

Appendix F: Appraisal of Housing and New Communities options

Significant Positive Effect	++	Likely to have a significant positive effects
Minor Positive Effect	+	Likely to have a positive effects
Neutral	0	Neutral
Minor Negative Effect	-	Likely to have negative effects
Significant Negative Effect	--	Likely to have significant negative effects
Uncertain	?	Uncertain
No Relationship	NA	Not applicable/No relationship

NB: where more than one symbol/colour is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. Where a box is coloured but also contains a '?', this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

General Approach

Issue HNC1 - How should we ensure the right types and tenures of housing is provided?

Issue HNC1 - How should we ensure the right types and tenures of housing is provided?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 1A	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 1B	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 1C	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 1A would see the continuation of the current approach to allow some flexibility for developers to provide a mix of homes within a broad range. Option 1B would see the setting of specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver, based on the identified needs for size, type and tenure, across different parts of the district and Option 1C would see the setting of specific housing mix targets which each site must deliver and identify opportunity sites for specific types or tenures.

The Council’s Housing Needs Assessment (2021) highlights that when split across the three main tenures, the main dwelling type/size required within market housing is for 3- and 4-bedroom houses. Within the affordable home ownership sector, the main need is for 2- and 3-bedroom dwellings, and for social/affordable rent, the requirement is mainly for 2-bedroom dwellings. There is also a need to cater for the large student population in Canterbury City and the ageing population across the whole of Canterbury. The Council’s housing land supply statement shows that completions have dipped below the annual requirements in recent years, though completions were above the requirement in 2017/18 highlighting the need to allocate sufficient land to meet needs.

Options 1A and 1B would help to deliver new housing and therefore minor positive effects are identified for housing (SA objective 10). Option 1C would see that for specific sites housing mix targets are set and opportunities identified for specific types/tenures. This would help to maximise the benefits of providing the right type of housing in the right locations to meet local needs in accordance with the needs assessment and therefore a significant positive effect is identified.

Minor positive effects are identified for the economy (SA objective 12) and health (SA objective 14). All of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury and provide and sustain both a new and existing workforce and also job creation associated with the development of new housing. There are clear links between good health and living standards so new housing would help to improve living standards and in turn health.

Each of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury. The delivery of new housing would likely result in an increase in vehicle use and the associated emissions which would have negative effects on air pollution, greenhouse gases and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2, and 13) and so minor negative effects are identified, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport and development that meets high levels of energy efficiency would help to mitigate to an extent.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver new housing across Canterbury, but the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage. However, there would also likely be a requirement for biodiversity net gain.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new housing would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan (WMRP) that they operate in an area of serious water stress although Broad Oak reservoir may help to mitigate these issues. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is a high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration. All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Option 1C would see that for specific sites housing mix targets are set and opportunities identified for specific types/tenures. This would help to maximise the benefits of providing the right type of housing in the right locations to meet local needs and therefore a significant positive effect is identified for housing (SA objective 10). A significant positive effect is also identified for health (SA objective 14) as there are clear links between good health and high quality living standards that meet housing need.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new housing development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.

Issue HNC2 - How should we approach providing opportunities for small and medium sized housing developments?

Issue HNC2 - How should we approach providing opportunities for small and medium sized housing developments?

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 2A	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+/?	?	+	-	+/?
HNC 2B	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 2C	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 2A would see the continuation of the Council’s current approach to small and medium sites which is a focus on large strategic sites. This option would help to meet needs in urban areas where large strategic sites are located but may not meet needs across the whole of Canterbury, particular for rural areas. A minor positive effect with some uncertainty is identified for SA Objective 10. Option 2B would increase the proportion of supply coming from small and medium sites through additional allocations and windfall sites. This option would help to provide new housing to meet needs across Canterbury and therefore a minor positive effect is identified. Option 2C seeks to maximise opportunities for delivery of small and medium sites to deliver new homes and is the preferred option. This option would be likely to maximise the benefits of the provision of small and medium housing sites to meet local needs across Canterbury. A significant positive effect is therefore identified for housing (SA objective 10) and also for health (SA objective 14).

The housing needs assessment identifies a need for 1,120 homes per year. The Council’s housing land supply statement shows that completions have dipped below the annual requirements in recent years, though completions were above the requirement in 2017/18 highlighting the need to allocate sufficient land to meet needs.

The delivery of new housing would likely result in an increase in vehicle use and the associated emissions which would have negative effects on air pollution, greenhouse gases and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2, and 13) and so minor negative effects are identified, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport and development that meets high levels of energy efficiency would help to mitigate to an extent.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new housing would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan that they operate in an area of serious water stress although Broad Oak reservoir may help to mitigate these issues. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration.

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver new housing across Canterbury, but the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage. However, there would also likely be a requirement for biodiversity net gain.

<p>Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport. • Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency. • Incorporation of SuDS into new development. • Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management. • Policies promoting good design. <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For any new housing development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals. • Development would avoid important biodiversity sites. • Development would avoid geologically important sites. • Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development. • Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site. • Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding. <p>Uncertainties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The precise location of development.
--

Issue HNC3 - How should we provide opportunities for suitable brownfield and regeneration developments?

