

# Appendix I: Appraisal of Policy Sections – Canterbury, Whitstable, Herne Bay, Rural Areas

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

NB: where more than one symbol is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. No colour has been used in these circumstances. 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.



## 2. Canterbury

### SA Objective 1. To reduce air pollution and encourage improvements in air quality

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	+/-	-/?	-	-	-	-/?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-/?	-/?	-	-	-	-	-/?	-	-/?	-/?	-/?

**Likely significant effects**

The policies would result in residential and/or economic development. Development is likely to result in some effect on local air quality through its construction and operation. The policies seek to create sites that are accessible by active and sustainable means, helping to reduce the potential effects on local air quality from transportation. Despite this, most of the policies are identified as having a minor negative effect, especially after according with the other policies of the draft Local Plan. Policy C1 would incorporate public realm and connectivity improvements which are likely to support air quality improvements. Some positive effects are therefore assessed.

Polices C6, C7, C8, C12, C13, C21, C23 would support the provision of, amongst other things, new bus routes, public transport improvement and/or requirement for bus stops within their developments, ensuring that such large sites are well serviced by public transport. Policy C14 specifically requires the development of its site to be well connected to the public transport network.

Policy C2’s associated site is within the Canterbury AQMA and was identified as having a significant negative effect on this objective. The policy does seek a ‘car free’ development which is likely to support achievement of the objective, by reducing occupational emissions although emissions to air will be experienced during construction. Policies C6, C17 and C18 would result in development that is within 500m of the Canterbury AQMA. These policies are scored as having a minor negative effect with some uncertainty. A number of measures in C6 (including new and improved walking and cycling connections and park and ride however may reduce traffic congestion within with the Canterbury AQMA). C17 and C18 would seek a ‘car free’ development which would support less vehicle (and associated emissions use). Military Road is within the Canterbury AQMA although it is unclear as to the development that may take place under C25.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**



It is not known how likely the policies within close proximity to the Canterbury AQMA could affect this AQMA.

**SA Objective 2. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
 The policies would all result in encouraging residential and/or economic development. Development is likely to result in the creation of emissions/Greenhouse gases through its construction and operation. The policies do seek to create sites that are accessible by active and sustainable means, helping to reduce the potential effects by reducing the amount of emissions/Greenhouse gases produced from transportation.

Polices C1, C6, C7, C8, C12, C13, C21, C23 would all provide new bus routes, public transport improvement and/or requirement for bus stops within their developments, ensuring that such large sites are well serviced by public transport. Policy C14 specifically requires the development of its site to be well connected to the public transport network and the new facilities proposed within other policies. Despite this, the policies are identified as having a minor negative effect.

**Mitigation**  
 Local plan policies that seek to ensure energy efficiency would help to mitigate GHG emissions produced within new development. **Assumptions**  
 It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 3. To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13
--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----



<b>Score</b>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/- -	+/- -	-	-	-	-/?	-/?	+/- -	-	-	
<b>Policy</b>	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	-	+/-	-/?	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	++	?	?	+ +/- -/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C20 and C21 would see the development of mainly greenfield land. Such sites are therefore also identified with an uncertain effect as it has been assumed the site would compromise of biodiversity assets more than brownfield sites. Similarly, policy C15 would see the development of mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. Policies C2, C17, C18, C19, C22 and C23 would only see the development of mainly brownfield land.

Sites associated with policies C2, C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C15, C19, C20, C21, C22 and C23 have been identified as having the potential to affect an International/National designation (often Ancient Woodlands), local designation and/or protected species. Many of the policies identified above identify a need for open spaces, landscape buffers, green infrastructure, habitat improvement, rectification of habitat severance, the provision of pollinator habitats and other requirements to aid in mitigating their effects on biodiversity assets and species. Policies also often contain a requirement for 20% net biodiversity gain, though the likelihood of this occurring is uncertain. All of the policies would also have to accord with the other policies of the Local Plan.

Policies C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C20 and C21 are identified as having a minor negative effect. Policy C15 would have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects. Policies C17, C18, C19, C22 and C23 are identified as having minor positive effects.

Policy C16 would see the creation of a new Canterbury Eastern Movement Corridor and would have minor negative effects. Similarly, Policy C10 would see the creation of a new South West Canterbury Link Road. Minor negative effects are identified for these policies. However, there is some uncertainty depending on the assets associated with specific routes identified in the future detailed design phase.

Policy C1 contains the Canterbury City Centre Strategy, which encourages development within Canterbury City Centre, where the chance of development compromising local biodiversity assets is limited. Policy C3 is similar by identifying and encouraging the regeneration of 13 sites within the City Centre and this regeneration is unlikely to significantly compromise biodiversity assets. Both policies have the potential to provide new open spaces, that could aid local biodiversity/species. A minor positive and minor negative effect is identified for these policies.

Policy C4 supports development within the wider Canterbury Urban Area and supports the developments that would be provided by policies C5-C22, C23 and policy C24. Similarly, policy C5 provides criteria for what the four sites it governs should provide. Both of these policies identify a need for open space and policy C5 identifies a need for the enhancement of biodiversity and habitat connectivity, especially for the Larkey Valley Wood, the disused Elham Valley Railway and along the River Stour. Policy C11 provides similar requirements for the three sites it governs. These policies would therefore have a minor positive to significant negative effects.



Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an uncertain effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An uncertain effect is therefore identified.

Policy C24 seeks to deliver a strategic wetland which would create a large amount of wetland habitat. The policy seeks to offset the impact of development on the nitrogen and phosphate levels at Stodmarsh and therefore a significant positive effect is identified.

Some uncertainties are identified about the in-combination effects of the allocations identified in the HRA Reg. 18.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
It has been assumed that greenfield land is more bio-diverse than brownfield land.  
It is assumed the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing the potential negative effects of development resulting from these policies.

**Uncertainties**  
It is not known to what degree every site could provide 20% biodiversity net gain.  
Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 4. To conserve geological sites and safeguard mineral resources within the District**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	0	0	0	-	-	-/?	0	-/?	0	-/?	-/?	-/?	-	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-/?	-/?	-/?	0	0	0	-/?	-/?	-/?	0	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
All of the policies would encourage some form of development at some point, resulting in the use of mineral resources. Many of the associated sites to the policies are within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA) (which covers much of the central area of the district). Policy C6, C8, C12, C14, C15, C20, C21 and C22 require provision of a minerals assessment as these locations have been identified by KCC as having the potential to compromise mineral resources



that have yet to be extracted, though the likelihood of such resources being compromised is unknown. Merton Park also includes a RIGS, which the policy seeks to integrate effectively into the site. A minor negative effect is identified.

**Mitigation**

Policy C13 could include reference to provision of a minerals assessment.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

It is not known how likely policy C6 would compromise currently untapped mineral resources.

**SA Objective 5. To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the District for people and wildlife**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	--	--	--	-	-	-/?	--	--	--	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-/?	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	-/?	0	+/-	+	+/-/?	+/-/?	+/- -/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C1, C2, C3, C4, C17, C18, C19 and C23 would create/encourage development primarily within the existing built environment of Canterbury, ensuring their landscape effects would be minimal and providing opportunities for the character of the built environment of Canterbury to be enhanced. A mixture of minor positive to minor negative effects are identified.

Policies C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C10, C11, C12, C13, C14, C15, C16, C20, and C22 would create/encourage development on the edge of Canterbury's existing built environment or result in considerable infilling. Such development could have effects on local landscapes and townscapes, as the development in such places can cause a change to local character. Negative effects are identified.

Policies C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C15, C20, C21, C22 all contain landscape mitigation and enhancement factors, such as the planting of landscape buffers/woodland, requirements for development to incorporate opportunities to support the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal and adopting measures to preserve local amenity etc. These measures are considered likely to help mitigate the landscape effects assessed in



the associated site assessments. Whilst policies C6, C7, C12, C13 include requirements for landscaping and buffers to mitigate the visual impact of the development, it is considered that the potential for significant negative effects on landscape (identified in site assessments) remain. Policies C5 and C11 are also identified as having similar effects. Policies C10 and C16 would create new road infrastructure that could have significant negative effects on local landscapes. However, there is uncertainty depending on the specific route and detailed design, which could mitigate and reduce such effects. Minor with uncertainty is assessed. The site associated with Policy C21 is within the Kent Downs AONB and located within a rural location. Significant negative effects assessed through the site assessment remain. However, the landscaping measures in the policy wording could reduce these effects through implementation.

Policy C24 would create strategic wetland, enhancing the natural environment and landscapes of its surroundings. A positive effect is identified.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen. There are potentially positive and negative effects on landscape and townscape although this is uncertain. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An uncertain effect is therefore identified although there is potential for positive and negative effects on landscape/townscape.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
None.

**Uncertainties**  
Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 6. To protect water resources and ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	0	0	0	0	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	0	-	+/-	+/-	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	+	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	?	?	+ +/-/?



**Likely significant effects**

Policy C24 would create a new wetland habitat, helping to improve water quality and therefore a significant positive effect is identified. The provision of wetland would support water quality improvements at Stodmarsh.

The following policies are identified as having negatives effects on water resources and local water bodies and/or ground water: C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C22 and C23. C5, C11 and C17 to C23 are also likely to increase pressures on water resource through new development. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would help to mitigate these effects, through for example water efficiency measures.

Policies C6, C7, C12 and C13 require the creation of new wastewater treatment works and policy C15 requires connections from its site to be made to the wastewater treatment works created by policies C12 and C13. This would ensure wastewater is properly managed for the developments delivered by these policies. Policies C6, C7, C12 and C13 would therefore have a mixture of minor negative to minor positive effects, with policy C15 having a minor positive effect.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is brief and high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An uncertain effect is therefore identified.

The remaining policies are all identified as having a mixture of minor negative to neutral effects on local water bodies and/or ground water, with effects being mitigated by the other policies of the Local Plan.

A mix of significant and minor positive effect is assessed overall with some uncertainty.

**Mitigation**

The inclusion of water efficiency measures.

**Assumptions**

It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would reduce any negative effects.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 7. To reduce the risk of flooding and where appropriate prevent coastal erosion**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13
Score	+	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	-/?	++	++	++





Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	++	-/?	++	++	++	++	++	++	--	++	?	?	+ +/- -/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C2, C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C19, C20, C21 and C22 would allow for development in areas not at risk of flooding and are therefore identified as having significant positive effects. Policies C4, C5 and C11 support the development of envisaged in the above policies and therefore are also identified as having a significant positive effect.

Policy C23 would create development within a Flood Zone 2 or 3 area, therefore would be at risk of flooding and would have significant negative effects on this objective – although site specific FRA would help to address or reduce this risk. Policies C10 and C16 would create new infrastructure routes within Canterbury and portions of these new roads could be within areas at risk of flooding, although neither indicative route is located within the prominent areas of flood risk within Canterbury. Policies C10 and C16 are also identified as having negative effects with some uncertainties on this basis.

Policies C1 is a wide ranging policy and C3 is focused on regeneration opportunity areas within Canterbury City Centre, a minor positive effect is identified for these policies.

Policy C24 would create new wetland habitat that could aid in the management of the surrounding areas flood risk and would have significant positive effects.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An unknown effect is therefore identified as the flood risk within these areas are not known.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C10 and C16 might not create roads/infrastructure within areas at risk of flooding when such development is implemented, as areas at risk of flooding could be routed around/minimised considerably.

**SA Objective 8. To promote sustainable waste management**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-/?	-	-	-	-

#### **Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would encourage or result in development at some point and any amount of development would result in the production of waste (through construction and when buildings are occupied). The policies are therefore assessed on the basis that they would have minor negative effects. It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any waste generated by these policies is kept to a minimum, with waste being properly recycled and disposed of as necessary.

Policy C23 has the potential to provide a waste depot to aid in the correct management of waste, though uncertainty exists around whether such a development would be created.

#### **Mitigation**

None.

#### **Assumptions**

It is assumed the other policies of the Local Plan and Kent Mineral and Waste Local Plan would work to ensure any development encouraged or created by these policies properly recycles and disposes of their waste.

#### **Uncertainties**

It is not known how likely a waste depot would be created by policy C23.

### **SA Objective 9. To preserve, enhance, promote and capitalise on the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District's historic environment**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13
--------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----



<b>Score</b>	+	+/-	+/-/?	0	0	-	0	0	0	-/?	0	-	-	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>C14</b>	<b>C15</b>	<b>C16</b>	<b>C17</b>	<b>C18</b>	<b>C19</b>	<b>C20</b>	<b>C21</b>	<b>C22</b>	<b>C23</b>	<b>C24</b>	<b>C25</b>	<b>C26</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	-	0	-/?	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	+	?	?	<b>+/-/?</b>

**Likely significant effects**

Policy C1 sets out the overarching strategy for Canterbury City Centre which would, amongst other things, seek to enhance the World Heritage Site and improve the public realm around and connecting key heritage assets. These provisions would support achievement of this objective. Policy C3 may have positive or negative effects depending on improvements to public realm and regeneration opportunities developed which may support the historic environment within the city.

Policies C2, C6, C12, C13, C14, C17, C18, C20, C21 and C23 have been identified as having potential negative effects on local heritage and/or archaeological assets. C6 includes measures to mitigate adverse impacts on the World Heritage Site with provision of viewing corridors from open space and PRowS crossing the site. C7 includes similar measures.

Policy C2 identifies a need for development to protect heritage assets including Old Dover Road, Oaten Hill and St Lawrence Conservation Area, and nearby Listed and Locally Listed Buildings on Dover Street. Policies C12 and C13 both seek to protect heritage assets, Listed Buildings, and the views and setting of the World Heritage Site. Policies C14 and C15 seek to ensure the development they create would not compromise nearby Listed Buildings. Policy C17 affords protection to nearby Listed Buildings, Conservation Area and Areas of Archaeological Importance/Potential. Policies C18, C21 and C23 seek to ensure the development they create protects Areas of Archaeological Importance and local Listed Buildings. This means such policies mitigate the potential negative effects of site development to some degree.

