlikely to exceed 5 units. Take accourt employment | |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | ustain 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 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? | 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: | |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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: | |
| 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 | 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 is of a well serviced bus route, convenience [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.] | e store, primary school or GP. |

| 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 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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 Negative [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 Landscape Value. | adjacent to an Area of High |
| | | |

| Sus Bas | tainability Objectives and eline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| 6. G | eology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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). | 6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats? | Significant 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 |
| | Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). Two National Nature Reserves (Blean | | proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant impact/minor negative impact. If |
| • | Woods and Stodmarsh). 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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 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 |
| | | 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 200m of a Local Wildlife Site. The ground wooded and likely to be sensitive in rega | ls of the house are heavily |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C | 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 '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 itself. 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. | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain Uncertain Uncertain 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] |
| 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 To detrimental 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? | No Impact [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: | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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 | | |
| 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.)? | No 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 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: | |
| 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 | 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 |
| | 10.3 Will location encourage increased use of shops or services within town centre? | 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: | |
| 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 |
| | | |
| 12 Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing available and affordable to everyone 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 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] |
| 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 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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] 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 |

| 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 | 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 | 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 | Minor Negative |
| | 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: Site asses | sed as being greenfield land. |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 |

| | stainability Objectives and seline 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. | 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. | | |

| OVERALL | COMMENTS. |
|---------|-----------|
|---------|-----------|

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/220: K&C Hospital, Ridlands Farm and Langton Fields, Canterbury

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|---|
| Economy and Employment To acemployment opportunities to everyone. | hieve 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 |
| South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 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. |
| 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 Negative [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: Proposal value hospital as an employment site; however replaced elsewhere as part of another scuses and loss of employment | it is envisaged that this would be |
| 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 | Uncertain |
| | 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 | Uncertain |
| | 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? | Uncertain [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 of | n the urban fringe of Canterbury. |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and imp | rove the quality of inland and coastal water | 'S |
| North Kent and Swale CAMS area is | 3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground | Minor Negative |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | and/or surface water quality? | [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 |

| Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|
| 3.3 Will it protect and improve ground and surface water quality? | Uncertain |
| Discussion and Assumptions: There is a outside the south-east boundary. | small pond approximately 10-25 |
| d its impacts, promoting more sustainable 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Significant Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m walkin |
| | distant of a convenience store, G and primary school to score significant positive. If site is withi 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyon 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 Negative Impact [Sites located within 800m of a but 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 oth local services. Sites beyond 800 walking distance of these service 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: Within 800 is a 'special' and a 'private' school but or have been counted. [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | nly state owned primary schools |
| | water quality? Discussion and Assumptions: There is a outside the south-east boundary. dits impacts, promoting more sustainable 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? 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 reduce the need to travel? Discussion and Assumptions: Within 80 is a 'special' and a 'private' school but or have been counted. [Make a particular reference to any particular referen |

| 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 |
| The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO | 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* | 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 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? | 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? | 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: A third of land i.e. hospital site. Adjacent to and parpart within the Old Dover Road Conserva allocated in the Local Plan (2006) for pubscheme would replaced this on neighbour and potential for pre-historic finds. | rt within an AHLV. Adjacent to and tion Area. Part of the site is lic playing fields; however any |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------|---|--|---|
| 6. 0 | Geology and Biodiversity To avoi | d damage to geological sites and improve | biodiversity |
| | | 6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species | - |
| • | Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit | and habitats? | Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes /or is adjacent to recognised |
| • | Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). | | biodiversity features. Impacts will be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation proposed, score as significant |
| • | Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). | | impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant |
| • | Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh). | | impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, |
| • | 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). | | score minor negative. If it is advised that there is 'likely' to be |
| • | 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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 |
| | | 6.3 Will it provide apportunities for now habitet | 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] |

| Sus | stainability Objectives and seline 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: | |
| 7. C | Climate Change, Energy and Air Cality and promote energy efficience | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of | of climate change, improve air |
| • | | 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 |
| • | 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). | 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? | Minor Positive [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: | |
| • | Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. | | |
| 8. F | lood Risk and Coastal Erosion Trimental 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 |