Issue HNC3 - How should we provide opportunities for suitable brownfield and regeneration developments?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 3A	0	0	+/?	?	+	-	?	0	+	+/?	+	+	+	+
HNC 3B	0	0	+/?	?	++	-	?	0	++	+/?	++	++	++	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 3A would see the continuation with the current approach to brownfield sites. This would mean continuing to encourage development on previously developed land in suitable locations for new development in the first instance, rather than locating development on greenfield land. Option 3B maximises opportunities for delivery of suitable brownfield and regeneration developments.

The Council’s housing land supply statement shows that completions have dipped below the annual requirements in recent years, though completions were above the requirement in 2017/18 highlighting the need to allocate sufficient land to meet housing needs.

Both options are considered to have positive effects on biodiversity (SA objective 3). Both options would prioritise the development of brownfield sites before greenfield development. This will help to reduce the amount of greenfield land required for new development and the associated biodiversity impacts, although some uncertainty is noted as brownfield sites can also provide important habitats for wildlife. Minor positive effects from option 3A are also identified for landscape (SA objective 5), the historic environment (SA objective 9), housing (SA objective 10), land use (SA objective 11), economy (SA objective 12), transport (SA objective 13) and health (SA objective 14). This reflects that the opportunities presented by brownfield and regeneration development to provide environmental enhancements, for example landscaping and bringing into use derelict heritage assets and in the case of health development in sustainable locations minimising reliance on the car and the associated emissions and also through improved environmental quality by developing derelict land and buildings.

Option 3 B maximises opportunities for delivery of suitable brownfield and regeneration developments and this option is anticipated to have a range of significant positive effects including on landscape (SA objective 5), historic environment (SA objective 9), land use (SA objective 11), economy (SA objective 12) and health (SA objective 14). This is reflective of minimising the use of greenfield land (which is considered of higher environmental value overall) and the opportunities presented by brownfield and regeneration development to provide environmental enhancements, for example landscaping and bringing into use derelict heritage assets and in the case of health development in sustainable locations minimising reliance on the car and the associated emissions and also through improved environmental quality by developing derelict land and buildings. There would also be opportunities to provide new or enhancements to existing facilities for example open space and sports or health facilities.

Both options are considered to have neutral effects on air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objectives 1 and 2). Brownfield sites are likely to be in sustainable locations accessible by public transport. Development of such sites would help to minimise reliance on the car as primary means of transport and reduce associated emissions which would help to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, although there would still be an increase in car use from new development, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites. All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new development and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced. Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6) in line with commentary under previous issues.

Uncertain effects are identified for geological sites and minerals resources (SA objective 4), and flood risk (SA objective 7). This is reflective of the fact that the precise location of development would determine effects.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency (e.g., BREEAM excellent rating).
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- Greenfield sites are overall of higher environmental value than brownfield sites.
- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from development.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of new development.
- Prioritising the use of brownfield land may limit the choice of land supply available for new housing development.

Issue HNC4 - How should we ensure the right densities are delivered in developments across the District?

Issue HNC4 - How should we ensure the right densities are delivered in developments across the District?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 4A	-	-	+/?	+/?	+/?	-	+/?	0	+/?	+	+/?	+	-	+
HNC 4B	-	-	+/?	+/?	+/?	-	+/?	0	+/?	+	+/?	+	-	+
HNC 4C	-	-	+/?	+/?	+/?	-	+/?	0	+/?	++	+/?	+	-	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects
 Option 4A would continue the current approach to density of influencing site density through good design. This option continues the approach in the current Local Plan where the approach to density is influenced through good design and must be considered in its local context on a site by site basis. Option 4B - Identify a minimum density for the district as a whole and continue the current approach to density of influencing site density through good design. 4C (Preferred Option) - Set specific densities, or range of densities, for areas of the district to make best use of the land. Site allocation densities would be influenced by the local distinctiveness and character so that housing fits in with surroundings, and good design. Significant positive effects are identified from option 4C in relation to housing (SA objective 10) and health (SA objective 14).

A mixture of positive and uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and mineral resources, landscape, flood risk, and the historic environment (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9). This reflects commitments in all options to good design which can help to minimise negative effects on the environment, for example in relation to flood risk or the setting of heritage assets and also can help to design environmental enhancements for example in relation to biodiversity. Some uncertainty is also identified subject to the precise location of development and that good design can only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Each of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury. The delivery of new housing would likely result in an increase in vehicle use and the associated emissions which would have negative effects on air pollution, greenhouse gases and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2, and 13) and so minor negative effects are identified, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites and the two air quality management areas. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport and development that meets high levels of energy efficiency would help to mitigate to an extent. Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6) in line with commentary under previous issues.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
 - Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
 - Development would avoid geologically important sites.
 - Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from development.
 - Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
 - Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.
- Uncertainties**
- The precise location of new development.

Issue HNC5 - How should we ensure housing is provided for rural communities?