Policies C10 and C16 would create road infrastructure that has the potential to affect local heritage and archaeological assets, though the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing these effects to some degree. The overall effect is uncertain to some extent and future detailed design processes should take into account designated and undesignated heritage assets to ensure effects are mitigated or avoided.

Policy C24 would create wetland habitat that would likely conserve the setting of surrounding heritage assets, resulting in minor positive effects.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An unknown effect is therefore identified as sufficient information is not known to identify potential effects on local heritage assets.

The other policies are identified as having neutral effects as the other policies of the Local Plan mitigate their effects.

**Mitigation**

Policies for the South West Link Road (C10) and Eastern Movement Corridor (C16) could include specific reference to the requirement for consideration of designated and undesignated assets through detailed design.

**Assumptions**

It has been assumed that where policies are not self-mitigating, the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing the negative effects generated by the Canterbury policies.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 10. To ensure the supply of high quality homes, which cater for identified needs**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	NA	NA	++	NA	+/?	+/?	++

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C11, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C19, C20 and C23 would all provide or encourage some housing and would therefore have significant positive effects. Policies C1 would also support some residential development in Canterbury city centre which would support this objective.

Policies C10 and C16 would provide new road infrastructure that would support access and enhance connectivity to nearby housing developments/existing communities. A minor positive effect is identified.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for residential development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, a minor positive but uncertain effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, which would likely contain some residential development, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. A minor positive but uncertain effect is therefore identified as the ambitions for these sites could change (i.e. instead of a garden village non-residential could developed).

The remaining policies would bear no relation to this SA Objective.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 11. To promote the sustainable use of land and conserve soil quality**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	++	++	++	+ +/ - -	--	--	--	--	- / ?	--	--	--	--	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	--	+ / - -	--	++	++	++	--	--	++	++	+ / ?	?	- / ?	+ + / - -

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C20 and C21 would see the development of mainly greenfield land or agricultural land, though it is important to note that an up to date site specific agricultural assessment is not available for all sites. Such sites are therefore also identified with an uncertain effect as it has been assumed the site would compromise agricultural land. A significant negative effect is therefore identified.

Similarly, policy C15 would see the development of a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. A mixture of minor positive to significant negative effect is identified.

Policies C2, C17, C18, C19, C22 and C23 would only see the development of mainly brownfield land and are therefore scored as having a significant positive effect.

Policies C10 and C16 would have significant negative effects due to them likely using greenfield land to develop road infrastructure.

Policies C3, C4, C5 and C11 encourage and support the development proposed by developments in other policies and have been scored appropriately based on how likely the policies they support would develop greenfield and/or brownfield land. Policy C1 provides an overarching strategy for the revitalisation of Canterbury city centre which would support, amongst other things, development in previously developed areas.

Policy C24’s creation of wetland habitat has the potential to consume greenfield land but would use it to create a protected wetland that could conserve soil resources. A positive but uncertain effect is therefore identified.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. However, it is likely that some greenfield land would be required if the opportunity area was brought forward. A negative but uncertain effect is therefore identified.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 12. To achieve a strong and sustainable economy, and revitalise town, local and rural centres**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	++	++	++	++	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	++	++	+	++	+	+	++	++	++	NA	?	?	++

**Likely significant effects**

Policies C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C11, C12, C13, C15, C18, C21, C22 and C23 would aid in the creation of some form of economic development or development that would improve/revitalise city, town, local and rural centres. Many of these policies would also provide housing and other development



that would support the local economy (accessibility improvements, educational development etc). A significant positive effect is therefore identified. The infrastructure improvements created by C10 and C16 could aid the local economy considerably and a significant positive effect is identified on this basis.

Policies C8, C9, C14, C17, C19 and C20 would only encourage residential development and would therefore have a minor positive effect due to the benefits new residential development brings to local economies.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An unknown effect is therefore identified as the use of these sites could change from what has been identified at this stage.

Policy C24 and its creation of wetland habitat bears no relationship to this SA Objective.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 13. To promote and encourage sustainable transport**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>C2</b>	<b>C3</b>	<b>C4</b>	<b>C5</b>	<b>C6</b>	<b>C7</b>	<b>C8</b>	<b>C9</b>	<b>C10</b>	<b>C11</b>	<b>C12</b>	<b>C13</b>	
<b>Score</b>	++	+	+	+ +/-	+ +/-	+ +/-	+ +/-	+/-	+/-	+ +/-	+ +/-	+/-	+/-	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>C14</b>	<b>C15</b>	<b>C16</b>	<b>C17</b>	<b>C18</b>	<b>C19</b>	<b>C20</b>	<b>C21</b>	<b>C22</b>	<b>C23</b>	<b>C24</b>	<b>C25</b>	<b>C26</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	+/-	+	+ +/-	+	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	++	NA	?	?	+ +/-/?

**Likely significant effects**



Many of the policies would create accessibility and transportation improvements across Canterbury to ensure their respective developments are accessible places by sustainable and active travel methods. Such improvements are wide ranging and include cycle routes, Public Rights of Way improvements, bus lanes, one way systems to improve traffic flow, and priority for public transport to name a few.

Policies C6, C7, C8, C12, C13, C21, C23 include requirements for public transportation improvements, new bus routes and/or creation of bus stops to be created, which would generate positive effects. Policies C5 and C6 identify a need for park and ride facilities, which would increase the accessibility of bus transportation and encourage its use. A positive effect is identified. Policy C14 requires development to ensure it maximises any connectivity to surrounding public transport, which would generate positive effects. Whilst the policies themselves seek to ensure the associated developments would be as well connected and accessible as possible, it is likely the development created by these policies would be primarily reliant on private vehicle use, based on current transport use. Some negative effects are therefore also assessed. Policies C10 and C16 identify safeguarded routes for significant transport infrastructure delivery. These are likely to have significant effects on transport aid in efforts to reduce congestion in the city centre, although would likely increase vehicle use outside the city centre.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an uncertain effect is identified. Similarly, Policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An unknown effect is therefore identified as it is not known what accessibility and public transport requirements the development of these sites might require at this stage.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

**SA Objective 14. To promote safe, healthy, inclusive and sustainable communities**

Policy	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	
Score	++	++	++	++	++	+ +/-	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	
Policy	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18	C19	C20	C21	C22	C23	C24	C25	C26	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	+ +/-	++	++	+ +/-	++	++	++	++	++	++	?	?	+ +/-/?



**Likely significant effects**

The policies would create or help to create safe spaces (including open spaces) that often encourage healthy lifestyles through the promotion of sustainable and/or active travel. Such improvements also ensure the communities these policies would create through site delivery are interconnected with surrounding communities. Often the policies have a provision for development to improve the accessibility of schools, health and community facilities. Unless identified otherwise, these connectivity improvements, creation of new communities and other elements of the policies (some identified below) ensure these policies would have a significant positive effect.

Policies C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C11, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C19 and C20 afford protection to and/or encourage the creation of open spaces within the CCC area. Policies C4, C5, C6, C7, C11, C12 and C13 would seek to ensure the provision of new schools/educational facilities. Policy C4, C5, C6, C7, would support the creation of new health facilities. The creation of new facilities would generate significant positive effects.

Policy C18 could result in the loss of a leisure facility, though the policy does require this loss to be replaced. Similarly, policies C6 and C15 would result in the loss of open space and community facilities, but the policies do seek to ensure new open space is developed. A mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified for these policies.

Policy C24 would create new wetland habitat that could be used by local communities, creating significant positive effects.

Policy C25 identifies Military Road as an opportunity area for development that might be developed over the lifetime of the plan for residential development, though as it is not known if such development would happen, an unknown effect is identified. Similarly, policy C26 identifies the ambitions of the University of Kent to develop a garden community within its landholdings, though the policy is high level as such ambitions are in their early stages. An unknown effect is therefore identified as a detailed design that identifies what possible community, health or educational facilities these policies would provide is not known at this stage of the assessment.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policies C25 and C26 are not sufficiently advanced to be able to assess their effects accurately against this SA Objective.

## Canterbury - Summary text

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Cumulative Effects Score	-/?	-	+ +/- -/?	-	+/- -/?	+ +/-/?	+ +/- -/?	-	+/-/?	++	+ +/- -	++	+ +/-/?	+ +/-/?

- 1.1.1 New development is likely to result in some air quality effects (SA Objective 1) from the developments construction and operation. Whilst the air quality effects (SA Objective 1) of traffic generated by these developments can be offset through public transport or active travel improvements, such effects can never be entirely mitigated. Therefore, the policies within 500m of the Canterbury AQMA were scored as having minor negative effects with uncertainties, as their effects could be significant. Policy C2 is within this AQMA and therefore a significant negative effect was identified, though the policy does require its development to be 'car free'. Policy C2 is therefore scored as having a minor negative with uncertain effects. The remaining policies are all identified as having a minor negative effect.
- 1.1.2 Similar to the policies effects on air quality (SA Objective 1), the policies have been identified as having a minor negative effect in terms of their contribution towards Greenhouse gases and emissions (SA Objective 2), as such emissions are hard to mitigate and even public transport produces emission to some degree.
- 1.1.3 In terms of the policies effects on biodiversity (SA Objective 3) the policies would provide a wide range of effects. The policies set out a requirement for 20% biodiversity net gain, alongside open space, and other environmental improvements, though it is important to note that uncertainty exists regarding some policies capacity to meet such requirements. Several of the policies would result in the consumption of a large amount of greenfield land, which is a significant loss of habitat. The policies therefore often provided either minor negative or a mixture of minor negative and minor positive effects. Policy C24, through the creation of wetland habitat, would have a significant positive effect on local biodiversity (SA Objective 3) and policies C17, C18, C19, C22 and C23 would have minor positive effects. Due to the size of the development, they govern, policies C4, C5 and C11 are scored as having significant negative effects with the potential for some minor positives.
- 1.1.4 The policies would result in the use of mineral resources (SA Objective 4). Policy C6, C8, C12, C14, C15, C20, C21 and C22 require provision of a minerals assessment as these locations have been identified as having the potential to compromise mineral resources that have yet to be extracted, though the likelihood of such resources being compromised is unknown. A minor negative to uncertain effect is identified for these policies, with the remaining policies being scored as neutral.
- 1.1.5 A mix of minor positive and significant negative effects are assessed for landscape (SA Objective 5). Policies C1, C2, C3, C4, C17, C18, C19 and C23 would create/encourage development primarily within the existing built environment of Canterbury, and could provide opportunities for the character of the built environment of Canterbury to be enhanced. A mixture of minor positive to minor negative effects are identified for their effects on landscapes. Policy C24 would help to improve local landscapes through the creation of wetland habitats, providing positive effects. Whilst

policies C6, C7, C12, C13 include requirements for landscaping and buffers to mitigate the visual impact of the development, it is considered that the potential for significant negative effects on landscape (identified in site assessments) remain. Policies C5 (covering south west Canterbury overall) and C11 (covering east Canterbury overall) are also identified as having similar effects. Policies C10 and C16 would create new road infrastructure that could have significant negative effects on local landscapes. However, there is uncertainty depending on the specific route and detailed design, which could mitigate and reduce such effects.

- 1.1.6 The following policies are identified as having significant negative effects on local water bodies and/or ground water (SA Objective 6): C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C22 and C23. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would be able to mitigate these effects to be only minor negative. Policies C5, C17, C18, C19, C20 and C21 were also identified as having a minor negative effect on water resources (SA Objective 6).
- 1.1.7 A mix of significant positive and minor negative effects are assessed for water resource and quality (SA Objective 6). The provision of wetland under Policy C24 would support water quality improvements at Stodmarsh which is likely to have significant positive effects on water quality. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would help to mitigate effects on water resource, through for example water efficiency measures. Policies C6, C7, C12 and C13 require the creation of new wastewater treatment works and policy C15 requires connections from its site to be made to the wastewater treatment works created by policies C12 and C13. This would ensure wastewater is properly managed for the developments delivered by these policies, supporting water quality improvements.
- 1.1.8 Policies C2, C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C19, C20, C21 and C22 would allow for development in areas not at risk of flooding (SA Objective 7) and are therefore identified as having significant positive effects. Policies C4, C5 and C11 support the development of these policies and therefore are also identified as having a significant positive effect. Policy C24 would create new wetland habitat that could aid in the management of the surrounding areas flood risk (SA Objective 7) and would have significant positive effects.
- 1.1.9 Policy C23 would create development within a Flood Zone 2 or 3 area, therefore would be at risk of flooding (SA Objective 7) and would have significant negative effects. Policies C10 and C16 would create new infrastructure routes within Canterbury and portions of these new roads could be within areas at risk of flooding. Policies C10 and C16 are also identified as having minor negative effects with some uncertainties on this basis.
- 1.1.10 Policies C1 is a wide ranging policy and C3 is focused on regeneration opportunity areas within Canterbury City Centre, a minor positive effect is identified for these policies (SA Objective 7).
- 1.1.11 All of the policies would encourage or result in development at some point and any amount of development would result in the production of waste (SA Objective 8). The policies are therefore assessed on the basis that they would have minor negative effects. It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any waste generated by these policies is kept to a minimum, with waste being properly recycled and disposed of as necessary. Policy C23 has the potential to provide a waste depot to aid in the correct management of waste, though uncertainty exists around whether such a development would be created.
- 1.1.12 The policies in this section contain a range of measures to protect and enhance the assets within the city including the World Heritage Site (WHS) and measures to mitigate impacts on view and setting of the WHS in new development locations. Policies C2, C6, C12, C13, C14, C17, C18, C20, C21 and C23 have been identified as having potential negative effects on local heritage and/or archaeological assets (SA Objective 9). Policies C2, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C21 and C23 all contain some form of heritage asset protection in order to aid in mitigating these policies effects

on local heritage assets (SA Objective 9) to some degree. Policy C1 would have minor positive effects through potentially supporting the enhancement of Canterbury's heritage assets. Policy C3 would have a mixed score of minor positive and minor negative effects with uncertainties.