| Sustai Baseli | inability Objectives and ine Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|---|--|---|
| its | elf. | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| 9. Acc every | | to services and benefits of prosperity fairl | y and improve wellbeing of |
| Go W | easalter, Greenhill and Eddington, orrell, Heron, Northgate, Barton and incheap have LSOAS in the 20% ost deprived in England | 9.1 Will it improve social and environmental conditions in the most deprived areas? | Significant Positive Impact [No impact unless proposed site located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units |
| se un | 7 primary schools, seventeen econdary schools, two pupil referral nits and two special schools | | ward. Significant if Site > 100 units |
| wi | 665 secondary places for years 7-11 Il be required by 2012 and 5,078 | 9.2 Will it increase economic activity? | Significant Negative Impact |
| su sc Th rei ye 20 • Ca se | aces by 20 17, allowing for 5% urplus capacity within secondary whools over the district as a whole. Here is suggest a need to move 275 secondary places for ears 7-11 by 2012 and 862 places by 2017 anterbury is a net importer of econdary students (from neighbouring | | [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] |
| • Sc | stricts). Difference by the stricts of the strict of the stricts | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? | Uncertain |
| | rrently undersubscribed. pproximately 700 pupils attend | 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, | No Impact |
| • Ca ma in the | 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. | culture, health, education, open space etc.)? | [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] |
| le\ the | 5.6% of the population have NVQ vel 4 or above. This is lower than for e South East (33.9%) and Great ritain as a whole (31.3%). | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is and Wincheap Ward. | on the boundary of Barton Ward |
| pequwothat | ercentage of the population with no lalifications at all is 7.2% of the brking age population which is lower an as the South East (8.5%) and reat Britain as a whole (11.3%). | | |
| 10. Su | stainable Living and Revitalisa | ation To revitalise town and rural centres a | and to promote sustainable living |
| | ne closest A&E services are in argate and Ashford. Kent and | 10.1 Will it improve townscapes/rural centres and physical assets? | Uncertain |
| | anterbury Hospital does not have cident and Emergency services. | 10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town centres? | Significant Negative Impact |
| • Ne | ewly opened minor injury unit at stuary View Medical Centre in easalter, Whitstable. | | [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 Sustai | nability 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 hous | sing 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 |
| | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the qu | ality 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 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: | |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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, 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. | | |

| OVERALL (| COMMENTS. |
|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-----------|

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/221: Land at Patrixbourne Road, Bridge

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every | 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) 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). | 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? | 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: Assessed dwellings. Take account of existing uses | |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To st | 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? | 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: The site harural location. | as been assessed as being in a |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and imp | rove 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality? | 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 the Nailbourne River. | |
| 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 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 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 well serviced bus route, a convenience [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | e store, primary school and a GP. |

| 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 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 |
| 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? | 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 Natural Beauty and an Area of High Land | |
| | | |

| Su Ba | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|----------|---|--|---|
| | | | |
| 6. | Geology and Biodiversity To avoi | d damage to geological sites and improve | biodiversity |
| • | Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long Rock at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; Coopers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit | 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 |
| • | Three Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts and Sandwich Bay, The Swale and Stodmarsh), all of which are also Special Protection Areas (S PA). | | be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation |
| • | Two Special Areas for Conservation (SAC) (Blean Complex and Stodmarsh). | | proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant |
| | Two National Nature Reserves (Blean Woods and Stodmarsh). 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). | | impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is |
| • | 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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: There is a on the periphery of the site. The wooded Nailbourne River may be sensitive in reg | area to the north of the site and |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C | 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 'managed realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? | Significant Negative Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain |
| at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the | , , | Uncertain |
| 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). 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] |
| 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 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? | Significant Negative Impact [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: | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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 | | |
| 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.)? | 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 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: | |
| 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 | 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 |
| Seasalter, Whitstable. | | 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: | |
| 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 |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | sing available and anordable to everyone | |
| Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) | 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 uni 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 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 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 minopositive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 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 |
| 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: 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.] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 | 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 | 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 |
| | 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: The site halland. | as been assessed as greenfield |
| | e 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 |
| | 15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase | Uncertain |
| | <u> </u> | 1 |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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 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: | |
| • | KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

Discussion and Assumptions:

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/222: Land at Moat Lane, Rough Common

| 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) 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). | 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? | 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: The site I development proposal for 80 units. Take of employment | |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | ustain vibrant rural and coastal communiti | 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 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: The site I rural location. | nas been assessed as being in a |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | ers |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 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 |

| 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: | |
| 4. Transport Reduce road traffic and | l its impacts, promoting more sustainable | modes of transport |
| Highway network is under acute | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Minor Positive |
| 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) | | [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? | 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 othel 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 well serviced bus route, a convenience [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.] | store and primary school. |

| 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 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 |
| 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? | 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 and an Area of High Landscape Value. The on either side of the site. | within a designated green gap nere are two Conservation Areas |
| | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|--|
| 6. 0 | Geology and Biodiversity To avoi | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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). 15 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? | 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? | 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 within 250m of an International Wildlife Site and Local Wildlife Site. | | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air C quality and promote energy efficience | 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 '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 itself. 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. | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? 7.2 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy generated from renewable sources? Discussion and Assumptions: The site in | No Impact [Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone 3] Uncertain Uncertain Uncertain 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] Inot in a flood risk area. | |
| 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental 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 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 | 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? 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when 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? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and | Not applicable Uncertain | |
| | coastal erosion? Discussion and Assumptions: | Chocitain | |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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 | | |
| 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.)? | Minor Positive [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: | |
| 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: | |
| 11. High Quality Design and Sustair | nability 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 hous | ing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | | |
| 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) | 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] |
| 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 | 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| 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: The site 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 As been assessed as being in a |
| 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | 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: The site harural location. | [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 as been assessed as being in a |

| Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|
| 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 |
| Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| tainable use of land in more sustainable lo | cation patterns |
| 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: The site has greenfield land. | as been assessed as being |
| | |
| prudent use of natural resources and the | sustainable management of |
| prudent use of natural resources and the 15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials? | sustainable management of Uncertain |
| | |
| 15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources?15.3 Will it reduce minerals extracted and | Uncertain |
| 15.1 Will it minimise the demand for raw materials?15.2 Will it promote the use of local resources? | Uncertain Uncertain |
| | 13.3 Will it reduce death rates and negative health impacts in key vulnerable groups? 13.4 Will it promote healthy lifestyles? 13.5 Will it improve peoples' perception of their local area being a place where people from different ethnic backgrounds get on well together? 13.6 Will it promote sport and physical activity? Discussion and Assumptions: tainable use of land in more sustainable loud 14.1 Will it promote the wise use of land (minimise development on greenfield land)? 14.2 Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land? 14.3 Will it reduce land contamination? 14.4 Will it promote the use of previously developed land? 14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance? |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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. | | |

| | | | L CC | | |
|--------------|------|--------|----------|--------|-----|
| \mathbf{U} | v Ln | \sim | $ \circ$ | JIVIIV | 10. |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/223: Riverside Youth Centre, Kingsmead Road, Canterbury

| 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 |
| South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 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? | 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: Assessed 15-20 units. Take account of existing uses | |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To | sustain vibrant rural and coastal communitie | as . |
| 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 havider urban area. | as been assessed as being in a |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and in | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme lo flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns | | 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 i | s within 10m of the River Stour. |
| 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 | 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 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 othe 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 well serviced bus route, a convenience [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.] | e store, primary school and GP. |

| Su | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-------------|---|--|---|
| | | | |
| 5. 0 pro | Countryside and Historic Environ tect 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 |
| • | 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 | 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 |
| | 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled monuments at risk from a total of 53 | 5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure | negative] Minor Positive |
| • | (9.4%). In addition, there are a further 32 gardens on the Kent Gardens Trust/Kent County Council | throughout the district? | [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? | 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? | 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? | 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: If develope multi-sports pitch. | ed, it would result in the loss of |
| | | | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| 6. Geology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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) Ag 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 is also designated as a Local Wildlife Site | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Cquality and promote energy efficience | 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? | Minor Negative [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). 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] sin a Flood Risk 2 area. |
| 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T detrimental 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 Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been | 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? | Minor Negative [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 | 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| section which runs through Canterbury itself. | 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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] |
| units and two special schools 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.)? | 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 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: | |
| 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 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: The site having wider urban area. | as been assessed as being a |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | inability To encourage sustainable design ar | nd practice |
| Material assets, Landscape, Cultural leritage | 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 | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | | |
| | | Minor Positive |
| | 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] |
| 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 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 mino 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 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 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 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 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 |
| 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 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 mino positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 |
| 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: The site haland. | as been assessed as brownfield |
| | e 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 |
| | 15.5 Will it minimise the use of water and increase | Uncertain |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/224: Vulcan Close, Whitstable

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employment To aclemployment opportunities to everyone | nieve a strong and stable economy which cone | 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) 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). | 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? | 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: Assessed 30-40 units. Take account of existing uses | |
| 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 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: The site havider urban area. | as been assesssed as being in a |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and in | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme lo flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns | | 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: | |
| 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 | 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 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 well serviced bus stop, a convenience [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | store, primary school and GP. |

| 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 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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? | 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? | 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? | 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 | adjacent to a conservation area. |
| | | |
| | | |

| Su | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| 6. 0 | Geology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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 Sandvich Roy, The Studie and | 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 |
| | 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 | | 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. |
| • | Woods and Stodmarsh). 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). | | impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is |
| • | 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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 designated] |

| ustainability Objectives and aseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|
| | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is an International Wildlife Site. | s approximately 500m to SSSI and |
| Climate Change, Energy and Air ality and promote energy efficier | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts | 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 |
| 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). Includes the main road around | 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 scor as positive] |
| 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 | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | s not within flood risk area. |
| Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion strimental 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 Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed' | To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal of 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 flood zone 3] |
| realignment' strategy has been recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are | 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the | 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| | | |
| around the River Stour, including the | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and | Uncertain |
| around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|---|--|
| | Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England | | located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units] |
| • | 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools | | |
| • | 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 | 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] |
| • | secondary students (from neighbouring districts). Some schools such as Herne Bay high | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for | Uncertain |
| | school over subscribed and others currently undersubscribed. | raising employment potential? 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to | Significant Positive Impact |
| • | Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet. | opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? | [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school, |
| • | 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. | | 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: | |
| • | 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 | 10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town | Minor Positive |

| 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 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 negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre] |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|---|
| | 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 Susta | nability 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: | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing 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? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create | score as significant positive] |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty | score as significant positive] Uncertain |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes? | Score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable |
| | 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 | Score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the | 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? | Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the of some state of the state | 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: | Score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | Score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| For 2010/11, the number of notifiable offences in Canterbury recorded by the | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain Incertain Uncertain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|---|
| 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 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)? | 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: The site had brownfield land. | as been assessed as being |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 | Not applicable |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | the character of the countryside? | |
| | | 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: | 1 |
| • | KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | |

| OVERALL C | COMMENTS. |
|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-----------|