Issue HNC5 – How should we ensure housing is provided for rural communities?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 5A	+/-	+/-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	+/-	+
HNC 5B	+/-	+/-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	+/-	+
HNC 5C	+/-	+/-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	+/-	+

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 5A would see a continuation of the existing approach to rural housing development. This option would maintain the current approach which focuses growth only on the more sustainable rural settlements through specific allocations. Option 5B focuses rural housing development at the Rural Service Centres and supports infill development at other settlements within village boundaries. Option 5C (Preferred Option) supports housing developments at and adjacent to Rural Services Centres, Local Centres and Villages where this provides affordable housing. The housing needs assessment identifies a need for 1,120 homes per year. These options would help to deliver a portion of this in rural communities to help meet local needs and therefore positive effects are identified for housing (SA objective 10). Significant positive effects are identified in relation objective 5C as this option would help to direct new housing development to the most sustainable rural locations and maximise benefits of the delivery of new housing in these locations.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver new housing across Canterbury, but the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Growth at the rural locations identified through these options would help to see development in more sustainable locations which may be accessible by sustainable modes of transport and help to reduce associated emissions. However, the likely reality of growth in rural areas is an increase in car use so there would be associated negative effects in relation to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and sustainable transport and so mixed positive and negative effects are identified for SA objectives 1, 2 and 13.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6) in line with commentary under previous issues.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from development.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.

Community infrastructure and design

Issue HNC6 - How can we support sustainable living in new communities?

Issue HNC6 - How can we support sustainable living in new communities?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 6A	+/?	+/?	?	?	++	-	?	0	?	+	+	+	+	+
HNC 6B	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	+	+	+	+
HNC 6C	+	+	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	+	+	++	++

Commentary:**Likely significant effects**

Option 6A would see a continuation with the existing approach to supporting sustainable living in new communities. The current approach requires strategic development sites to incorporate social infrastructure and community facilities based on garden city principles, such as for open space, recreational, cultural, and shopping facilities. Option 6B sets clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments. Option 6C - (Preferred Option) sets clear requirements for new or improved social and community infrastructure to be delivered as part of strategic developments and requires large developments to demonstrate that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes walking/cycling time. All options would be expected to support the delivery of high-quality housing (SA Objective 10).

The Council's indoor sports facilities needs assessment notes that there is no surplus of provision and that there is a need to support other developments (via planning, developer contributions and officer expertise) which may assist in increasing sport and physical activity within the wider community. Provision of community infrastructure could help to address this need. Option 6C requires large development to demonstrate that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes on foot or bike. This would help to reduce reliance on the car as primary means of transport and in turn the associated emissions. Positive effects are identified for air pollution (SA objective 1) and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 2) and a significant positive effect in relation to sustainable transport and health (SA objectives 13 and 14).

A mixture of positive and uncertain effects are identified from options 6A and B in relation to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objectives 1 and 2). This reflects that new infrastructure to support sustainable living could help to reduce reliance on the car as the primary means of transport and in turn reduce emissions and improve air quality, which also has associated positive health effects. Improvements to existing social and community infrastructure would help to use land efficiently by reducing the need for development of other land for these facilities. A positive effect is therefore identified for land use (SA objective 11) for all options. New social and community infrastructure would contribute to economic growth and so a positive effect is identified from all options on SA objective 12.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects on biodiversity, geological sites, flood risk and the historic environment (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9). The precise location of social infrastructure and community facilities would determine effects. Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6) in line with commentary under previous issues. All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8).

A significant positive effect is identified from option 6A in relation to landscape (SA objective 5) reflecting the requirement for Garden City principles. A significant positive effect from option 6C is identified in relation to sustainable transport (SA objective 13) reflecting a requirement for large development to demonstrate that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes on foot or bike which would help to reduce reliance on the car as primary means of transport. A significant positive effect from option 6C is also identified for health. New or improved community infrastructure could include health or sports facilities and the requirement that large development to demonstrate that essential services can be accessed within 15 minutes on foot or bike would all have positive health effects. The links between exercise and health are wide ranging and well known.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency (e.g., BREEAM excellent rating).
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.

- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from development.
 - Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
 - Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.
- Uncertainties**
- The precise location of new social infrastructure.

Issue HNC7 - How should we ensure high quality design?

Issue HNC7 - How should we ensure high quality design?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 7A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
HNC 7B	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
HNC 7C	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 7A would see a continuation of the current criteria based approach to design. This option sets out design criteria to be addressed by applicants - for all types of developments including commercial or office development - and requires masterplans for all strategic sites at planning application stage. For the very largest sites this is intended to identify through the planning application how the site fits into the wider surroundings, physical and social infrastructure provision, phasing and timing and detailed design proposals. Option 7B would see use of the new National Design Guide and National Model Design Code. Option 7C (Preferred Option) - embed masterplans and design requirements for strategic development sites within the Local Plan and continue current design criteria based approach for other sites and types of development, setting out when specific design tools, such as design codes, would be appropriate.

Positive effects are identified across all of the SA objectives for all three options. This reflects that high quality design can have a range of positive environmental effects including provision of walking and cycling routes and green infrastructure, biodiversity and landscape enhancements, enhancement to the setting of heritage assets and enable redundant heritage assets to be brought back into use, the minimisation of waste, delivery of high quality housing, economic growth and provision of physical and social infrastructure.