- 1.1.13 Policies C10 and C16 would create road infrastructure that has the potential to significantly affect local heritage and archaeological assets (SA Objective 9), though the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing these effects to some degree, ensuring they only have minor negative effects with some uncertainties. Policy C24 would create wetland habitat that would likely conserve the setting of surrounding heritage assets, resulting in minor positive effects. The remaining policies have been identified as having neutral effects on heritage assets (SA Objective 9).
- 1.1.14 Policies C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C11, C12, C13, C14, C15, C17, C18, C19, C20 and C23 would all provide or encourage some amount of housing (SA Objective 10) and would therefore have significant positive effects. Policies C10 and C16 would provide new road infrastructure that would support and enhance nearby housing developments/existing communities (SA Objective 10). A minor positive effect is identified for these policies. Policy C1 would have a minor positive effect with policies C25 and C26 having a minor positive to uncertain effect.
- 1.1.15 Policies C6, C7, C8, C9, C12, C13, C14, C20 and C21 would see the development of mainly greenfield land or agricultural land, though it is important to note that an up to date site specific agricultural assessment is not available for all sites. Such sites are therefore also identified with an uncertain effect as it has been assumed the site would compromise agricultural land. A significant negative effect is therefore identified for these policies effects on sustainable land use (SA Objective 11). Policies C10 and C16 would have significant negative effects due to them likely using greenfield land to develop road infrastructure.
- 1.1.16 Policy C15 would see the development of a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. A mixture of minor positive to significant negative effect is identified to reflect this.
- 1.1.17 Policies C2, C17, C18, C19, C22 and C23 would only see the development of mainly brownfield land and are therefore scored as having a significant positive effect for the sustainable use of land (SA Objective 11). Policy C26 would potentially develop some greenfield land and is therefore scored as minor negative with uncertainties.
- 1.1.18 Policies C1, C3, C4, C5 and C11 encourage and support the development proposed by the other developments and have been scored appropriately based on how likely the policies they support would develop greenfield and/or brownfield land.
- 1.1.19 Policy C24's creation of wetland habitat has the potential to consume greenfield land but would use it to create a protected wetland that could conserve soil resources. An uncertain effect is therefore identified for its sustainable land use (SA Objective 11) effects.
- 1.1.20 Policies C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C11, C12, C13, C15, C18, C21, C22 and C23 would aid in the creation of some form of economic development or development that would improve/revitalise city, town, local and rural centres (SA Objective 12). Many of these policies would also provide housing and other development that would support the local economy (accessibility improvements, educational development etc). A significant positive effect is therefore identified. The infrastructure improvements created by C10 and C16 could aid the local economy (SA Objective 12) considerably and a significant positive effect is identified on this basis.
- 1.1.21 Policies C8, C9, C14, C17, C19 and C20 would only encourage residential development and would therefore have a minor positive effect due to the benefits new residential development brings to local economies (SA Objective 12).

- 1.1.22 The policies would cumulatively have significant positive and minor negative effects in terms of encouraging public and sustainable transport use (SA Objective 13). Policies C6, C7, C8, C12, C13, C21, C23 include requirements for public transportation improvements, new bus routes and/or creation of bus stops to be created, which would generate positive effects. Policies C5 and C6 identify a need for park and ride facilities, which would increase the accessibility of bus transportation and encourage its use. Policy C14 requires development to ensure it maximises any connectivity to surrounding public transport, which would generate positive effects. The proposed improvements in several policies are wide ranging and include cycle routes, Public Rights of Way improvements, bus lanes, one way systems to improve traffic flow, and priority for public transport. Whilst the policies themselves seek to ensure the associated developments would be as well connected and accessible as possible, it is likely the development created by these policies would be primarily reliant on private vehicle use, based on current transport use. Some negative effects are therefore also assessed. Policies C10 and C16 identify safeguarded routes for the South West Link Road and Eastern Movement Corridor. These are likely to have significant effects on aiding efforts to reduce congestion in the city centre although would also likely increase vehicle use outside the city centre.
- 1.1.23 The policies would broadly provide significant positive effects and minor negative effects with regards to creating healthy communities (SA Objective 14). Policies C4, C5, C6, C7, C11, C12 and C13 would seek to ensure the provision of new schools/educational facilities. Policy C4, C5, C6, C7 would require the creation of new health facilities. The creation of new facilities would generate significant positive effects. Though policies C6, C15 and C18 could result in the loss of community facilities these policies do seek to replace this provision. These objectives therefore have a mixed score of significant positive and minor negative effect.
- 1.1.24 Policies C25 and C26 are different to the other policies as these policies are very high level and the effects of these policies will not be identifiable until actual developments come forward under them. Due to this, they have been scored as having a minor negative effect for their effects on air quality (SA Objective 1), climate change (SA Objective 2), mineral resources (SA Objective 4) and waste (SA Objective 8), due to such effects being easier to predict and more a fact of development rather than type or quantity. These policies also scored as having a minor positive and minor negative effect for their landscape effects (SA Objective 5) and minor positive with uncertainties regarding their supply of housing (SA Objective 10). Policy C26 would also likely develop some amount of greenfield land and therefore also scored as having minor negative effects with uncertainties regarding its effects on soil quality (SA Objective 11). Against the remaining SA Objectives, these policies scored as having an uncertain effect.

### **Mitigation**

- 1.1.25 Policy C13 could include reference to provision of a minerals assessment.
- 1.1.26 Policies for the South West Link Road (C10) and Eastern Movement Corridor (C16) could include specific reference to the requirement for consideration of designated and undesignated assets through detailed design.

### **Assumptions**

- 1.1.27 It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing and negative effects of these policies against air quality (SA Objective 1), emissions (SA Objective 2), biodiversity (SA Objective 3), water resources (SA Objective 6), waste (SA Objective 8) and heritage assets (SA Objective 9).

- 1.1.28 It has been assumed that sites with the potential to affect agricultural land, but updated agricultural land information is not known, that quality agricultural land would be affected.
- 1.1.29 It has been assumed that greenfield land is more bio-diverse than brownfield land.

### **Uncertainties**

- 1.1.30 Air quality (SA Objective 1): It is not known how likely the policies within close proximity to the Canterbury AQMA could affect this AQMA significantly.
- 1.1.31 Biodiversity (SA Objective 3): It is not known to what degree agricultural land would be lost and to what degree every site could provide 20% biodiversity net gain.
- 1.1.32 Mineral resources (SA Objective 4): It is now known how likely policy C6 would compromise currently untapped mineral resources.
- 1.1.33 Flooding (SA Objective 7): Policies C10 and C16 might not create roads/infrastructure within areas at risk of flooding when such development is implemented, as areas at risk of flooding could be routed around/minimised considerably.
- 1.1.34 Waste (SA Objective 8): It is not known how likely a waste depot would be created by policy C23.
- 1.1.35 Uncertainties exist as to what effects policies C25 and C26 would have in reality as these policies are high level and effects would be more identifiable once developments proposed under these policies occur in terms of their biodiversity (SA Objective 3), landscape (SA Objective 5), water resources (SA Objective 6), heritage assets (SA Objective 9), housing (SA Objective 10), land use (SA Objective 11), economic growth (SA Objective 12), sustainable transport (SA Objective 13) and healthy and safe communities (SA Objective 14).

## **3. Whitstable**

### **SA Objective 1. To reduce air pollution and encourage improvements in air quality**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	-	-	-	-	+/-

#### **Likely significant effects**

Policy W1 would have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects as it encourages development whilst also encouraging active travel and more sustainable forms of travel through ensuring Whitstable Town Centre is as accessible as possible by walking and cycling. The policy would achieve this

through providing more green infrastructure and sustainable transport improvements, which would reduce the likelihood of the town centres air quality being compromised.

Policy W2 would have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects as it would aid development at Whitstable Harbour, which would comprise of fishing, commercial, business, employment, leisure, parking, and residential development, all of which could contribute to affecting the air quality of the area. The policy and Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan does seek to encourage active and sustainable forms of travel, which would help to reduce the potential effects on air quality from travel to and from Whitstable Harbour.

Policy W3 would have a minor negative effect through supporting development within the Whitstable Urban Area but mitigating its air quality effects by ensuring development accords with a set of criteria, some of which would help to reduce the effects of such development on local air quality and encourage active and sustainable travel methods. Additionally, the development of a Park and Bus could help to reduce congestion and associated air quality impacts which would be positive.

Policy W4 helps to govern the development of three allocated sites (policies W5-W7) and seeks to create sustainable communities and provide environmental improvements. The policy would aid in the creation of infrastructure that better accommodates active and sustainable travel and enhancements to local Public Rights of Way. It would also provide a mobility hub. Policy W4 would support large scale development across South Whitstable, which would create air quality effects from development construction and operation. A mix of effects are therefore identified.

Policy W5 would see the considerable development of the Land at Brooklands Farm site, which would cause air quality effects during its construction and operation. These effects would be reduced by this policy by improving the accessibility of the area by sustainable (new bus route) and active travel methods, mobility hub and creating 15 minute neighbourhoods. A minor negative effect is therefore identified.

Policy W6 would see the considerable development of the Land South of Thanet Way site, which would cause air quality effects during its construction and operation. These effects would be reduced by this policy by improving the accessibility of the area by sustainable and active travel methods and creating 15 minute neighbourhoods and a new park and bus facility. A mix of effects are therefore identified.

Policy W7 would see the development of the Land at Golden Hill site, which would cause air quality effects during its construction and operation. These effects would be reduced by this policy by improving the accessibility of the area by sustainable and active travel. Policy W8 is similar, though it would see associated development at the Bodkin Farm site. A minor negative effect is therefore identified for these policies.

Policies W9 and W10 would see the development of the associated small sites of St Vincent's Centre site and 37 Kingsdown Park site, respectively. The development of these sites would create air quality effects from their construction and operation, though the sites are small in scale and the policies offer little to mitigate such effects. A very minor negative effect is therefore identified.

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

#### **Mitigation**

Policies W9 and W10 could make explicit reference to supporting active connectivity by transport measures.

#### **Assumptions**





It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.  
**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 2. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies W1 and W3 would have a minor negative effect through supporting development within the Whitstable Town Centre and Whitstable Urban Area, respectively, but mitigates this by ensuring they are as easy to access by sustainable and active methods as possible, including improvements to cycleways reducing the amount of Greenhouse gases produced from transportation. Policy W1 also seeks to ensure developments within the Town Centre minimise their contribution to climate change and vulnerability to its effects, whilst supporting effective reuse of buildings. A mix of positive and negative effects is assessed.

Policies W2, W4, W5, W6, W7 and W8 would all contribute towards emissions through embodied carbon within construction and emissions during. The policies do mitigate this by encouraging active and sustainable travel, with some of the policies requiring park and bus facilities, mobility hubs, new bus routes, Public Rights of Ways protection/expansion and more. With this mitigation and the other policies of the Local Plan, a minor negative is identified for these policies.

Policies W9 and W10 would also result in development within Whitstable but not of a scale envisioned by the other policies. These policies would still result in the generation of Greenhouse gases and other emissions through their construction and operation from people travelling to and from the sites. A minor negative effect is therefore identified.

**Mitigation**  
 Local plan policies that seek to ensure energy efficiency would help to mitigate GHG emissions produced within new development. Policies W9 and W10 could make explicitly reference to supporting active connectivity by transport measures.

**Assumptions**  
 It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**



None.

**SA Objective 3. To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	0/?	0/?	+/-/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policy W1 requires new development to not compromise existing open spaces, and provide new open spaces and green infrastructure which could create new habitats for the species of Whitstable. The policy also seeks to secure environmental benefits for local communities but would see the generation of development within the Whitstable Town Centre which may have minor effects on species. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects are identified.

Policy W3 affords protection to the open spaces and blue and green infrastructure within the Whitstable Urban Area and seeks to reduce habitat fragmentation and improve ecology within this area. It also seeks to protect and enhance The Swale, Thanet Coast and Tankerton Slopes Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Seasalter Levels Local Nature Reserve and The Duncan Down and Convict’s Wood Local Wildlife Sites due to their ecological value. The policy would also support new development. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified.

Policies W4, W5, W6, W7, W8 and W10 would all result in the creation of development that is within 400m of an International/National biodiversity designation (identified in associated site assessments). Policies W4, W5, W6 and W7 include measures that would see the creation of new grassland, woodland, hedgerows and other priority habitats to aid in mitigating any habitat loss or damage they could cause to the biodiversity assets of the area. W5 also seeks to improve the connectivity of local biodiversity assets, especially at Convicts Wood (this is the only associated site assessment that included ancient woodland / LWS on site) and the policy would mitigate impacts. Policy W6 would seek to enhance Benacre Wood. They also seek to provide 20% biodiversity net gain and create connected biodiversity sites across the sites created by these policies, alongside protecting hedgerows. Policies W5, W6 and W7 are therefore scored as having a minor negative effects. Policy W8 is on the outskirts of the existing built environment of Whitstable but would provide similar mitigation to these policies and is therefore also scored as having a minor negative effect. Policy W2 would see the continued development of Whitstable Harbour which could have associated effects on local biodiversity assets (associated site is within 400m of a range of designated sites). A minor negative effect is identified.