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/225: Longfield Close, Swalecliffe, Whitstable

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every | 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) 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). | 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? | 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: Assessed 10-12 units. Take account of existing uses | on a development proposal for s 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? | 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | prove the quality of inland and coastal water | 's |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 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: | |
| 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 | 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 well serviced bus route, a convenience slightly further. [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | e store and GP. A primary school is |

| 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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? | 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: | 1 |
| | | |
| | | |

| Su | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|------|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| 6. 0 | Geology and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | 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 | 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 |
| | 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 | | 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? | 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 negative where feature is designated] |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|----|---|---|--|
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| Uá | Climate Change, Energy and Air Cality and promote energy efficience | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts | 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 |
| | 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). | 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 scoas 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 | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | s not in a flood risk area. |
| et | domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion T trimental 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 Reculver and Minnis Bay a 'managed realignment' strategy has been | 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 whe 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 | 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| | section which runs through Canterbury | | The state of the s |
| | | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | section which runs through Canterbury | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and | Uncertain |
| | section which runs through Canterbury itself. | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|---|--|
| | Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England | | located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units] |
| • | 37 primary schools, seventeen secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools | | |
| • | 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 | 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] |
| • | districts). Some schools such as Herne Bay high | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? | Uncertain |
| | school over subscribed and others currently undersubscribed. | 9.4 Will it help to provide more equal access to | Minor Positive |
| • | Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet. | opportunities, services and facilities (e.g. sport, culture, health, education, open space etc.)? | [Score significant positive if proposed site is within 800m walking distance of primary school |
| • | 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. | | convenience store and 60 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: | |
| • | 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 | 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 |
| • | Newly opened minor injury unit at Estuary View Medical Centre in | Control: | [Sites located within town centre will score significantly positive. |

| • | 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. | | [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 negative. Significant when site > 400 units or when distance >5km from town centre] |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| | 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 Susta | nability 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: | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing 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? | 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] |
| | 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? | positive. Sites above 100 units |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable |
| | 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 | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the | 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? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the of the control of the c | 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: | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| For 2010/11, the number of notifiable offences in Canterbury recorded by the | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain the District Uncertain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|---|
| 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). | 13.5 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: | |
| 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)? | 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: The site has been assessed as brownfield land. | |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the | ne 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 |
| | 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 | Not applicable |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | | the character of the countryside? | | |
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | | |
| 16. | 16. Waste To reduce generation and disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable 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 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: | | |
| • | KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | | |

| OVERALL (| COMMENTS. |
|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-----------|

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/226: Land at Bakers Lane, Chartham

| Sustainability Obje Baseline Information | ectives and on | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Economy and Er employment oppor | mployment To ach rtunities to everyo | nieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| Canterbury is below | Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 1.1 Will it improve efficiency, competitiveness, vitality and adaptability of the local economy? | uncertain |
| South East. 73.9% of people of Canterbury district active (2011) Service sector is the in Canterbury (88% and tourism related contributing the great sector is the contribution of the contributi | | 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 groups for employees in C was almost £361.0 than average counnational levels (£38). | | 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: Assessed units. Take account of existing uses and | |
| 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 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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: | |
| 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 | 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 well serviced bus route, train station, a school. A GP is slightly further but is wit [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | a convenience store and primary thin the village. |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|---|
| 5. Countryside and Historic Environr | ment To protect and improve landscapes fo | or both people and wildlife and to |
| protect and maintain vulnerable asse | 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 |
| 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? | 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? | 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 AHLV to the south of the village. The site 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 | 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) Ag 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: | |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality and promote energy efficience | uality 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 |
| 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 |
| 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] not within 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 To detrimental to the public well-being, | 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 coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | 1 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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 | | |
| 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.)? | Minor Positive [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: | |
| 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? | 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 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: The site is centre. | further than 5km from a town |
| 11. High Quality Design and Susta | inability 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 |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| 12 Housing Lo make suitable bou | | |
| | | |
| Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing 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 units or over in rural areas score as minor positive. All sites in rural/coastal locations less than |
| 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 units or over in rural areas score as |
| 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 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 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? Discussion and Assumptions: | [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 |

| 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 |
| 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: The site has greenfield land. | as been assessed as being |
| 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 |
| | materials and promote recycling: | |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|--|--|------------------------|
| | | efficiency in water use? | |
| | | 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. | | |

| _ | /EB | | ~ | | | |
|-------|-----|-----|---|------|--------|--|
| ()) | /ER | ΔII | | эклк | ı – Nı | |
| | | | | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/227: Joseph Wilson Industrial Estate