Significant positive effects are identified from option 7C across all of the objectives. This reflects the wide ranging positive effects of the commitment in the option on good design, which would help to ensure the delivery throughout Canterbury of high quality developments which minimise their environmental impacts and provide enhancements to benefit the environment and population of Canterbury.

Mitigation

- None.
- Assumptions**
- None.
- Uncertainties**
- None.

Issue HNC8 - How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?

Issue HNC8 - How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?														
New Homes														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 8A	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	+	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+
HNC 8B	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	+	NA	+/-	NA	NA	NA	+
HNC 8C	++	++	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	++	NA	++/-/?	NA	NA	NA	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 8A would see a continuation of the current approach but with “indicative net zero”. This option would continue the current Local Plan approach which does not set any particular local building standards for energy or sustainability, relying instead on national standards. The council would continue to encourage developers to aim for higher standards to indicate how net zero might be achieved, but this would not be mandatory. Option 8B would see the early introduction of Future Homes Standard. Option 8C (Preferred Option) would require all new homes delivered to be net zero.

These options are concerned with low carbon and energy efficient housing and therefore have no relationship with the majority of the SA objectives. Options 8A and 8B would have minor positive effects on air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, flood risk, waste management, housing, and health (SA objectives 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 14). This is reflective of the fact that low carbon and energy efficient housing would help to reduce emissions, improve air quality, have a positive effect on climate change and in turn reduce flood risk (flood risk can be one of the consequences of climate change), reduce waste generation, provide better quality housing, and improve health. However, there is also potential for negative effects in the short terms for housing (SA Objective 10) as the requirements are likely to affect development viability as developers adjust to the early introduction of the Future Homes Standard.

Significant positive effects are identified from option 8C in relation to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, waste, housing, and health. This is reflective of the commitment in the option requiring all new homes to be net zero and that this would help to reduce emissions and in turn improve air quality, reduce waste from new housing development and deliver high quality new

housing which would raise living standards and in turn improve health. However, there is potential for negative effects in the short terms for housing (SA Objective 10) as the requirements are likely to affect development viability as developers adjust to new requirements.

Mitigation

- None.

Assumptions

- None.

Uncertainties

- The potential impact on viability of housing development, especially as new requirements are bedded in, is uncertain to some extent.

Issue HNC8 - How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?

Refurbishments and modifications to existing homes

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 8D	+/?	+/?	NA	NA	NA	NA	+/?	NA	NA	+/?	NA	NA	NA	+/?
HNC 8E	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+
HNC 8F	++	++	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	++	NA	NA	NA	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 8D requires the submission of an energy plan to assess the potential for improvements to the energy performance of the overall building. Option 8E applies the requirement to meet Building Regulations Part L energy standards to modifications to buildings to all but the smallest extensions and the submission of an energy plan to assess the potential for improvements to the energy performance of the overall building. Option 8F (Preferred Option) sets higher local domestic build energy standards for modifications to existing homes and requires the submission of an energy plan to assess the potential for improvements to the energy performance of the overall building.

These options are concerned with low carbon and energy efficient housing with respect to refurbishments and modifications to existing homes and therefore have no relationship with the majority of the SA objectives. Options 8D and E would have minor positive effects on air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, flood risk, housing, and health (SA objectives 1, 2, 7, 10 and 14). This is reflective of the fact that low carbon and energy efficient housing would help to reduce emissions, improve air quality, have a positive effect on climate change and in turn reduce flood risk (flood risk can be one of the consequences of climate change), reduce waste generation, provide better quality housing, and improve health. However, some uncertainty is also identified for option 8D given it relates to assessing the potential for improvements as opposed to a firm commitment requiring improvements.

Significant positive effects are identified from option 8F in relation to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, waste, housing, and health. This is reflective of the commitment in the option requiring for higher local domestic build energy standards for modifications to existing homes that this would help to reduce emissions and in turn improve air quality and improve existing housing which would raise living standards and in turn improve health.

Mitigation

- None.

Assumptions

- None.

Uncertainties

- None.

Issue HNC8 - How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?

Water efficiency

SA Objective	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA010	SA011	SA012	SA013	SA014
Option	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA010	SA011	SA012	SA013	SA014
HNC 8G	NA	NA	+/?	NA	NA	+/?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+/?
HNC 8H	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+
HNC 8I	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	++	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 8G would see a continuation with the current approach to water efficiency. The current approach encourages developments to minimise water use as far as practicable by incorporating appropriate water efficiency and water recycling measures. In new homes, a required level of 110 litres maximum daily allowable usage per person is sought however there are no requirements for developments to demonstrate that this standard is achieved. Option 8H requires proposals for new homes to demonstrate the higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day. Option 8I (Preferred option) is a blended approach to require proposals for new homes to demonstrate the higher water efficiency standard and for large and/or strategic sites to exceed the current building regulations.

These options are concerned with low carbon and energy efficient housing with respect to water efficiency and therefore have no relationship with the majority of the SA objectives. Minor positive effects from options 8G and 8H are identified for biodiversity (SA objective 3), water resources and quality (SA objective 6), and health (SA objective 14). This is reflective of commitments to use water efficiently which will help to conserve water supplies. Some uncertainty is also identified in respect of option 8G which is reflective that under this option there is no requirements for developments to demonstrate that the standard identified is achieved.