Policy W10, though in close proximity to an important biodiversity designation, is within the built environment on a site that is previously developed. It is therefore considered that the effect on local biodiversity assets is minimal, especially given the small scale nature of the 37 Kingsdown Park site. Whilst



policy W9 is not near to an important biodiversity designation, it is a small urban site similar to W10. Both policies seek to secure 20% biodiversity net gain although given the previously developed character the net gain may be minimal. A neutral effect but uncertain effect is identified for these policies.

Some uncertainties are identified about the in-combination effects of the allocations identified in the HRA Reg. 18.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties** It is not known to what degree every site could provide 20% biodiversity net gain.

**SA Objective 4. To conserve geological sites and safeguard mineral resources within the District**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	0	-/?	0	-/?	-/?	0	0	0	0	0	-/?

**Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would result in the use of mineral resources as they support the creation of new development within Whitstable. None of the policies would see development within in a designated MSA except policies W2 and W5 though the likelihood of such mineral resources being utilised is unlikely given the location of these sites. Policy W5 does require any development to carry out a Minerals Assessment. It is therefore considered that the policies would have a minor negative effect through the consumption of resources, with uncertainties existing around the effects relating to policy W2 and W5. W4 scores the same as this refers to the development included in W5.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

It is not known to what extent the implementation of policies W2 and W5 would prevent the mining of certain mineral resources.

**SA Objective 5. To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the District for people and wildlife**



Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+	+/-	--	--	--	--	-/?	+/?	+/?	+/- -

**Likely significant effects**

The policies would all result in the creation of development within the Whitstable with policies W1 to W8 resulting in larger scale development and policies W9 and W10 resulting in the creation of small scale urban infilling development.

Policy W1 would see the sensitive regeneration of the Whitstable Town Centre, ensuring development is in keeping with its surroundings and is within the existing built environment and is looking to improve the Town Centre environment. Policy W2 would have similar effects but at Whitstable Harbour. These policies would not cause a change in the landscape character of their area (built environment) and could even improve it. Policies W1 and W2 are therefore identified as having minor positive effects.

Policy W3 encourages development within Whitstable Urban Area and does afford protection to important landscape assets such as existing open spaces and specific designated sites. However, the policy is silent on the need to protect landscapes specifically, though does require development within the Whitstable Urban Area to accord with the other policies of the Local Plan. A minor positive and negative effect is therefore identified.

Policies W4, W5, W6 and W7 would see development on the edge of the existing built environment of Whitstable. Such development is therefore more exposed within the existing landscape, with more potential to affect local landscapes. The policies therefore contain considerable mitigation that requires the retention and expansion of existing tree cover and other natural assets and provision of open spaces, grasslands, woodlands, and hedgerows to reduce landscape impacts. The policies also require development to incorporate the landscape enhancements identified within the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. These policies are identified as having a negative effect. Whilst policies W4, W5, W6 and W7 include requirements for landscaping and buffers to mitigate the visual impact of the development, it is considered that the potential for significant negative effects on landscape (identified in site assessments) remain.

Policy W8 would see development located on the edge of Whitstable, potentially compromising local landscapes within the Green Gap. The policy does require the use of natural and semi-natural open spaces in order to reduce its effects on local landscapes, alongside according with the recommendations of the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. A significant negative effect is therefore identified. However, the measures proposed may reduce landscape impacts through implementation so some uncertainty is identified.

Policies W9 and W10 would result in the development of sites within the built environment of Whitstable and upon small sites. Given the size and location of these sites, the development is unlikely to compromise local landscapes and could improve townscape. A minor positive effect is identified for these policies although this is uncertain to some extent.

**Mitigation**

Policy W3 could make specific reference to development within the Whitstable Urban Area to be in accordance with the character and setting of its surroundings.

**Assumptions**  
None.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

**SA Objective 6. To protect water resources and ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	0	-/?	0	-	-/?	-/?	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
The development provided by policies W5 and W6 have been identified as having the potential to compromise local water bodies that are within or close to their respective development site whilst the site associated with W2 is a harbour location. The other policies have not been identified as likely compromising any local water bodies. Through the implementation of the other policies of the Local Plan, potential effects on water bodies and the water environment should be mitigated. Policies W5 and W6 are considered to have a minor negative effect with some uncertainties. However, new development will likely increase pressures on water resource through new development. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would help to mitigate these effects.

**Mitigation**  
The inclusion of water efficiency measures.

**Assumptions**  
It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would successfully ensure any development helps mitigates its potential effects on local water resources/environment.

**Uncertainties**  
It is not known how likely the development resulting from policies W5 and W6 would actually compromise local water bodies.

**SA Objective 7. To reduce the risk of flooding and where appropriate prevent coastal erosion**



Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	-	++	++	-	++	++	-	++	++	++/-

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies W2, W5 and W8 would result in the creation of development in an area at risk of flooding. The other policies would create development in areas not at risk of flooding. Policies W5 and W8 mention the need to ensure residential development is located outside of flood zones 2 and 3 land. Policies W5 and W8 are identified as having a minor negative effect, with policy W1 having a minor positive effect. The other policies are all identified as having a significant positive effect for creating development not at risk of flooding.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 8. To promote sustainable waste management**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
 All of the policies would result in the creation of waste through encouraging a range of development within Whitstable, though the amount of waste produced should be reduced by the application of the other policies contained within the Local Plan. The other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure that such waste is disposed of correctly. The policies are considered to have a minor negative effect.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any waste generated by these policies is kept to a minimum and correctly disposed of.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 9. To preserve, enhance, promote and capitalise on the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District’s historic environment**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+/-	0	0	-	0/?	0/?	0	0	0	+/-

**Likely significant effects**

Policy W5 would create development of a site that would be adjacent to several Grade 2 Listed Buildings, and within close proximity of other heritage assets and a conservation area. The policy includes mitigation measures including a landscape buffer which is considered likely to reduce or mitigate negative effects. Policy W5 would also require for the assessment of Areas of Archaeological Potential. Policies W6 and W7 require assessment and mitigation on any impacts on archaeological potential on the site. Some uncertainty is identified for these policies. The other policies would create development that would not be adjacent to any heritage assets and was not identified as having effects on local heritage assets in the site assessments. It is also likely that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any development created by these policies would mitigate any effects on local heritage assets. Policy W1 seeks to protect the heritage assets of the Whitstable Town Centre. W2 may support enhancement of Whitstable Harbour which may support enhancements. Overall, a mix of positive and negative effects are assessed for these policies.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would work to ensure the development created by these policies would mitigate their effects on the heritage environment to acceptable levels.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 10. To ensure the supply of high quality homes, which cater for identified needs**



Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+/?	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	++

**Likely significant effects**  
 All of the policies would create new housing developments across Whitstable, providing a wide range of high quality homes and some specialist housing to meet the district’s housing need within the Whitstable area. Cumulatively, a significant positive effect is identified for all of these policies.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 11. To promote the sustainable use of land and conserve soil quality**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	++	--	--	--	--	+/-	--	++	++	+ +/-

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies W1, W2, W9 and W10 would see the creation of new development entirely or primarily upon brownfield/previously developed land ensuring this land is repurposed into new uses and potentially ensuring greenfield/high quality land does not need to be developed. A significant positive effect is therefore identified for these policies.

Policy W7 would see the creation of development on a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified for this policy, as the benefits of repurposing brownfield land is offset somewhat by the site still having to use some amount of greenfield land.

The remaining policies would see development on greenfield land, likely resulting in the loss of this land permanently. These policies would have a significant negative effect. Through careful design and the implementation of the other policies of the Local Plan, the potential loss of greenfield land could be kept to a minimum through effective densities. Several of the policies also require detailed design codes to be created that ensures the development created is well designed and in accordance with the garden city principles.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure the amount of greenfield land lost from the implementation of these policies would be kept to a minimum.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 12. To achieve a strong and sustainable economy, and revitalise town, local and rural centres**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	++

**Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would support this SA Objective to some degree as the creation of new housing development and the improvement of the built environments accessibility often leads to improved economic growth and the strengthening of the local economy.

Policy W1 would allow for a wide range of development within the Whitstable Town Centre, seeking to support the Primary Shopping Area and providing new office development. Policy W2 would encourage fishing, commercial, business, employment, leisure, parking, and residential development within Whitstable Harbour.

Policy W3 identifies the Commercial Area at Estuary View should be supported and should complement the town centre by providing new business, commercial and leisure opportunities. It also requires policies W4-W10 to allocate land for the delivery of new homes, infrastructure, business space, community facilities, sports facilities and open space.

Policies W4–W7 would ensure the creation of large scale mixed development, including the creation of new business floorspace and flexible working spaces. These policies would also provide a park and bus facility that would support the accessibility of any business and retail spaces created.



Policies W8, W9 would create smaller scale employment opportunities in the creation of new school, shopping and community facilities opportunities alongside investment in the construction of housing.

Due to providing economic benefits and aiding in the improvement of the accessibility of the Whitstable economy, the policies are cumulatively identified as having a significant positive effect.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 13. To promote and encourage sustainable transport**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+	+/-

**Likely significant effects**

The policies provide new housing and economic development across the Whitstable area. However, the policies each contain requirements for the improvement of the accessibility of Whitstable. The policies require the development of new and improved walking and cycling routes within Whitstable and the improvement of local Public Rights of Way where appropriate to do so.

Policies such as W4–W7 would create large improvements such as through the creation of a park and bus facility (as does policy W3). These parks and bus facilities would encourage the use and increase the accessibility of public transport within Whitstable. Any development created by these policies would have to ensure they have adequate access into the local road infrastructure.

Policies that could or would result in new development (policies W1–W8) would also result in the generation of traffic during construction and operations. Policies W1 and W2 would see the creation of development within the existing built environment of Whitstable, meaning such development is more likely to be serviced by public transport and walking/cycle ways. W1 would also support the vitality of a well-connected town centre. Policy W3 also seeks to ensure that the development created by policies W4-W10 provide appropriate infrastructure to be enhance connectivity.



Policies W5-W8 would create development on the outskirts of the built environment of Whitstable, and whilst the policies themselves and other policies within this section seek to ensure they would be as well connected and accessible as possible, it is likely the development created by these policies would be primarily accessed by private vehicle use.

Policies W9 and W10 would result in the creation of development within the built environment of Whitstable and such development would be small scale, making any traffic generated by these sites small and easier to mitigate. The location of the sites contained within these policies also ensure that future residents are more likely to be able to walk/cycle to necessary services and facilities.

Policies W1, W2, W3, W9 and W10 all scored as having a minor positive effect. The remaining policies are all identified as having a minor positive and minor negative effect.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 14. To promote safe, healthy, inclusive and sustainable communities**

Policy	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-

**Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would aid in the creation of development that would supply some new community, health and/or educational facilities, whilst also providing homes for the existing and future communities of Whitstable. The policies would also ensure that new and existing facilities are more accessible by providing considerable infrastructure and accessibility improvements to Whitstable. Policy W3 ensures the development created by policies W4-W10 provide sufficient community and sports facilities/open spaces. Whilst the policies would create residential development, potentially straining existing facilities, the new facilities provided by the policies should ensure any strain on existing facilities is mitigated. There is potential for the construction and operation of new housing, employment and retail development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes. A mix of positive and negative effect is therefore identified for these policies.

**Mitigation**

None. <b>Assumptions</b>
None. <b>Uncertainties</b>
None.

**Whitstable - Summary text**

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
<b>Cumulative Effects Score</b>	+/-	+/-	+/-	-/?	+/- -	-	+ +/-	-	+/-	++	+ +/- -	++	+/-	+/-

- 1.1.36 The developments created by policies would result in a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects on local air quality (SA Objective 1) for policies W1, W2, W3, W4 and W6, with the remaining policies having a minor negative effect.
- 1.1.37 In terms of producing emissions (SA Objective 2) certain policies do often seek to encourage active and sustainable forms of travel including a Park and Bus facility which is likely to support the objective. Policies W1 and W3 are identified as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects, with the remaining policies having a minor negative effect.
- 1.1.38 Similarly, the creation of development has the potential to affect local biodiversity assets and habitats (SA Objective 3). Policy W1 and W3 include mitigation or aid in ensuring other policies mitigate by requiring these developments to provide high quality open spaces. Whilst the policies would provide open spaces, many of the policies would encourage development on greenfield land and the loss of existing habitats. Policies W9 and W10 however are brownfield sites within the existing built environment of Whitstable and are still required to provide open spaces, potentially resulting in the creation of habitats for biodiversity to enjoy. The policies are also overall governed by a need to provide 20% biodiversity net gain, reducing any significant effects the policies could have to minor negative, with some of the policies then resulting in development that could have minor positive effects. Policies W9 and W10 are identified as having neutral and uncertain effects on biodiversity (SA Objective 3).
- 1.1.39 Policies W2, W4 and W5 would potentially result in the creation of development that could sterilise currently untapped mineral resources (SA Objective 4), though the likelihood of this occurring is unknown and therefore these policies scored as having a minor negative with uncertain effects. The remaining policies scored as having a neutral effect on mineral resources (SA Objective 4).
- 1.1.40 Changes to the built environment has the potential to create effects on local landscapes (SA Objective 5). Policies such as W1, W2, W9 and W10 could improve local landscapes as they would encourage development within the existing built environment of Whitstable and improve its character

and setting. A minor positive effect was identified for these policies with some uncertainties existing regarding W9 and W10. The other policies would result in development on the outskirts of Whitstable's built environment, making such sites ability to mitigate their landscape effects limited. Policies W4, W5, W6, W7 and W8 are identified as having significant negative effects, with policy W8 having uncertainty regarding the mitigation implementation. Policy W3 would have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects due to encouraging such development but also containing requirements for such development to mitigate its landscape effects.