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employment To ac employment opportunities to every | hieve a strong and stable economy which cone | 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) 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). | 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. |
| 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: Assessed 7,500m2 of employment / business space uses and loss of employment | as a development proposal for e only.Take account of existing |
| 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? | 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? | 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | | 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: | |
| 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 | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Uncertain [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? | Uncertain [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: Assessed 7,500m2 of employment / business spac distance of a well serviced bus route and [Make a particular reference to any particular such as bus links.] | e only. Within 800m walking d supermarket. |

| Su Ba | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| 5. (pro | Countryside and Historic Environ otect and maintain vulnerable ass | ment To protect and improve landscapes f 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 |
| • | 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. | 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] |
| | 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* listed buildings. There are 5 scheduled | 5.3 Will it protect and enhance Green Infrastructure | Minor Negative |
| • | 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 | throughout the district? | [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? | Minor Negative [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: The site is archaeological finds have been recorded | |
| | | | |

| Sustaina Baseline | bility Objectives and Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | |
| 6. Geolog | gy and Biodiversity To avoid | d damage to geological sites and improve | biodiversity |
| (RIGS Rock | nally Important Geological Site i) includes; Chislet Colliery; Long at Tankerton; Brambling Quarry; ers Pit; and Chartham Hatch Pit | 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 |
| and S Stodm | Ramsar sites (Thanet Coasts andwich Bay, The Swale and narsh), all of which are also al Protection Areas (S PA). | | be significantly negative where habitat or species has a national designation. If habitat improvements or mitigation |
| (SAC) Stodm | Special Areas for Conservation (Blean Complex and narsh). | | proposed, score as significant impact/minor impact. If site is within 250m of nationally designated site score as significant |
| Wood | lational Nature Reserves (Blean s and Stodmarsh). es of Special Scientific Interest | | impact/minor negative impact. If proposed site includes or is adjacent to local designated sites, score minor negative. If it is |
| • 10 Loc | cal Nature Reserves (LNR) cal Wildlife Sites | | 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? | 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 |