Significant positive effects from option 8I are identified in respect of water resources and quality (SA objective 6). This reflects a requirement for proposals for new homes to demonstrate the higher water efficiency standard and for large and/or strategic sites to exceed the current building regulations. This option would therefore maximise efforts to use water efficiently and to conserve water supplies.

Mitigation

- None.

Assumptions

- None.

Uncertainties

- None.

Issue HNC8 - How can we deliver low carbon and energy efficient housing?

Incorporating renewable energy within new developments

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 8J	+	+	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	+
HNC 8K	++/?	++/?	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	++	NA	NA	NA	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Significant positive effects are identified from option HNC8K (Preferred Option) in relation to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, housing, and health (SA Objectives 1, 2, 10 and 14). This is reflective of the commitment in the option to requiring large/strategic developments to demonstrate a decentralised energy supply which could result in substantial benefits. However, there is some uncertainty due to the delivery potential being dependent on viable or feasible. The existing option would support reduced emissions but would rely to some extent on national policy provisions.

Mitigation

- None.

Assumptions

- None.

Uncertainties

- There is some uncertainty due to the delivery potential being dependent on viable or feasible.

Specialist housing needs

Issue HNC9 - How should we approach providing housing for older people?

Issue HNC9 - How should we approach providing housing for older people?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 9A	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 9B	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	+
HNC 9C	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 9A requires all large and/or strategic sites to provide a proportion of the site for older persons housing (e.g., 5%). Option 9B would allocate specific sites for the delivery of older persons housing. Option 9C (Preferred Option) provides a blended approach with a proportion of the site being delivered through large and/or strategic sites and allocated specific sites. The Council's Housing Need Assessment notes the following minimum levels of need over the plan period have been identified for older people accommodation:

- Age Exclusive Housing Stock: 576 units
- Specialist Units: 1,732 units
- Care home bedspaces +1,150, 26% with nursing.

Canterbury has an ageing population (reflective also of national trends) so the provision of suitable housing to meet the needs of this population will be very important over the plan period and beyond.

Each of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury for older people and so positive effects are identified from all 3 options on housing (SA objective 10). Options 9B and 9C would have significant positive effects as these options would allocate specific sites and this would help to ensure that needs are met across the district. The delivery of housing for older people would help to create jobs associated with the delivery of this housing and raise living standards so positive effects are identified on SA objectives 12 and 14.

The delivery of new housing would result in an increase in vehicle use and the associated emissions which would have negative effects on air pollution, greenhouse gases and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2, and 13) and so minor negative effects are identified, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites and the two air quality management areas. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport and development that meets high levels of energy efficiency would help to mitigate to an extent. Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new development would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan that they operate in an area of serious water stress. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration. However, the proposed provision of Broad Oak reservoir may help to mitigate these issues.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver older peoples housing across Canterbury, but that the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new housing development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.

Issue HNC10 - How should we approach providing accessible and disability-friendly homes

Issue HNC10 - How should we approach providing accessible and disability-friendly homes

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 10A	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 10B	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+/-/?	?	+	-	+
HNC 10C	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 10A would see a continuation of the current approach so that major developments (such as those of 11 or more dwellings) and strategic sites to provide 20% of new dwellings to be built to M4 (2) standards on major developments and strategic sites. Option 10B would ensure all new dwellings are built to a minimum of M4 (2) standards and encourage M4 (3) standards. Option 10C (Preferred Option) would require around 15% of new dwellings to be built to M4 (2) standards, and around 5% of new dwellings to be built to M4 (3) standards on major developments and strategic sites to better reflect the needs.

The Housing Needs Assessment (2021) notes disability prevalence in Canterbury’s household population, and the limitations on daily activities associated with it, and that it is heavily skewed towards the older age groups. The assessment also notes that meeting the disability needs of Canterbury’s ageing population will require both adaptations to existing housing stock, and the delivery of appropriately designed new dwellings. By 2040, it is estimated there will be 13,400 people in Canterbury whose activities are ‘limited a lot’ by their condition (+ 1,660 from 2020). For those also suffering from ‘bad or very bad health’, a total of 7,000 people is estimated for 2040 (+874 from 2020). It will therefore be very important to meet the needs of those with disabilities over the plan period and beyond.

Each of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury for people with disabilities or access needs and so positive effects are identified from all 3 options on housing (SA objective 10). Significant positive effects are identified for option 10C as this option would ensure that around 15% of new dwellings are built to M4 (2) standards, and around 5% of new dwellings are built to M4 (3) standards on major developments and strategic sites which would maximise the benefits of these standards for those with disabilities and best meet needs across the district. However, for Option 10B there may be negative effects on delivery due to the impacts on viability of requiring all development to be at M4 (2) level. Minor positive economic effects are identified against SA objective 12 (economy) reflecting that the delivery of accessible and disability-friendly homes would provide job opportunities (subject to the skill set of the local population and approach taken by housebuilders).