- 1.1.41 Policies W2, W5 and W6 have the potential to affect local water bodies/resources (SA Objective 6) and whilst the other policies of the Local Plan would likely ensure they mitigate their effects, a minor negative and uncertain effect are identified as it is not known to what degree such water assets would be compromised and if the effects can be mitigated. Policies W4, W5, W7, W8, W9 and W10 are identified as having a minor negative effect due to such policies resulting in the greater consumption of water resources (SA Objective 6), whilst policies W1 and W3 would have neutral effects.
- 1.1.42 A mix of significant positive and minor negative effects are assessed for flood risk (SA Objective 7). The majority of associated sites are within Flood Zone 1. Policies W2, W5 and W8 would result in the creation of development in an area at risk of flooding. Policies W5 and W8 mention the need to ensure residential development is located outside of flood zones 2 and 3. Policies W5 and W8 are identified as having a minor negative effect. The other policies are all identified as having a significant positive effect for creating development within flood zone 1.
- 1.1.43 All of the policies would result in the creation of waste (SA Objective 8) though their potential effects would all be mitigated by the other policies of the Local Plan, ensuring such effects would only be minor in reality.
- 1.1.44 Policies W2 and W5 would result in development that has the potential to affect local heritage assets (SA Objective 9) due to it being adjacent to and in close proximity of many heritage assets. The other policies of the Local Plan would ensure the potential effects of policies W2 and W5 on local heritage assets are only minor negative in nature. Policy W1 contains a requirement for the protection of heritage assets within the Whitstable Town Centre, generating minor positive effects. The other policies are considered to be able to ensure they do not compromise the heritage assets of Whitstable and would have neutral effects, though it should be noted that uncertain effects are also identified for policies W6 and W7.
- 1.1.45 All of the policies would result in the creation of high quality housing (SA Objective 10) and therefore they all scored as having either a significant or minor positive effect.
- 1.1.46 The policies would result a wide range of effects on the land (SA Objective 11) of Whitstable. Policies W1, W2, W9 and W10 would see the creation of new development entirely or primarily upon brownfield/previously developed land ensuring this land is repurposed into new uses and potentially ensuring greenfield/high quality land does not need to be developed. A significant positive effect is therefore identified for these policies. Policy W7 would see the creation of development on a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified for this policy, as the benefits of repurposing brownfield land is offset somewhat by the site still having to use some amount of greenfield land.
- 1.1.47 The remaining policies would see development on greenfield land, likely resulting in the loss of this land permanently. Through careful design and the implementation of the other policies of the Local Plan, the potential negative effects from these policies would be mitigated. Several of the policies also require detailed design codes to be created that ensures the development created is well designed and in accordance with the garden city principles. These policies would have a significant negative effect.

- 1.1.48 All of the policies require the creation of some form of development that would provide employment/economic opportunities (SA Objective 12) and improve the accessibility of Whitstable, ensuring existing and future employment opportunities are accessible. This would result in these policies therefore generating either significant or minor positive effects.
- 1.1.49 The policies would provide a range of transport (SA Objective 13) effects. Policies W1, W2, W3, W9 and W10 would all have minor positive effects through creating development within the built environment of Whitstable that also improves the accessibility of these areas. The other policies would see the creation of development in a less accessible location but do require a range of infrastructure improvements to offset this to some degree. These policies are identified as having a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on transport.
- 1.1.50 All of the policies would aid in the creation of development that would supply some amount of new community, health and/or educational facilities (SA Objective 14), whilst also providing homes for the existing and future communities of Whitstable. The policies would also ensure that new and existing facilities are more accessible by providing considerable infrastructure and accessibility improvements to Whitstable. Policy W3 ensures the development created by policies W4-W10 provide sufficient community and sports facilities/open spaces. Whilst the policies would create residential development, potentially straining existing facilities, the new facilities provided by the policies should ensure any strain on existing facilities is mitigated. A minor positive effect is therefore identified for these policies.

### **Mitigation**

- 1.1.51 Landscape (SA Objective 5): Policy W3 could make specific reference to development within the Whitstable Urban Area to be in accordance with the character and setting of its surroundings.
- 1.1.52 Policies W9 and W10 could make explicitly reference to supporting active connectivity by transport measures (SA Objective 1 and 2).
- 1.1.53 The inclusion of water efficiency measures (SA Objective 6).

### **Assumptions**

- 1.1.54 It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing and negative effects of these policies against air quality (SA Objective 1), emissions (SA Objective 2), water resources (SA Objective 6), waste (SA Objective 8) and heritage assets (SA Objective 9) and land use (SA Objective 11).

### **Uncertainties**

- 1.1.55 Biodiversity (SA Objective 3): It is not known to what degree every site could provide 20% biodiversity net gain.
- 1.1.56 Mineral resources (SA Objective 4): It is not known to what extent the implementation of policies W2 and W5 would prevent the mining of certain mineral resources.
- 1.1.57 Water resources (SA Objective 6): It is not known how likely the development resulting from policies W5 and W6 would actually compromise local water bodies.



## 4. Herne Bay

### SA Objective 1. To reduce air pollution and encourage improvements in air quality

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	-	+/-	-	-	+/-

#### **Likely significant effects**

The policies would result in residential and/or economic development. Development is likely to result in some effect on local air quality through its construction and operation. Policy HB1 would have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects through encouraging development whilst also encouraging active travel and more sustainable forms of travel through the town centre so it is as accessible as possible by walking and cycling. The policy would achieve this through providing multifunction green space and sustainable transport improvements, which would reduce the likelihood of the town centre's air quality being compromised. Policies HB3, HB4, HB6, HB8 would seek pedestrian and cycling connectivity and often public transport improvement. No development will take place within or adjoining the Herne Bay Number 1 AQMA.

#### **Mitigation**

None.

#### **Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

#### **Uncertainties**

None.

### SA Objective 2. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+/-

#### **Likely significant effects**

Policies HB1 and HB3 would have a minor negative effect through supporting development within Herne Bay Town Centre and Herne Bay Urban Area, respectively, but mitigates this by ensuring they are as easy to access by sustainable and active methods as possible, including improvements to cycleways reducing the amount of Greenhouse gases produced from transportation. A mix of positive and negative effects is assessed.

The Policies would all contribute towards emissions through embodied carbon within construction and emissions during occupation. Many of the policies (HB3, HB4, HB6, HB8) do mitigate this by encouraging active and sustainable travel (including walking and cycling connectivity). Policies HB5 and HB9 would result in small scale of development. These policies would still result in the generation of Greenhouse gases and other emissions through their construction and operation from people travelling to and from the sites. A minor negative effect is therefore identified.

**Mitigation**

Local plan policies that seek to ensure energy efficiency would help to mitigate GHG emissions produced within new development.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 3. To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/-	+/?	+/-	-	+/?	-	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/?	+/-/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policy HB1 would see development created within the Herne Bay Town Centre, potentially compromising the limited biodiversity assets of this area, though the policy does seek to protect and enhance existing open space, and blue and green infrastructure, including the Seafront promenade, the Coastal slopes and Memorial Park, to deliver environmental benefits. A mixed score of minor positive and minor negative is therefore identified.

Policy HB2 seeks to regenerate parts of Herne Bay Town Centre, whilst also providing improvements to the public realm. Such development and regeneration could affect local biodiversity assets although uncertainty exists regarding the existing biodiversity assets as the sites are previously developed. A minor positive but uncertain effect is therefore identified.



Policy HB3 encourages a wide range of development across the Herne Bay Urban Area, potentially affecting Herne Bay’s biodiversity assets. However, the policy does specifically require any development within the Herne Bay Urban Area to be in accordance with the other policies of the Local Plan. It also ensures the other Herne Bay policies provide environmental and ecological benefits, alongside protecting the Thanet Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and Bishopstone Cliffs Local Nature Reserve specifically. A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects are identified.

Policy HB4 would result in development on the outskirts of Herne Bay’s built environment and would be in close proximity to ancient woodland. The loss of the greenfield land would result in the loss of biodiversity habitat. Policy HB6 and HB8 would also result in the loss of greenfield land and is also located on the outskirts of Herne Bay’s built environment and would therefore have similar effects. Policies HB4 and HB6 both require their respective development to incorporate opportunities for biodiversity enhancement as identified within the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal.

Policy HB5 would see development within the built environment of Herne Bay and identifies an area for new open spaces. Given the associated site’s location near a railway and how heavily developed the site currently is, it is likely there would be no habitats/biodiversity lost from the redevelopment of the site, resulting in potentially positive effects. Policies HB7 and HB9 would develop similar, small associated sites and would therefore have similar effects. Policy HB10 would see development at the established Eddington Business Park, and the policy would create some number of open spaces and landscape buffers. A minor positive effect with some uncertainties is identified.

Policies HB4-HB10 require 20% biodiversity net gain, with many also seeking to provide pollinator habitats and ecological connections. Uncertainty exists around the ability for these policies to provide 20% biodiversity net gain, However, achieving this will provide benefits.

Some uncertainties are identified about the in-combination effects of the allocations identified in the HRA Reg. 18.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**

Uncertainties exist around the ability of the policies to deliver upon 20% biodiversity net gain and the likelihood of certain sites/policies actually having negative effects on local biodiversity assets.

**SA Objective 4. To conserve geological sites and safeguard mineral resources within the District**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	0	0	0	-/?	0	-/?	0	0	0	0	-/?





**Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would encourage some form of development at some point, resulting in the use of mineral resources. Many of the associated sites (HB4, HB6, HB8, HB10) to the policies are within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA) (which covers much of the central area of the district and parts of the Herne Bay area). Policy HB4, HB6 require provision of a minerals assessment as these locations have been identified as having the potential to compromise mineral resources that have yet to be extracted, though the likelihood of such resources being compromised is unknown. HB8 and H10 have associated sites in MSAs. However, these are in locations where extraction is not considered likely. Overall, a minor negative effect with some uncertainty is identified.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

It is not known how likely certain policies would compromise mineral resources.

**SA Objective 5. To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the District for people and wildlife**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+	+/-	- -/?	+	-	+	-	+	+/-	+/- -/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policy HB1 and HB2 would create development within the Herne Bay Town Centre that would be in accordance with its surroundings, improving the built environment and potentially having minor positive effects. Policy HB3 supports the development provided by policies HB4-HB10, ensuring they provide environmental and open space benefits that could offset the effect of development on the landscape to some extent. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified.

Policy HB4 would result in large scale development on the fringes of Herne Bay’s built environment and within the Green Gap that separates Herne Bay from Whitstable. As noted in the site assessment for the associated site, a large development in this area could affect local landscapes and also



compromise the individuality of the two settlements through coalescence. The policy requires development to incorporate the opportunities for landscape enhancement identified within the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. A significant negative effect is identified. However, this may be reduced through the effectiveness of the open space and green corridors delivered in implementation.

Policies HB5, HB7 and HB9 would all result in small scale development within the built environment of Herne Bay and be on primarily previously developed/brownfield land. The development of these sites therefore has the potential to improve local landscapes/townscapes through high quality development and would therefore have a minor positive effect.

Policy HB6 would result in development on the edge of Herne Bay’s built environment but this area is within close proximity of a waste treatment works, meaning the potential for this development to compromise local landscapes is reduced. The policy also requires development to incorporate the opportunities for landscape enhancement identified within the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal. A minor negative effect is identified.

Policy HB8 would result in large scale mixed development on the edge of Herne Bay. The site borders a railway and would partially run into the existing built environment of Herne Bay. It would develop primarily greenfield land, which given its size could also lead to further landscape effects. A minor negative effect is identified.

Policy HB10 would result in large scale development on a site that comprises both brownfield and greenfield land within Eddington Business Park. The potential landscape effects from the loss of greenfield land would be offset from the development of brownfield land within a long established business park, which already dominates the landscape character of its surroundings. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified.

It is assumed that the landscape buffers, density requirements and the requirement for high level architectural and landscape design contained within all or some of these policies would further mitigate the potential effects on local landscapes.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the landscape buffers, density requirements and the requirement for high level architectural and landscape design contained within all or some of these policies would further mitigate their potential effects on local landscapes.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 6. To protect water resources and ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects



Score	0	0	-	-/?	-	-/?	-	-/?	-	-/?	-
-------	---	---	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	---

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies HB4, HB6, HB8 and HB10 have all been identified as having the potential to compromise local water bodies, though the likelihood of this occurring, especially after the application of the other Local Plan policies, is uncertain. A minor negative with uncertain effects is therefore identified.

However, new development will likely increase pressures on water resource through new development. Any affects produced would likely be to be mitigated through the application of the other policies of the Local Plan regarding, for example, water efficiency.

**Mitigation**  
 The inclusion of water efficiency measures.

**Assumptions**  
 It is assumed that the application of the other policies of the Local Plan would mitigate any potential effects of the policies.

**Uncertainties**  
 It is not known how likely policies HB4, HB6, HB8 and HB10 would affect water bodies from the implementation of the development they propose.

**SA Objective 7. To reduce the risk of flooding and where appropriate prevent coastal erosion**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	++	+/-	-	++	++	++	++	++	--	+ +/- -

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies HB4 and HB10 would see the creation of mixed use development within areas at risk of flooding. Policy HB4 requires that no residential development would take place within Flood Zone 2 & 3, but would create economic, educational and/or health facilities located within such zones. The other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing the potential affects from development on land at risk of flooding. Policy HB4 is therefore identified as having minor negative effects. Policy HB10 does not include such requirements. A significant negative effect is therefore assessed. Overall, a mix of significant positive and negative effects are assessed.

**Mitigation**



HB10 contains no bespoke flood risk policy wording. It could contain the requirement for residential development to be located outside of Flood Zones 2 & 3 as policy HB4 does.