| Discussion and Assumptions: Discussion and Assumptions: Discusion and Discussion and | | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of climate change, improve air quality and promote energy efficiency Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Carterbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose Hold the Line for most coastine. EA propose Hold the Line for most coastine. EA propose Hold the Line for most coastine flooding and drought years as a court of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Carterbury itself. 7.3 Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas emissions? 7.3 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.4 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.7 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.8 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy 7.7 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.8 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? 7.9 Will it minimise the need for energy? 7.9 Will it minimise the share of energy? 7.9 Will it help to increase the share of energy? 8. Water resources in the area are also the share of energy? 8. Flood | | | | designated] |
| Climate change poses a threat both in terms of flooding and drought to Canlerbury. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severely of operation of the concern that t | | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| terms of flooding and drought to Cantebury. Particular concerns it he 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 at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rainfall in the region decreases on One Air Caulity management Area (AQMA) declared - AQMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean introgen dioxide (NC2) air quality objective (AQCO), includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A228, A2650 and A230. The earlier AQMA (AQMA) the Boad Street/Milliary Read declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA 2. Average domestic consumption of 4,225 KWh. 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-beling, the economy and the environment. 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-beling, the economy and the environment. 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 9. Particular concern is the increased frequency and severity of coastal flood events. EA propose Hold the Line for misc coastiline, however, between Reculver and Minnis Bay a "managed realignment" strategy has been recommended by the EA. 18. Will it help to discourage inappropriate developments/infrastructure? 18. Will it help to manage and reduce the risks are as of the public well-beliance at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which coastal erosion? 18. Will it reduce or minimise greenhouse gas managed rea | 7. 0 qua | Climate Change, Energy and Air Cality and promote energy efficience | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts of | of climate change, improve air |
| Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the Riva Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the Riva Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the Riva Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the Rivar Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the Rivar Stour, including parts of the ACRA. Expropse 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeft. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeft. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeft. In land sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeft. In land sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeft. In land sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas at risk of flooding particularly areas at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? In land sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas and section which r | terms of flooding and d Canterbury. Particular increased frequency an coastal flood events. E the Line' for most coast | 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, | 7.1 Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change? | Score negative if proposed site lies within a flood risk area as defined by the Environment Agency. Significant if flood zone |
| at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury listeit. **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 (AOMA) declared - ACMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NC2) air quality objective (ACO), includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A22 KWH compared to an average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWH. **Average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. **Bifood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be recommended by the EA. **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and residence and sinks of flooding and castal erosion of the district which runs through Canterbury listeit. **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding the section which runs through Canterbury listeit. **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 the section which runs through Canterbury listeit. **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion?** **Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosi | | 'managed realignment' strategy has | | Uncertain |
| section which runs through Canterbury liself. Water resources in the area are also likely to be placed under stress as overall rarinfall in the region decreases One Air Quality management Area (AGMA) declared - AGMA2 Canterbury City Centre in respect of exceedences of the annual mean nitrogen dioxide (NC2) air quality objective (AGO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A28, A2050 and A290. The earlier AGMA (AGMA1 Broad Street/Military Boad) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AGMA 2. A verage 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 To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment. 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 and coastal erosion? 8. 2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8. 3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8. 3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? | • | | 7.3 Will it maintain and improve local air quality? | 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 (NC2) air quality objective (AQO). Includes the main road around Canterbury city centre and various roads feeding into it including parts of the A29, A205 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. B. Flood Risk and Coastal Errosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 7.6 Will it help to increase the share of energy proposed site is size where number of units >750 assuming dwelling density of 30 dph and could support CHP and then score as positive] Uncertain Score as uncertain unless or proposed the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment 8. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 8. I will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to exist of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 8. Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? 8. Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | | | 7.4 Will it minimise the need for 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). 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 (AQMAI Broad Street/Military Road) declared in 2006 is incorporated within AQMA2. Average domestic consumption of 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 kWh. S. 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 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. Average domestic consumption of 4,227 kWh. B. 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 B. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion? B. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? B. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? B. Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion? B. Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? B. Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? B. Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coasta | | | 7.5 Will it increase efficiency in the use of energy? | Uncertain |
| 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 To reduce the risk of flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment • 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 arround the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion which would be detrimental to the public well-being, the economy and the environment 1. Uncertain [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3] 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion which runs through Canterbury itself. | | 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 | generated from renewable sources? | [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] |
| 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South East of 4,725 KWh. 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 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | | 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 | inot in a nood 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 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 itself. 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | • | 4,227 KWh compared to an average domestic consumption within the South | | |
| 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 around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury itself. 8.1 Will it help to minimise the risk of flooding to existing and new developments/infrastructure? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of flooding and the risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of flooding and the risk of flooding and coastal erosion? Inland sections of flooding and the risk of flooding and coastal erosio | 8. F | Flood Risk and Coastal Erosion Trimental to the public well-being, | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment | rosion which would be |
| 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 itself. 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? Indicate the properties of the district which are development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? Indicate the properties of the district which are development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? Indicate the properties of the district which are development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? | • | 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 | | [Score as uncertain unless site included in Flood Risk Area when score as negative. Significant if |
| section which runs through Canterbury itself. associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? Uncertain | • | recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are | development in areas at risk from flooding and | Not applicable |
| 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? Uncertain | | around the River Stour, including the section which runs through Canterbury | | Not applicable |
| Discussion and Assumptions: | | itself. | | Uncertain |
| i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e | | | Discussion and Assumptions: | 1 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|---|
| 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? | Minor Positive [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? | Uncertain [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. Approximately 700 pupils attend grammar schools in Faversham, Canterbury and Thanet. | 9.3 Will it improve access to skills and training for raising employment potential? 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 Uncertain [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 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: Extension on greenfield land, outside of the urban be | |
| 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? | No 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? | No 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 |

| 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: | |
| 11. High Quality Design and Sustain | nability 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 hous | ing 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? | 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] |
| 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] No Impact |
| 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] No Impact [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 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] No Impact [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 | 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] No Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor 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] No Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive.] Uncertain Not applicable |
| 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? 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] No Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | 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] No Impact [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 | 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: | [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] No Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 |
| 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 | 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 |
| | developed rand: | [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: | |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 |

| | stainability Objectives and seline 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. | 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 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: | |
| • | KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | |

| OVERALL | COMMENTS. |
|---------|-----------|
|---------|-----------|

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/228: Howe Barracks, 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 | | |
| South East. 73.9% of people of working age within Canterbury district were economically active (2011) 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). | 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. | | |
| 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? | 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: Take ac employment | count of existing uses and loss of |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To st | 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? | Uncertain [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: Site on the | e urban fringe of Canterbury. |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and imp | rove 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality? | 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: There are site; historically these have provided wa | e underground springs present on atter to Canterbury. |
| 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 bustoute 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: Within 80 Thomas' Primary School. [Make a particular reference to any particul such as bus links.] | |