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver accessible and disability housing across Canterbury, but that the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Each of these options would help to deliver new accessible and disability housing in Canterbury. The delivery of this housing would likely result in an increase in vehicle use and the associated emissions which would have negative effects on air pollution, greenhouse gases and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2, and 13) and so minor negative effects are identified, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites and the two air quality management areas. Promotion of the use of sustainable modes of transport and development that meets high levels of energy efficiency would help to mitigate to an extent.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6) in line with commentary under previous issues.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new housing development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.
- The potential impact on viability of some new housing development linked to enhanced standards being required across all development scales.

Issue HNC11 - How and where should we provide opportunities for new student accommodation?

Issue HNC11 - How and where should we provide opportunities for new student accommodation?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 11A	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	+/?	+
HNC 11B	+	+	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	++	+
HNC 11C	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	+/?	+

Commentary:**Likely significant effects**

Option 11A would see a continuation of the current approach to purpose built student accommodation. The current approach provides significant flexibility in terms of how and where purpose built accommodation can be delivered. Option 11B would provide purpose built student accommodation only on or near campus e.g., within a 5-10 minute walk of the campus. Option 11C (Preferred Option) would provide purpose-built student accommodation on or near campus e.g., within a 5-10 minute walk of the campus, but enable some flexibility on alternative locations subject to strict criteria. This would help to ensure use of sustainable modes of transport by students.

With three Higher Education institutions within the district, Canterbury's ratio of students (aged 18+) to permanent residents (aged 16–74) is one of the highest in England at 16.4%, compared to a national average of 6%. The provision of suitable accommodation to meet the needs of this student population will be very important over the plan period and beyond.

All 3 options focus purpose built student accommodation only on or near campus e.g., within a 5-10 minute walk of the campus. This would help to reduce the need to travel and in turn the associated vehicle emissions and therefore positive effects are identified for air quality (SA objective 1) and greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 2) and sustainable travel (SA objective 13). However, Options 11A and C also provide flexibility over where student accommodation is built, and this could result in development in locations not accessible by sustainable modes of transport so there is also some uncertainty as to whether these locations would be accessible by sustainable modes of transport. However, student accommodation developments are often car free schemes and reliant on transport links, so uncertainty with regards to location may be lessened.

All options would have positive effects on housing and the economy (SA objectives 10 and 12) as they would help to deliver new student accommodation and there would be job opportunities associated with development of this accommodation subject to the skills set of the local population and approach taken by the developers of this accommodation.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new development would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency, though there may be less economies of scale with small scale housing development in rural areas. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan that they operate in an area of serious water stress. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is a high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver new student accommodation, but that the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.

Issue HNC12 - How should we provide accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers?

Issue HNC12 - How should we provide accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 12A	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
HNC 12B	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	+/?	0	+/?	+	+/?	+	+/?	+
HNC 12C	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	++	+	+	+	++

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 12A would see a continuation of the current approach to meeting Gypsies and Travellers housing needs. This option continues the current responsive approach to the changing needs of the gypsy and travellers within our community. New sites or extensions to existing sites would be required to meet a set of criteria similar to that already in use. Option 12B - Allocate new pitches (either as new sites or extensions to existing sites) to meet Gypsies and Travellers housing needs. Option 12C (Preferred Option) would continue the current approach and take opportunities through the Local Plan to allocate new pitches where suitable sites are identified.

The 2018 Canterbury Gypsy and Traveller Assessment (GTAA) sets out a five-year supply requirement (2017/18–2021/22) of 17 pitches, and a longer-term need of 29 pitches to 2037. Over the last three years, 14 pitches have been completed, and a further 9 pitches have been granted permission. On the assumption that the 14 pitches have already been completed and are now occupied, this leaves a residual requirement of 15 pitches to 2037. Rolled forward to 2040, this equates to a residual requirement of around 20 pitches between 2020 and 2040. With 9 pitches granted permission, a further 11 pitches are therefore required to 2040.

Option 12A would have positive effects across the majority of the objectives. This reflects that the criteria in the existing policy (HD10 in the adopted Local Plan include criteria on a number of issues to ensure that there are no adverse environmental effects from use of land by Gypsies and Travellers including to be well related to local services, avoiding adverse impacts on residential development, and incorporation of a landscape/strategy and environmental management plan where appropriate). Option 12B would allocate new pitches either as new sites or extensions to existing sites. It is assumed that such allocations would be assessed against criteria similar to that in the existing Local Plan in which case this option would have positive effects against the majority of the SA objectives, however there is some uncertainty over exactly what criteria would be used to ensure that the development of such pitches would not have any adverse environmental effects. Option 12C would also have positive effects across the majority of the objectives as it would combine the current approach of using criteria to ensure no negative environmental effects and take opportunities to allocate new sites. This option would maximise the delivery of sites to meet identified needs for the Gypsy and Travellers and so significant positive effects are identified for housing (SA objective 10), economy (SA Objective 12) and health (SA objective 14).

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new Gypsy and Traveller sites in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Any new Gypsy and Traveller Pitches allocated under option 12B would be assessed against similar criteria to that contained in the current Local Plan.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.
- The type of criteria which would be used to assess any new sites delivered through option 12B.

Issue HNC13 - How should we support opportunities for self and custom-build housing?