**Assumptions**  
It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would work to reduce the potential effects of development within Flood Zone 2 & 3 land to acceptable levels.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

**SA Objective 8. To promote sustainable waste management**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
All of the policies would result in the creation of waste by encouraging a range of development within the Herne Bay, though the amount of waste produced should be reduced by the application of the other policies contained within the Local Plan. The other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure that such waste is disposed of correctly. The policies are considered to have a minor negative effect.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
It is assumed the other policies of the Local Plan and Kent Mineral and Waste Local Plan would work to ensure any development encouraged or created by these policies properly recycles and disposes of their waste.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

**SA Objective 9. To preserve, enhance, promote and capitalise on the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District’s historic environment**



Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	-/?	0	0	+/-/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policy HB8 would result in the development of a site that contains two Locally Listed Buildings (Blacksole Farm and Barn) and could therefore compromise these assets. This would be mitigated by policy HB8 requiring any development to be high quality and the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing any potential negative effects policy HB8 might have on local heritage assets. The policy also requires consideration of whether the locally listed buildings could be integrated into the residential development as part of the scheme. The associated site assessment consideration of significant negative effects has therefore been reduced to minor negative effect however there is some uncertainty due to the implementation and detailed consideration through the planning application process.

The other policies would result in development that has not been identified as being in close proximity of any heritage assets, considerably limiting their potential to cause negative effects on Herne Bay’s heritage assets. Policies HB6 and HB9 calls for the assessment of Areas of Archaeological Potential and for the mitigation of any adverse impacts on heritage assets. Policy HB1 also seeks to protect, enhance, and capitalise on the heritage assets of Herne Bay (especially The Kings Hall and The Bandstand) which is considered to have a positive effect. Policies HB6 and HB9 would have a neutral effect.

**Mitigation**

HB8 could be strengthened so that the integration of Locally Listed Buildings forms part of the approach to any residential development.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing any negative effects on heritage assets to acceptable or negligible levels.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 10. To ensure the supply of high quality homes, which cater for identified needs**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+/?	++	++	+	0	0	+	+	+/?	++



**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies HB3, HB4, HB5, HB8, HB9 and HB10 all have the potential to provide or encourage high quality housing within Herne Bay and would therefore have positive effects. HB3 and HB4 would be significant. Policies HB6 and HB7 are associated with the development of sites for economic development, not residential, and therefore have neutral effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 11. To promote the sustainable use of land and conserve soil quality**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	++	+ +/- -	--	+	- -/?	+	+ +/-	+	+/- -/?	+ +/- -

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policy HB4 would see the development of a large quantity of greenfield land. Policies HB6 and HB10 have been identified as likely resulting in the development of greenfield, though an updated site specific agricultural land assessment is not available for these sites, meaning uncertainties exist regarding if agricultural land would be lost (although significant greenfield land would be lost). A significant negative effect is identified for policy HB4, with policies HB6 and HB10 having a significant negative effect with some uncertainties identified. Some positive effects are assessed for HB10 given the likely brownfield land that would also come forward. Given the reference to allocations a mix of significant positive and negative effects is also assessed for HB3.

Policy HB8 would provide mixed effects against this objective due to it seeing the development of a large amount of greenfield and brownfield land. A mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified.



The remaining policies would primarily develop a mixture of brownfield land, previously developed land or low quality land, ensuring their development has saved land of better quality from being developed and are putting Herne Bay’s land to best use. For these policies, a significant positive effect is identified.

It has also been identified that the application of the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any development uses land as sustainably as possible.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It has also been identified that the application of the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any development uses land as sustainably as possible. It has been assumed that sites with the potential to affect agricultural land, but updated site specific agricultural land information is not known, that quality agricultural land would be affected.

**Uncertainties**

For policies HB6 and HB10 it is not known if or to what extent their proposed developments would compromise agricultural land.

**SA Objective 12. To achieve a strong and sustainable economy, and revitalise town, local and rural centres**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+	++	++	+	++	++	++	+	++	++

**Likely significant effects**

Policy HB1 would also encourage retail and office development and policy HB2 would encourage regeneration development that can contain economic development. Policy HB3 seeks to support local employment and Business and Employment Areas, whilst also providing employment opportunities through encouraging retail and educational development.

Policy HB4 would also encourage the creation of retail, community and education development that would all provide employment opportunities.

Policy HB6 would provide 9,800sqm of business or employment floorspace, also allowing for alternative compatible uses to support this sites aim of being an employment led site. Policy HB7 is similar by providing 1,560sqm of business or employment floorspace. Policy HB8 would generate large amount of business, employment, and commercial development. Policy HB10 is primarily focused upon providing 25,280sqm of business floorspace.



Policies that provide opportunities for educational development would also aid in improving the economy of Herne Bay as this allows for its population to gain the skills they need. All of the policies also contain accessibility improvements that would make the economy of Herne Bay more accessible and facilitate its growth.

New, high quality housing is important for improving and expanding the economy of Herne Bay and policies HB5 and HB9 all have the potential to or definitely would provide high quality housing within Herne Bay with attendant positive economic effects. The policies are cumulatively identified as having a significant positive effect,

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 13. To promote and encourage sustainable transport**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	0	+/-	0	+/-	+/-

**Likely significant effects**

All of the policies would provide or encourage some form of development, which would place some form of a strain on the infrastructure of Herne Bay. However, the policies contain some provision for the improvement of Herne Bay’s infrastructure, with the associated sites that are developed having to provide considerable accessibility improvements and ensure they are accessible by active and sustainable travel means.

Policies HB4, HB6 and HB8 all contain a criterion for their associated development to provide a Transport Assessment to demonstrate the connectivity of the site with the existing highway network, any necessary mitigation, and measures to minimise the need for use of private cars.

Policy HB1 identifies that the Council will encourage development that encourages the use of public transport to access different areas of the town centre and seafront, especially Central Parade, High Street and Mortimer Street, the railway station and the wider suburbs. For this policy a minor positive effect is identified.





Policies HB5, HB7 and HB9 would see the development of considerably smaller sites than the other policies and the amount of traffic these developments would create is lower than the other policies, but its infrastructure benefits would also be proportionately lower. For these policies, a neutral effect is identified.

The remaining policies would have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects due to them providing accessibility improvements whilst also creating greater strain on the existing infrastructure of Herne Bay.

**Mitigation**

Potential for HB10 to contain the requirement for a Transport Assessment similar to the requirements contained within policies HB4, HB6 and HB8, given scale of site allocation.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 14. To promote safe, healthy, inclusive and sustainable communities**

Policy	HB1	HB2	HB3	HB4	HB5	HB6	HB7	HB8	HB9	HB10	Cumulative Effects
Score	+	++	+ +/-	+ +/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+ +/-

**Likely significant effects**

Many of the policies would create new open spaces and improve the accessibility of Herne Bay, helping to connect communities and provide safe places for communities to gather. All of the policies would also provide or have the potential to provide safe and well-designed housing and/or economic development that would aid in the creation/supporting of local communities. There is potential for the construction and operation of new housing, employment and retail development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes.

Policy HB2 seeks to regenerate areas within Herne Bay Town Centre, potentially allowing for the supporting of existing communities and the creation of new, more connected, and stronger communities. HB4 supports provision of a new secondary school.

Policies HB3, HB4 would provide educational facilities whilst HB5, HB8 and HB9 would support educational facilities and policies HB3, HB4 and HB10 would all provide new community facilities. Policy HB3 also holds policies HB4-HB10 to providing some form of community facilities, regardless of any absence of these policies mentioning the provision of such facilities.

Overall, due to the wide range of benefits these policies would provide a significant positive and minor negative effect is identified for each of these policies.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
None.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

### Herne Bay - Summary text

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Cumulative Effects Score	+/-	+/-	+/-/?	-/?	+/- -/?	-	+ +/- -	-	+/-/?	++	+ +/- -	++	+/-	+ +/-

- 1.1.58 The policies all encourage residential and/or economic development which would generate air quality (SA Objective 1) effects, though some of the policies do mitigate this to some extent through encouraging active travel and by other methods. Therefore, policies HB1, HB3, HB4, HB6 and HB8 are identified as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects, with the remaining policies having a minor negative effect.
- 1.1.59 The policies all encourage residential and/or economic development which would generate Greenhouse gases/emissions (SA Objective 2) during their construction and operation. However, many of the policies seek to reduce their potential effects through infrastructure improvements. Therefore, policies HB1, HB2 and HB3 are identified as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects, with the remaining policies having a minor negative effect.
- 1.1.60 Policies HB2, HB5, HB7, HB9 and HB10 would all result in development on brownfield/previously developed land in an area with few biodiversity assets identified, though uncertainty around this exists, and therefore a minor positive to uncertain effect on local biodiversity (SA Objective 3) is identified. Policies HB4, HB6, HB8 would all result in large scale development that would result in the loss of biodiversity habitats and therefore a minor negative effect is identified. Policies HB1 and HB3 would encourage development within Herne Bay, but also contain mitigating requirements

in terms of requiring sites to provide open space that could act to provide new habitats and reduce ecological severance. Policies HB1 and HB3 are identified as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects on local biodiversity (SA Objective 3). Policies HB4-HB10 all require 20% biodiversity net gain, with many of them also seeking to provide pollinator habitats and ecological connections, further helping to ensure any negative effects they could produce on local biodiversity (SA Objective 3) is minimised. The other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any development within Herne Bay is acceptable, though uncertainty exists around the likelihood of every site being able to provide 20% biodiversity net gain. Policies HB4 and HB6 also require for any development they produce to be in accordance with the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal.

- 1.1.61 All of the policies would result in the use of mineral resources as they support the creation of new development within Herne Bay. Policy HB4, HB6 require provision of a minerals assessment as these locations have been identified as having the potential to compromise mineral resources that have yet to be extracted, though the likelihood of such resources being compromised is unknown. HB8 and H10 have associated sites in MSAs. However, these are in locations where extraction is not considered likely. Overall, Aa minor negative effect with some uncertainty is identified for minerals (SA Objective 4).
- 1.1.62 A mix of minor positive with significant negative effects are assessed for landscape (SA Objective 5). Policies HB1, HB2, HB5, HB7 and HB9 would result in the creation of development within the built environment of Herne Bay, contributing to the local built environments character and potentially providing improvements to townscapes. These policies are identified as having a minor positive effect. Policies HB4, HB6, HB8 and HB10 would see the creation of development on the edge of Herne Bay's built environment, potentially affecting the areas local character and having negative effects on local landscapes. The site associated with HB4 could potentially have significant negative effects as the associated site would result in large scale development on the fringes of Herne Bay's built environment and within the Green Gap that separates Herne Bay from Whitstable. However, the effectiveness of landscaping buffers required in the policy wording may reduce these to minor. Some uncertainty over the effects of policy HB4 are therefore identified. Policy HB3 whilst encouraging such development, does also contain requirement for these and other policies to mitigate their landscape effects, providing a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects.
- 1.1.63 Most of the policies have not been identified as being within close proximity of a water body or having an effect on the water environment (SA Objective 6). Policies HB4, HB6, HB8 and HB10 have all been identified as having the potential to compromise local water bodies (SA Objective 6), though the likelihood of this occurring, especially after the application of the other Local Plan policies, is uncertain. A minor negative with uncertain effects is therefore identified for these policies. Policies HB3, HB5, HB7 and HB9 are identified as having minor negative effects due to them, similar to the other policies, placing a strain on local water resources. Policies HB1 and HB2 are identified as having a neutral effect.
- 1.1.64 Policies HB4 and HB10 would see the creation of mixed use development within areas at risk of flooding. Policy HB4 does require that no residential development would take place within Flood Zone 2 & 3, but would create economic, educational and/or health facilities located within such zones. The other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing the potential affects from development on land at risk of flooding. Policies HB4 and HB10 are therefore identified as having negative effects on flooding (SA Objective 7) with HB10 being significant as no flood risk mitigation is included. Overall, the policies would have a mix of significant positive effects and significant negative effects on flooding (SA Objective 7).

- 1.1.65 All of the policies would result in the creation of waste through encouraging a range of development within the Herne Bay, though the amount of waste produced should be reduced by the application of the other policies contained within the Local Plan. The other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure that such waste is disposed of correctly. The policies are considered to have a minor negative effects on waste (SA Objective 8).
- 1.1.66 Policy HB8 would result in the development of a site that contains two Locally Listed Buildings (Blacksole Farm and Barn) and could therefore compromise these assets. This would be mitigated somewhat by policy HB8 requiring any development to be high quality and the other policies of the Local Plan would also aid in reducing any potential negative effects policy HB8 might on local heritage assets. Policy HB8 would have a minor negative effect with some uncertainties. The other policies would result in development that has not been identified as being in close proximity of any heritage assets, considerably limiting their potential to cause negative effects on Herne Bay's heritage assets. Policies HB6 and HB9 calls for the assessment of Areas of Archaeological Potential and for the mitigation of any adverse impacts on heritage assets. Policy HB1 also seeks to protect, enhance, and capitalise on the heritage assets of Herne Bay (especially The Kings Hall and The Bandstand). Policy HB1 is therefore identified as having a minor positive effect with uncertainties, with policies HB6 and HB9 having a neutral effect.
- 1.1.67 Policies HB1, HB2, HB3, HB4, HB5, HB8, HB9 and HB10 all have the potential to provide or encourage high quality housing within Herne Bay and would therefore have significant positive or minor positive effects on improving the housing (SA Objective 10) within Herne Bay. Policies HB6 and HB7 are associated with the development of sites for economic development, not residential, and therefore a neutral effect has been identified against this objective.
- 1.1.68 Policies HB4, HB6, HB10 would all result in or would likely result in the development of greenfield or agricultural land (uncertainties exist around the effects of policies HB6 and HB10). Due to this, a significant negative effect is identified for policy HB4, with policies HB6 and HB10 having a significant negative effect with some uncertainties, with regards to these policies effects on land use (SA Objective 11). Some minor positive effects for HB10 are also assessed given brownfield land within the associated site allocation. Policies HB3 and HB8 would have a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects due to its use of land (SA Objective 11) due to development of a large amount of brownfield and greenfield land.
- 1.1.69 The remaining policies were all identified as having a significant positive effect as they would either create development or encourage development that would primarily use a mixture of brownfield, previously developed or low quality land, as this use of the land (SA Objective 11) would ensure Herne Bay's land resources are being put to best use.
- 1.1.70 Significant positive effects are assessed for employment and economy (SA Objective 12). The policies would provide either housing, retail and/or employment/economic development. Housing is important for supporting economic growth and land for new employment/economic development allows for new businesses or existing businesses to grow, aiding in creating economic growth. The policies also contain infrastructure improvements that would have a direct effect of increasing the accessibility of Herne Bay as a whole, including to and from its existing businesses.
- 1.1.71 The policies contain requirements for improvements to local infrastructure to ensure both active/sustainable travel is encouraged or at least not discouraged and for appropriate road access to be developed. Many of the policies would contribute towards the generation of traffic during their sites construction and operation, though policies HB5, HB7 and HB9 were identified as less likely to cause this due to them developing smaller sites. Policies HB5, HB7 and HB9 are therefore identified as having a neutral effect, whilst most of the other policies are identified as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects in terms of their effects on local transportation (SA Objective 13).