| ustainability Objectives and aseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| Countryside and Historic Environ | ment To protect and improve landscapes fo | or both people and wildlife and t |
| rotect and maintain vulnerable ass The Cathedral, St Augustine's Abbey and St Martin's Church are UNESCO | ets (including built and historic) 5.1 Will it improve access to the countryside and | Uncertain |
| World Heritage site. In 2011, there were 2,896 statutory listed buildings, 798 locally important | open space? 5.2 Will it avoid adverse impacts and enhance | Significant Negative Impact |
| 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 | designated and non-designated landscape features? | [No impact for sites located > 1ki 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 |
| Register. Of these, two from a total of 185, (1.08%), are grade 1, or grade II* | | 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 Negative [PDL sites will be positive and greenfield sites will be negative. Site will be significantly positive onegative if > 100 dwelligs] |
| compendium. | 5.4 Will it improve access to urban open space? | Minor Negative [Score positive if the proposed s is within 400m of open space* (+ hectares in size). Score significatif site > 100 units or if open spacor significant links to be provided on site. Score negative if open space is removed. NB *open space includes designated urbar 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? | Minor Negative [No impact unless site includes cultural heritage features. Impact will be significantly negative whe 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 an adjacent site] |
| | 5.7 Will it improve and promote access to buildings and landscapes of historic/cultural value? | Uncertain |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: Adjacent to Adjacent to and part within a Conservation Hospital. Proposal would result in a loss a series of scheduled ancient monument a roman water aquaduct, which suplied water A Roman road passed through the site man Roman finds. Some potential also for Pale | on Area i.e. setting of St. Martin's of existing open space. There a are scattered around the site in vater to the Cathedral and Abbey eaning there is potential for |

| 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). | d damage to geological sites and improve 6.1 Will it avoid damage to and enhance species and habitats? | Significant 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 |
| 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). 10 Local Nature Reserves (LNR) 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | 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 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 |
| | 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: | 1 |
| 7. Climate Change, Energy and Air Cquality and promote energy efficience | 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? | 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 |
| 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). | 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 within 250m of a SSSI |
| 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 Todetrimental to the public well-being, | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e the economy and the environment | erosion 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 coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | 1 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 Tyrimary 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? | Significant Positive 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 Negative 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.)? | Minor Positive [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: | |
| 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 | 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 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: | |
| 11. High Quality Design and Sustain | nability 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 hous | ing 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] |
| 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 |
| 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] Significant Positive Impact [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 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] |
| 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 | [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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable |
| 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? 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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | 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] Significant Positive Impact [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 | 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: | [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] Significant Positive Impact [Sites between 0 – 100 units minor positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable 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 |
| 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 | ocation 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? | 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? | Significant Positive Impact |
| | | [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 |
| | developed rand: | [PDL sites to score positive. Greenfield sites to score negative. Where site exceeds 100 units, score significant] |
| | 14.5 Will it encourage urban renaissance? | Significant Positive 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: Mostly pre includes some greenfield land. Greenfield adjacent to military operations. | eviously developed land but d likely to be contaminated as |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 |

| Sus Bas | tainability Objectives and eline 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 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, | 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. | | |

| O١ | /ERAI | LL CO | MMENTS. |
|----|-------|-------|---------|
| | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/229: Lane at Bekesbourne Lane, Littlebourne

| Sustainability Objective Baseline Information | es and | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|--|
| Economy and Employeemployment opportunit | yment To ach ies to everyo | nieve a strong and stable economy which one | offers rewarding and well located |
| Canterbury is below the E | 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 Canterbury district were eactive (2011) Service sector is the large in Canterbury (88%) with and tourism related emplicantributing the greatest jobs (40.3% and 8.9% resident in the second section of the second section in the section in the section in the second section in the s | ng age within economically est employer public sector loyers proportion of | 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 we for employees in Canterb was almost £361.00, whithan average county, regnational levels (£382.10, £405.70 respectively) | eekly earnings bury District ch is lower jional and | 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: Take accomployment | ount of existing uses and loss of |
| | | |
| 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? | 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? | 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: | |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and impo | rove the quality of inland and coastal water | 'S |
| 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 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: | |
| . 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 | 4.1 Will it reduce travel demand? | Minor Positive [Sites located within 800m walkin distant of a convenience store, G and primary school to score significant positive. If site is withi 800m of 2 of 3 services provided score minor positive. Sites beyon 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 biroute 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 oth local services. Sites beyond 800 walking distance of these service score as negative. If site beyond this distance and > 100 units sco 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 well serviced bus route, convenience surgery is slightly further. [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | store and primary school. A GP |
| | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | 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 Negative [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? | 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? | 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: | 1 |
| | | |
| | | |

| Su Ba | stainability Objectives and seline 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). 15 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). | 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 |
| • | 49 Local Wildlife Sites | | '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 designated] |

| За | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|----|--|---|---|
| | | Discussion and Assumptions: | |
| 7 | Climate Change, Energy and Air Cality and promote energy efficience | Quality To reduce the causes and impacts | of climate change, improve air |
| 1 | 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 |
| | 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). | 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 sco 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. | o reduce the risk of flooding and coastal e | rosion which would be |
| e | trimental to the public well-being, | the economy and the environment | |
| | 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 whe score as negative. Significant if flood zone 3] |
| | recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are | 8.2 Will it help to discourage inappropriate | Not applicable |
| | recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas | development in areas at risk from flooding and coastal erosion? | пот аррисаые |
| | 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 | i i | Not applicable |
| | recommended by the EA. Inland sections of the district which are at risk of flooding particularly areas around the River Stour, including the | coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks | |
| | 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 | coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and | Not applicable |
| | 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 itself. | coastal erosion? 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Not applicable Uncertain |