Issue HNC13 - How should we support opportunities for self and custom-build housing?														
SA Objective	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA010	SA011	SA012	SA013	SA014
Option														

HNC 13A	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 13B	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	+	?	+	-	+
HNC 13C	-	-	?	?	?	-	?	0	?	++	?	+	-	+

Commentary:

Likely significant effects

Option 13A would see all large and/or strategic sites provide a proportion of plots for self- and custom-built homes (e.g., 5%). Option 13B would allocate specific small sites (up to 10 units) for the delivery of self- and custom-built housing. Option 13C (Preferred Option) provides a blended approach with a proportion of plots being delivered through large and/or strategic sites and allocated specific small sites.

The HNA (2021) identifies a need for 1,120 homes per year. All of these options would help to deliver new housing to contribute to this need and therefore positive effects on housing (SA objective 10) are identified. Option 13C would maximise delivery of self and custom-building housing across the district and therefore a significant positive effect is identified. These options would also help to improve living standards and therefore a minor positive effect on health (SA objective 14) is identified.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects are identified for biodiversity, geological sites and minerals resources, landscape, water resources, flood risk, the historic environment and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11). This reflects that all options would help to deliver new housing across Canterbury, but the precise location of such development would determine effects. There would be opportunities for the inclusion of environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new development would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency, though there may be less economies of scale with small scale housing developments. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan that they operate in an area of serious water stress. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1, 2 and 13). This reflects the fact that all 3 options would help to deliver new housing and in turn there would likely be an increase in car use and the associated emissions, and this could exacerbate issues at the two automatic air quality monitoring sites and the two air quality management areas. This would be mitigated to an extent by development on large/strategic sites which would be likely to be accessible by sustainable modes of transport and policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new housing in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Development meeting high levels of energy efficiency.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting water efficiency and nutrient management.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For any new housing development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals. Development would avoid important biodiversity sites. Development would avoid geologically important sites. Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced from housing development. Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding. Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site. 	
Uncertainties	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The precise location of development. 	

Delivering infrastructure to support growth

Issue HNC14 - How can we maximise the benefits of strategic infrastructure investment for residents and businesses?

Issue HNC14 - How can we maximise the benefits of strategic infrastructure investment for residents and businesses?														
SA Objective	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA010	SA011	SA012	SA013	SA014
Option	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA010	SA011	SA012	SA013	SA014
HNC 14A	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	-	+/?	0	?	+	?	?	+/?	++
HNC 14B	+/?	+/?	?	?	?	-	+/?	0	?	+	?	?	+/?	++
HNC 14C	+/?	+/?	+	+/?	+/?	-	+/?	0	+/?	+	+/?	+/?	+/?	++
Commentary:														
Option 14A would see a continuation of the current approach to strategic infrastructure projects. The current approach provides broad encouragement for strategic infrastructure projects, to ensure adequate provision is made for various infrastructure types alongside new development. This support for strategic infrastructure is reflected in different ways, across several policies directed at various infrastructure types. Option 14B provides overarching general support for strategic infrastructure projects which are needed to support growth. Option 14C (Preferred Option)														

provides overarching general support for strategic infrastructure projects needed to support growth and to identify specific allocations and set criteria e.g. design for proposals where justified. All options would significantly support the health and community of Canterbury (SA Objective 14).

A mixture of positive and uncertain effects are identified from option 14C on the majority of the SA objectives. This reflects that this option would identify specific allocations for infrastructure and set criteria for the development of this infrastructure. This would provide opportunities to take account of environmental constraints in the siting of infrastructure and to ensure that criteria help to avoid any negative environmental effects from the development of infrastructure and could provide opportunities for environmental enhancements for example with good design. However, there is some uncertainty subject to the precise location of development and also that any environmental enhancements can only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

Positive effects from all options are identified for the economy (SA objective 12). New infrastructure would help to contribute to economic growth and revitalise town, local and rural centres subject to the location of the infrastructure. Positive and uncertain effects are identified from all options in relation to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and sustainable transport (SA objectives 1,2 and 13) reflecting that new infrastructure could include new public transport infrastructure and walking and cycling routes but could also include new road infrastructure which would be likely to increase car use.

Minor negative effects from all options are identified for water resources (SA objective 6). This reflects that new development would lead to an increase in water consumption but would be mitigated to an extent by policies promoting water efficiency. South East Water note in their latest Water Resources Management Plan that they operate in an area of serious water stress. This was designated by Defra in 2007 and is defined by the Environment Agency as an area where current (or future) household demand for water is high. The management of water supply is therefore a key consideration.

There are currently five internationally designated sites within the District and a number of local sites of importance as well as a range of heritage assets and important landscapes. Uncertain effects on biodiversity, geological sites, landscape, the historic environment, and land use (SA objectives 3, 4, 5, 9 and 11) options 14A and B. This reflects that the precise location of infrastructure development would determine effects on these objectives. There could also be opportunities as part of the provision of infrastructure to provide environmental enhancements, but this could only be fully determined at the detailed planning application stage.

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new infrastructure and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Likely significant effects

None identified.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
- Policies promoting good design.

Assumptions

- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
- Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
- Development would avoid geologically important sites.
- Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.
- Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Development would avoid negative effects on the setting of the World Heritage Site.