- 1.1.72 All of the policies would provide a more accessible Herne Bay, strengthening existing and future communities. The policies would also provide new housing and/or employment opportunities that would work to support and grow old and new communities. Policy HB2 seeks to regenerate areas within Herne Bay, potentially allowing for the supporting of existing communities and the creation of new, more connected, and stronger communities. Policies HB3 and HB4 would provide educational facilities (with HB5, HB8 and HB9 making contributions) and policies HB3, HB4 and HB10 would all provide new community facilities. Policy HB3 also holds policies HB4-HB10 to providing some form of community facilities, regardless of any absence of these policies mentioning the provision of such facilities. All of the policies are identified as having either a significant positive or minor positive effect for the community benefits (SA Objective 14) they would bring. There is potential for the construction and operation of new housing, employment and retail development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes. Negative effects are also assessed.

### **Mitigation**

- 1.1.73 Flood risk (SA Objective 7): HB10 contains no bespoke flood risk policy wording. It could contain the requirement for residential development to be located outside of Flood Zones 2 & 3 as policy HB4 does.
- 1.1.74 Heritage (SA Objective 9): HB8 could be strengthened to so that the integration of Locally Listed Buildings forms part of the approach to any residential development.
- 1.1.75 Transport (SA Objective 13): Potential for HB10 to contain the requirement for a Transport Assessment similar to the requirements contained within policies HB4, HB6 and HB8, given scale of site allocation.

### **Assumptions**

- 1.1.76 It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing and negative effects of these policies against air quality (SA Objective 1), emissions (SA Objective 2), biodiversity (SA Objective 3), landscape (SA Objective 5), water resources (SA Objective 6), flood risk (SA Objective 7), waste (SA Objective 8), heritage assets (SA Objective 9) and land use (SA Objective 11).
- 1.1.77 Land use (SA Objective 11): It has been assumed that sites with the potential to affect agricultural land, but updated site specific agricultural land information is not known, that quality agricultural land would be affected.

### **Uncertainties**

- 1.1.78 Biodiversity (SA Objective 3): Uncertainties exist around the ability of the policies to deliver upon 20% biodiversity net gain and the likelihood of certain sites/policies actually having negative effects on local biodiversity assets.
- 1.1.79 Mineral resources (SA Objective 4): It is not known how likely certain policies would compromise mineral resources.
- 1.1.80 Water resources (SA Objective 6): It is not known how likely policies HB4, HB6, HB8 and HB10 would affect water bodies from the implementation of the development they propose.
- 1.1.81 Land use (SA Objective 11): For policies HB6 and HB10 it is not known if or to what extent their proposed developments would compromise agricultural land.



## 4. Rural Areas

### SA Objective 1. To reduce air pollution and encourage improvements in air quality

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### Likely significant effects

The policies would result in residential and/or economic development. Development is likely to result in some effect on local air quality through its construction and operation. The policies do seek to create sites that are accessible by active and sustainable means, helping to reduce the potential effects on local air quality from transportation. Most of the policies are identified as having a minor negative effect. R26 would see some local air quality impacts during the construction phase.

#### Mitigation

None.

#### Assumptions

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

#### Uncertainties

None.

### SA Objective 2. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
 The Policies would contribute towards emissions through embodied carbon within construction and emissions during occupation. Many of the policies do mitigate occupation emissions associated with private vehicle use by encouraging active and sustainable travel (including walking and cycling connectivity).  
 Policy R1 requires its development to consider opportunities for District Heating through the utilisation of Snowdown Colliery to provide an open water source heat loop, which could help reduce emissions generated from this development. Additionally, the provision of connections through the site and to rail stations could reduce operational emissions to air. Overall, given the scale minor negative effects are assessed.

**Mitigation**  
 Local plan policies that seek to ensure energy efficiency would help to mitigate GHG emissions produced within new development. **Assumptions**  
 It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 3. To conserve, connect and enhance biodiversity across the District**

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
Score	-	+/-	+/-/?	-	+/-/?	+/-	+/-/?	-	+/-	+/-	+/-/?	-/?	-/?	+/?	
Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	+/-	+/-/?	-	-	+ +/-	+/-	-/?	-	+/-	-	+ +/-	-/?	?	+ +/-/?

**Likely significant effects**



Policies R1, R4, R8, R12, R13, R15, R18, R19, R20, R22, R23, R25, R27 would see the development of mainly greenfield land or agricultural land, though it is important to note that an up to date site specific agricultural assessment is not available for all sites. Such sites are therefore also identified with an uncertain effect as it has been assumed the site would compromise agricultural land.

Policies R3, R7, R9, R11, R16, R17 and R24 would see the development of a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. Policies R5, R6 and R10 would only see the development of mainly brownfield land. Due to developing brownfield land, minor positive effects are identified, though these policies could have minor negative effects due to potentially affecting important biodiversity designations (as identified below).

The following policies are identified as having the potential to affect an International/National Designation, Local Designation, protected species and/or priority habitat: R1, R4, R6, R8, R9, R10, R12, R13, R15, R16, R18, R19, R20, R22, R23, R24, R25, R26 and R27.

Many of the policies identified above identify a need for open spaces, landscape buffers, green infrastructure, habitat improvement, rectification of habitat severance, provision of pollinator habitats and other requirements to aid in mitigating their effects on biodiversity assets and species. Policies also often contain a requirement for 20% net biodiversity gain, though the likelihood of this occurring is uncertain. All of the policies would also have to accord with the other policies of the Local Plan. There are some residual uncertainties in relation to R12 due to the proximity to Stodmarsh SAC/SPA/Ramsar although the HRA at regulation 18 stage assesses that there would no adverse effect on the integrity of Stodmarsh. Overall, some uncertainties are also identified about the in-combination effects of the allocations identified in the HRA Reg. 18.

The potential effects of policies R3, R5, R7, R11, R14 and R17 on biodiversity designations is not known and therefore uncertainties are identified against these policies effects.

Policy R26 would create a reservoir and Country park. This would result in the development of some greenfield land and loss of habitat but would then result in an area that would provide considerable protected habitat for local biodiversity. A mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified. Similar effects were identified for policy R20, which also requires the creation of a Country park (though considerably smaller than the Country park created by policy R26).

Polices R2 and R21, support the development of other policies and would therefore have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects.

Policy R28 is a general countryside policy, allowing for new development within the countryside outside of identified sites in certain circumstances and uncertainties exist around the effects of this policy.

### **Mitigation**

None.

### **Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

### **Uncertainties**

The potential effects of policies R3, R5, R7, R11, R14 and R17 on biodiversity designations is not known and therefore uncertainties are identified against these policies.

Uncertainties exist around the potential effects of policy R28 on the CCC areas biodiversity as it might not result in development and does contain mitigation.

**SA Objective 4. To conserve geological sites and safeguard mineral resources within the District**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>R7</b>	<b>R8</b>	<b>R9</b>	<b>R10</b>	<b>R11</b>	<b>R12</b>	<b>R13</b>	<b>R14</b>	
<b>Score</b>	-/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-/?	-/?	0	-/?	0	0	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>R15</b>	<b>R16</b>	<b>R17</b>	<b>R18</b>	<b>R19</b>	<b>R20</b>	<b>R21</b>	<b>R22</b>	<b>R23</b>	<b>R24</b>	<b>R25</b>	<b>R26</b>	<b>R27</b>	<b>R28</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	-/?	-/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	-/?	0	0	-/?	0	0	-/?

**Likely significant effects**  
 All of the policies would encourage some form of development at some point, resulting in the use of mineral resources. Many of the associated sites to the policies (R1, R9, R10, R12, R15, R16, R23, R26) are within Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSA). Policies R12, R15, R16, R26 require provision of a minerals assessment as these locations have been identified as having the potential to compromise mineral resources that have yet to be extracted, though the likelihood of such resources being compromised is unknown. A minor negative effect with some uncertainty is identified.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 Uncertainties exist regarding how likely policies R1, R9, R10, R12, R15, R16, R23 and R26 would be to actually compromise mineral resources.

**SA Objective 5. To conserve and enhance the landscapes of the District for people and wildlife**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>R7</b>	<b>R8</b>	<b>R9</b>	<b>R10</b>	<b>R11</b>	<b>R12</b>	<b>R13</b>	<b>R14</b>	
<b>Score</b>	- /?	-	-	-	+/-	+/-?	-	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>R15</b>	<b>R16</b>	<b>R17</b>	<b>R18</b>	<b>R19</b>	<b>R20</b>	<b>R21</b>	<b>R22</b>	<b>R23</b>	<b>R24</b>	<b>R25</b>	<b>R26</b>	<b>R27</b>	<b>R28</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	-	-	-	-	-	+ +/-	-	-	-	+/-	-	++	-	+/-	++/-/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policies R5, R6, R9, R10 and R24 would create/encourage development primarily within the existing built environment within the CCC area, ensuring their landscape effects would be minimal and providing opportunities for the character of the built environment to be enhanced. A mixture of minor positive to minor negative effects are identified, with uncertainties existing regarding R6’s effect.

Policies R2, R3, R4, R7, R8, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R25 and R27 would create/encourage development not within the built environment of the CCC area, with such development often on the edge of the CCC areas existing built environment or resulting in considerable infilling. Such development could have effects on local landscapes, as the development in such places can cause a change to local character. A minor negative effect is identified. Many policies contain landscape mitigating factors, such as the planting of landscape buffers/woodland, being in accordance with the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal and adopting measures to preserve local amenity etc.

The associated site for R1 is located adjacent to the boundary of the Kent Downs AONB. Although a number of measures are proposed within the policy to reduce landscape effects, a significant negative effect is assessed. R6 is a brownfield site located within the Kent Downs AONB. Policy R6 requires a range of landscape and design measures to reduce any negative effects on the AONB and enhance the site which could provide landscape/design enhancements. There is some uncertainty about this. Similarly, the site associated with Policy R23 is within the AONB. Given the site is within the existing development envelope and would entail a small element of the overall site assessed, minor negative effects are assessed.

Policy R26 would create a large reservoir and Country Park, which would likely provide significant positive effects to local landscapes once completed. Policy R20 would also create a Country Park (though smaller in scale) and also creates residential development. A mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects is therefore identified for policy R20.

Policy R28 would allow for further development, in certain circumstances, within the countryside, though does specifically require for any development created by this policy to support and protect the rural character and appearance of its surroundings. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is identified.

The other policies of the Local Plan, especially those associated with design and conserving landscape character, would aid in ensuring these policies do not create significant negative effects.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
The other policies of the Local Plan, especially those associated with design and conserving landscape character, would aid in ensuring these policies do not create significant negative effects.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

**SA Objective 6. To protect water resources and ensure a high quality of inland and coastal waters**

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
Score	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	+ +/-

**Likely significant effects**  
The following policies are identified as having negative effects on local water bodies and/or ground water: R1, R6, R8, R9, R10, R12, R13, R15, R16, R18, R20, R22 and R23. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would be able to mitigate these effects to be only minor negative. Other remaining policies supporting allocations are considered to place pressure on water resources.

Policies R1, R15 and R20 would require the creation of new wastewater treatment works, ensuring these policies potential negative effects on local water resources/environment are further mitigated.

Policy 26 would create a large new body of water in the form of a new reservoir. This is required to help address water stress within the area and proposed by South East Water within their Water Resources Management Plan 2019. Thus a significant positive effect is identified.

**Mitigation**  
The inclusion of water efficiency measures.

**Assumptions**  
It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

**Uncertainties**

None.

**SA Objective 7. To reduce the risk of flooding and where appropriate prevent coastal erosion**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>R7</b>	<b>R8</b>	<b>R9</b>	<b>R10</b>	<b>R11</b>	<b>R12</b>	<b>R13</b>	<b>R14</b>	
<b>Score</b>	++	+ +/- -	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	--	++	++	++	++	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>R15</b>	<b>R16</b>	<b>R17</b>	<b>R18</b>	<b>R19</b>	<b>R20</b>	<b>R21</b>	<b>R22</b>	<b>R23</b>	<b>R24</b>	<b>R25</b>	<b>R26</b>	<b>R27</b>	<b>R28</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	++	++	++	++	++	++	+ +/- -	++	- -/?	++	++	++	++	?	+ +/- -/?