| | stainability Objectives and seline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|-----|---|--|---|
| • | Wincheap have LSOAS in the 20% most deprived in England 37 primary schools, seventeen | | located in identified disadvantaged ward. Significant if site > 100 units |
| | secondary schools, two pupil referral units and two special schools | | |
| | 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 | 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] |
| • | Canterbury is a net importer of secondary students (from neighbouring districts). | | Score j |
| • | 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 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: | |
| | 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. | 10.2 Will it encourage more people to live in town | Minor Negative |
| | 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 Negative

from town centre]

[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 centrel

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| | 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 Susta | nability 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: | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou | sing 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? | 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] |
| | 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? | positive. Sites above 100 units |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain |
| | meet residents' needs and aspiration and create balanced communities? 12.4 Will it reduce the number of unfit and empty homes? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable |
| | 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 | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the | 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? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| 13. Quality of Life To improve the of the control of the | 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: | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain |
| For 2010/11, the number of notifiable offences in Canterbury recorded by the | 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: quality of life for those living and working in 13.1 Will it reduce actual levels of crime? | positive. Sites above 100 units score as significant positive] Uncertain Not applicable Not applicable Uncertain the District Uncertain |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|---|--|
| 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: | |
| 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 |
| | 15.6 Will it protect water resources? | Uncertain |
| | 15.7 Will it encourage farming practices sensitive to the character of the countryside? | Not applicable |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts | |
|---|--|------------------------|--|
| | Discussion and Assumptions: | | |
| 16. Waste To reduce generation and disposal of waste, and achieve sustainable 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. | | | |

STAGE 3: SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL SHLAA/230: Land at Stonebridge Road, Kingsmead, Canterbury

| 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 |
| 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) 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). | 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? | 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: The site h development proposal for 15 dwellings. I transport time of an employment site. Ta loss of employment | t is within 10 minutes public |
| 2. Rural/Coastal Communities To s | ustain 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 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 |
| | 2.3 Will it help retain village/coastal services by stimulating demand? | uncertain] 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 urban area. | located within the Canterbury |
| 3. Water Quality To protect and im | 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 inland Canterbury district. Extreme low flow and flood events recorded in recent years. Area vulnerable to the effects of drought or changes in rainfall patterns. | 3.1 Will it minimise the adverse effects on ground and/or surface water quality? | 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 |

| 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: The site is | s within 10m of the River Stour. |
| 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? | 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 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 convenience store, primary schoool an [Make a particular reference to any particula such as bus links.] | id 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 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 |
| 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* | 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] |
| 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 Negative [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? | 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? | 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: The site is Landscape Value (AHLV). It is a greenfie Open Space (Kingsmead Fields). | within 1km of an Area of High Id site. Adjacent to an area of |
| | | |

| 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) 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 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|--|--|---|
| | | negative where feature is designated] |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is Conservation Interest (SNCI) - The River | adjacent to a Site of Nature Stour corridor. |
| 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? | Minor Negative [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 score as positive] s in a flood risk zone 2. |
| detrimental to the public well-being, | 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 | |
| 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 | existing and new developments/infrastructure? | Minor Negative [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 itself. | 8.3 Will it help to manage and reduce the risks associated with coastal erosion? | Not applicable |
| ilsell. | 8.4 Will it reduce vulnerability to flooding and coastal erosion? | Uncertain |
| | Discussion and Assumptions: The site is | in a flood viels name 0 |

| Sustainability Objectives and Baseline Information | Key questions/guidance | Sustainability Impacts |
|---|--|--|
| 9. Access to Services Share access everyone | 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 | 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] |
| units and two special schools 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.)? | 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 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: The site is | s in Northgate ward |
| 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 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: | |
| 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 |
| | | |
| 12 Housing To make suitable hou | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| | sing available and affordable to everyone | |
| 12. Housing To make suitable hou Canterbury had a population of 149,100 (2009) 64,070 units (April 2010) Average annual housing completion figure since 06/07 is 798 units | sing 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 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] |
| 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 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? | [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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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 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 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 |
| 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] 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? Discussion and Assumptions: 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 |

| 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 lower than the South East (79.4). | 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: | |
| 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 | 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 | Minor Negative |
| | 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? | Minor Negative |
| | | [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: | |
| 15. Natural Resources To ensure the existing resources | e 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 |

| | stainability Objectives and seline 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. | 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: | I |
| • | KCC operates two household waste recycling centres within Canterbury district; the Canterbury Recycling Centre and the Herne Bay Household Waste Recycling Centre. | | |

| OVERALL (| COMMENTS. |
|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-----------|