Uncertainties

- The precise location of development.

Issue HNC15 - How can we enhance the production of community and utility scale renewable energy?

Issue HNC15 - How can we enhance the production of community and utility scale renewable energy?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 15A	+	+	-/?	0	-/?	0	0	0	-/?	+	+/-/?	+	NA	+
HNC 15B	+	++	-/?	0	-/?	0	0	0	-/?	+	+/-/?	+	NA	+
Commentary:														
Likely significant effects														
HNC 15B (Preferred Option) would seek to actively support renewable and low carbon developments and remove the requirement to demonstrate need. This is considered to have significant positive effects on SA Objective 2. HNC 15A would also support but would require the demonstration of need. Minor positive effects are assessed for this option.														
However, there are likely to be negative effects on a range of objectives for both options. The development of renewable and low carbon technologies is likely to have an effect on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage (SA Objectives 3, 5 and 9). The Preferred Option may have greater effects in this regard. However, there is uncertainty for both options as the location and scale of potential development is not known at this stage. However, it is assumed that if locations are identified within an opportunities map for community and utility scale renewable energy projects, that these locations will be subject to assessment for potential impacts.														
Mitigation														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidance or mitigation of effects through the policy provisions and the planning application process. 														
Assumptions														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None. 														
Uncertainties														
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The location and scale of renewable and low carbon energy developments. 														

Issue HNC16 - How can we ensure that infrastructure is delivered at the right time to support development?

Issue HNC														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
HNC 16A	+/?	+/?	+/?	0	+/?	+	+/?	0	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?
HNC 16B	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	++
HNC 16C	++/?	++/?	+	0	++/?	+	++/?	0	++/?	++/?	++/?	++/?	++/?	++/?

Commentary:

Likely Significant Effects

Option 16A would see a continuation of the current approach to infrastructure delivery. The current Local Plan does not contain a policy which sets out when infrastructure should be provided to best support development. Instead, the timing of infrastructure provision is negotiated at the planning application stage. Although this approach provides flexibility at the point of decisions, it can be difficult to secure the delivery of infrastructure at the right time in some cases; such as where there may be viability issues. Option 16B sets clear requirements that necessary infrastructure must be provided in a timely manner to address the impacts of development. Option 15C (Preferred option) sets clear requirements for necessary infrastructure to be provided at the right time and explore opportunities to deliver critical infrastructure ahead of development.

A mixture of positive and uncertain effects are identified across the majority of the SA objectives reflecting that negotiation of infrastructure requirements at the planning application would help to mitigate any negative effects from development but some uncertainty in relation to securing the provision of this infrastructure to address negative effects. Positive effects for option 16B are identified across the majority of the objectives due to the requirement for the timely provision of infrastructure to address the impacts of development such that negative effects on the environment are avoided.

A mixture of significant positive and uncertain effects from option 15C are identified across the majority of the objectives reflecting that provision of infrastructure at the right time to address the impacts of development and exploring opportunities to deliver infrastructure ahead of development would maximise the benefits of infrastructure provision mitigating the effects of development. Provision of infrastructure ahead of development would also help to maximise the positive mitigating impacts of such infrastructure but there is some uncertainty at this stage.

All options are considered to have neutral effects on waste (SA objective 8). Whilst all of these options would help to deliver new infrastructure in Canterbury and in turn generate waste, all waste would need to be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.

Mitigation

- Policies promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- Policies seeking to protect and enhance the environment.

- Incorporation of SuDS into new development.
 - Policies promoting good design.
- Assumptions**
- For any new development in Minerals Safeguarding Areas, consideration would be given to prior extraction of minerals.
 - Development would avoid important biodiversity sites.
 - Development would avoid geologically important sites.
 - Waste would be managed in accordance with relevant standards to minimise the amount of residual waste produced.
 - Development would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.
- Uncertainties**
- The precise location of development.
 - There is some uncertainty in relation to securing the provision of infrastructure and impact on the viability of development.

Issue HNC17 - How should we address changes in development viability at planning application stage?

Issue HNC16 - How should we address changes in development viability at planning application stage?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
HNC 17A	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+/?	NA	+/?	NA	NA
HNC 17B	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+/?	NA	+/?	NA	NA
HNC 17C	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	+/?	NA	+/?	NA	NA

Commentary:
Likely significant effects
 Option HNC17A would see a continuation of the current approach to accepting viability assessments. The Council currently accept viability assessments at planning stage but encourage them to be submitted at pre-application stage if there are any early concerns about viability, in order to prevent potentially long delays created by a review of viability at the planning approval stage.
 Option HNC17B - No new viability evidence is accepted at planning application stage. Option 17C (Preferred Option) sets clear and limited criteria where new viability evidence is accepted at planning application stage.

All three options are considered to have positive effects on housing (SA objective 10) and the economy (SA objective 12). All of the options seek to ensure that viability concerns will not cause long delays in determining planning applications which should help in turn to minimise any delays in the delivery. However, greater certainty for the housing marking may be established by the Preferred Option. As these options are concerned with viability there is no clear relationship with the achievement of the majority of the objectives.

Mitigation

- None.

Assumptions

- None.

Uncertainties

- There is some uncertainty related to implementation.