**Likely significant effects**

Policies R1, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R22, R24, R25, R26 and R27 are identified as being in an area not at risk of flooding and therefore are scored as having a significant positive effect.

Policies R10 and R23 are identified as being within an area at risk of flooding and are therefore scored as having a significant negative effects. Policies R2 and R21 would both support development in areas at risk and not at risk of flooding and would therefore have a mixture of significant positive and significant negative effects. There is some uncertainty for Policy R23 as the policy references development taking part in the east (which is outside areas of high flood risk). However, the wording could be specific in relation to flood risk specifically.

Policy R28 allows for the creation of development within rural areas and therefore it is not known if it would allow for development at risk of flooding. Uncertain effects are therefore identified.

**Mitigation**

R10 and R23 could include specific reference to addressing flood risk. Although Policy R23 refers to development taking place in the east of the site, this could include specific reference to avoiding development in areas of flood risk.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policy R28 allows for the creation of development within rural areas, subject to criteria, and therefore it is not known if it would allow for development at risk of flooding. Uncertain effects are therefore identified.



**SA Objective 8. To promote sustainable waste management**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>R7</b>	<b>R8</b>	<b>R9</b>	<b>R10</b>	<b>R11</b>	<b>R12</b>	<b>R13</b>	<b>R14</b>	
<b>Score</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>R15</b>	<b>R16</b>	<b>R17</b>	<b>R18</b>	<b>R19</b>	<b>R20</b>	<b>R21</b>	<b>R22</b>	<b>R23</b>	<b>R24</b>	<b>R25</b>	<b>R26</b>	<b>R27</b>	<b>R28</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**Likely significant effects**  
 All of the policies would encourage or result in development at some point and any amount of development would result in the production of waste. The policies are therefore assessed on the basis that they would have minor negative effects. It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any waste generated by these policies is kept to a minimum, with waste being properly recycled and disposed of as necessary.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 It is assumed the other policies of the Local Plan would work to ensure any development encouraged or created by these policies properly recycles and disposes of their waste.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 9. To preserve, enhance, promote and capitalise on the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District’s historic environment**

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
Score	-/?	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	
Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-/?	-	0	-/?

#### **Likely significant effects**

The sites associated with Policies R1, R4, R6, R8, R10, R15, R18, R20, R22, R23, R25, R26 and R27 have been identified as having potential negative effects on designated heritage assets, local heritage assets and/or archaeological assets in the sites assessment.

Policies R1, R4, R6, R8, R10, R12, R13, R15, R16, R18, R20, R24, R25, R26, R27 and R28 identify a need to protect heritage assets, listed buildings, archaeological assets and/or conservation areas as appropriate, mitigating the potential effects of these policies to some degree. The other policies of the Local Plan would also aid in reducing the potential negative effects of these policies.

Given the scale of the site associated with Policy R1 and the heritage assets in proximity of the site there is some uncertainty about the implementation of measures identified to mitigate potential significant effects. The associated site assessment for Policy R26 identifies significant negative effects on historic environment. The Policy sets out requirements for addressing effects on Grade 2 listed building, Vale Farmhouse, Barnetts Lane which includes relocation and reconstruction and mitigation for other heritage assets. The implementation will be key to ensuring the effectiveness of such mitigation and some uncertainties are identified for the scale of effect.

#### **Mitigation**

None.

#### **Assumptions**

It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would also ensure any negative effects caused are only minor in nature.

#### **Uncertainties**

None.

### **SA Objective 10. To ensure the supply of high quality homes, which cater for identified needs**



Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
Score	++	++	+	++	+	+	++	++	0	0	++	++	+	++	
Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	++	+	++	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	+	0	+	+/?	++

**Likely significant effects**

Policies R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R24, R25 and R27 would result in the creation or encourage the creation of housing and would therefore have positive effects. Policies that support delivery of larger associated sites (over 100 dwellings) are assessed as significant.

Policies R9, R10 and R26 would not result in housing related development and therefore neutral effects are assessed. Policy R28 allows for new residential development within rural areas subject to criteria. Minor positive effects are assessed. Although the extent is uncertain to some extent.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainties**

Policy R28 allows for new residential development within rural areas subject to criteria. The effects of this policy are uncertain as the scale of development that may come forward is unknown.

**SA Objective 11. To promote the sustainable use of land and conserve soil quality**

Policy	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14
Score	--	+/- -	+/- -	-/?	+/-	+	+/- -	--	+/- -	++	+/- -	--	-/?	+ +/- -





Policy	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	Cumulative Effects
Score	--	+/- -	+/- -	--	--/?	+ +/-	+/- -	--/?	--/?	+/- -	--/?	+ +/-	--/?	?	+ +/- -

**Likely significant effects**

Policies R1, R4, R8, R12, R13, R15, R18, R19, R22, R23, R25, R27 would see the development of mainly greenfield land or agricultural land, though it is important to note that an up to date site specific agricultural assessment is not available for all sites. Such sites are therefore also identified with an uncertain effect alongside their significant negatives, as it has been assumed the site would compromise agricultural land.

Policies R3, R7, R9, R11, R16, R17 and R24 would see the development of a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land. Creating positive and negative effects.

Policies R6 and R10 would only see the development of mainly brownfield land and would therefore create positive effects (with the scale of the site associated with R10 being significant). Policies R2, R5, R14 and R21 would support the development created by other policies and would therefore have a mix of positive and negative effects.

Policy R26 would create a new reservoir and Country park, which would be on greenfield land but would also work to protect any land not developed once the park and reservoir are established (some brownfield land will also be used). Policy R20 would create a much smaller Country park. A mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects is identified for these policies.

Policy 28 allows for development, in certain circumstances, within the rural areas of the CCC area and therefore its effects are unknown as it could encourage development on both brownfield and greenfield land.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

It has been assumed that sites with the potential to affect agricultural land, but updated site specific agricultural land information is not known, that quality agricultural land would be affected.

**Uncertainties**

Updated agricultural land information is not available for all sites and the potential effects of policy R28 are not known as it is not possible to quantify where the development it could potentially cause would be located.

**SA Objective 12. To achieve a strong and sustainable economy, and revitalise town, local and rural centres**



<b>Policy</b>	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
<b>Score</b>	++	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	
<b>Policy</b>	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	++	+	+	+	+	++

**Likely significant effects**  
 Policies R1, R2, R7, R8, R9, R10, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R18, R19, R21, R22, R24, R25 and R27 would provide or support the provision of some form of economic development and are therefore identified as having a positive effect. R1, R7, R8, R9, R10, R14, R21 and R24 could result in significant effects. The policies would also provide housing, which is important for the continued growth and health of the local economy. Policy R28 seeks to protect existing businesses within the rural area, therefore some minor positive effects are identified also.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 13. To promote and encourage sustainable transport**

<b>Policy</b>	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	R11	R12	R13	R14	
<b>Score</b>	+ +/- -	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	
<b>Policy</b>	R15	R16	R17	R18	R19	R20	R21	R22	R23	R24	R25	R26	R27	R28	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+ +/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-



**Likely significant effects**  
 All of the policies would provide or encourage some form of development, which would place a strain on the transport infrastructure of rural areas of the district. Many of the policies would ensure their associated developments are accessible by sustainable and active travel methods. Such improvements are wide ranging from walking and cycling routes, Public Rights of Way improvements, bus routes, to priority for public transport. The developments are broadly considered to have a mix of minor to significant positive and negative effects against this SA Objective.

Policy R1’s associated site would likely see traffic impacts during the construction phase and inevitable increases in vehicle use during occupation. However, there is potential for connectivity between the site and train stations (Adisham and Aylesham), and provision of connectivity through the site via public transport. A range of significant positive and negative effects are therefore assessed. R20 includes requirements for public transportation improvements in the form of the creation of new bus routes to service the respective developments, which would generate significant positive effects.

Policy R28 identifies a need for facilities and services in rural areas to be appropriately accessible by public transport and walking and cycling. However, development could be expected to more broadly lead to an increase in transport. A mix of effects is likely.

**Mitigation**  
 None.

**Assumptions**  
 None.

**Uncertainties**  
 None.

**SA Objective 14. To promote safe, healthy, inclusive and sustainable communities**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>R7</b>	<b>R8</b>	<b>R9</b>	<b>R10</b>	<b>R11</b>	<b>R12</b>	<b>R13</b>	<b>R14</b>	
<b>Score</b>	+/- -	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	
<b>Policy</b>	<b>R15</b>	<b>R16</b>	<b>R17</b>	<b>R18</b>	<b>R19</b>	<b>R20</b>	<b>R21</b>	<b>R22</b>	<b>R23</b>	<b>R24</b>	<b>R25</b>	<b>R26</b>	<b>R27</b>	<b>R28</b>	<b>Cumulative Effects</b>
<b>Score</b>	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+	+/-

**Likely significant effects**



There is potential for the construction and operation of new housing, employment and retail development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes. Given the scale of the new community (R1) significant negative effects are assessed given the likely scale of development required. However, these will be experienced during construction and so are temporary.

The policies all seek to create safe spaces that allow local communities to grow and thrive. The policies often contain considerable requirements for open space and/or community, health and educational facilities, which are all fundamental to local communities. The policies also seek to ensure their respective developments are accessible by sustainable and active travel means, ensuring communities are interconnected and highly accessible.

Some of the policies govern small associated sites, but even these sites seek to ensure proportionate land and build contributions are secured for early years, primary, secondary and SEND education plus proportionate contributions for primary healthcare and other necessary off-site community infrastructure.

Policies are considered to have positive and negative effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**  
None.

**Assumptions**  
None.

**Uncertainties**  
None.

**Rural Areas - Summary text**

SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Cumulative Effects Score	-	-	+ +/-/?	-/?	+ +/- - /?	+ +/-	+ +/- - /?	-	-/?	++	+ +/- -	++	+/-	+/-

1.1.82 The creation of development always results in some air quality effects (SA Objective 1) from the developments construction and operation. Whilst the air quality effects (SA Objective 1) of traffic generated by these developments can be offset through public transport or active travel

improvements, such effects can never be entirely mitigated. The policies are all identified as having a minor negative effect, except for policy R26, which would have a neutral effect.

- 1.1.83 Similar to the policies effects on air quality (SA Objective 1), the policies have been identified as having a minor negative effect in terms of their contribution towards Greenhouse gases and emissions (SA Objective 2), as such emissions are hard to mitigate and even public transport produces emission to some degree.
- 1.1.84 Given the nature of the policies allowing for the creation of development within the rural areas of the CCC area, the policies potential effects on biodiversity (SA Objective 3) are wide ranging and complex. Whilst development in the rural area always has a higher potential to result in the loss of habitat/greenfield land or have effects on important designations, some of the policies would also develop previously developed/brownfield land, alongside providing a range of biodiversity enhancing measures to minimise their negative effects and potentially provide some benefits.
- 1.1.85 The Country park and reservoir provided by policy R26 would provide significant positives and minor negative effects through protecting a large amount of habitat and creating habitat but would also cause temporary disruption to existing habitats whilst the reservoir and Country park is created. Policy R20 would have similar effects from the creation of its own Country park.
- 1.1.86 Policies R2, R6, R9, R10, R16, R21 and R24 are all scored as having a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects on biodiversity (SA Objective 3). Policies R3, R5, R7, R11 and R17 would have a mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects with some uncertainties due to their previous land use not being known accurately. Similarly, policies R13, R22 and R27 would have a mixture of minor negative and uncertain effects. Policies R1, R4, R8, R12, R15, R18, R19, R23 and R25 are identified as having minor negative effects.
- 1.1.87 All of the policies would encourage some form of development at some point, resulting in the use of mineral resources (SA Objective 4) though most of the policies are identified as having a neutral effect. Policies R1, R9, R10, R12, R15, R16, R23 and R26 have all been identified as having the potential to negatively affect untapped mineral resources, though the likelihood such mineral resources would ever be mined is uncertain.
- 1.1.88 Many policies contain landscape mitigating factors, such as the planting of landscape buffers/woodland, being in accordance with the Canterbury Landscape Character and Biodiversity Appraisal and adopting measures to preserve local amenity etc. The other policies of the Local Plan, especially those associated with design and conserving landscape character, would aid in ensuring these policies do not create significant negative effects.
- 1.1.89 Policy R26 would create a large reservoir and Country park, which would provide significant positive effects to local landscapes (SA Objective 5) once completed. Similarly, policy R20 requires the creation of a Country park but would also see the creation of residential development, leading to a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects.
- 1.1.90 Policies R5, R6, R9, R10 and R24 would create/encourage development primarily within the existing built environment within the CCC area, ensuring their landscape effects (SA Objective 5) would be minimal and providing opportunities for the character of the built environment to be enhanced. A mixture of minor positive to minor negative effects are identified, with uncertainties existing regarding R6's effects
- 1.1.91 Policies R2, R3, R4, R7, R8, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R25 and R27 would create/encourage development not within the built environment of the CCC area, with such development often on the edge of the CCC areas existing built

environment or resulting in considerable infilling. Such development could have effects on local landscapes (SA Objective 5), as the development in such places can cause a change to local character. A minor negative effect has been identified for these policies. Policy R1 is identified as having a significant negative effect.

- 1.1.92 Policy R28 would allow for further development, in certain circumstances, within the countryside, though does specifically require for any development created by this policy to support and protect the rural character and appearance of its surroundings. A mixture of minor positive and minor negative effects is identified (SA Objective 5).
- 1.1.93 Policy 26 would create a large new body of water in the form of a new reservoir and thus a significant positive effect is identified as this would create a considerable water resource (SA Objective 6).
- 1.1.94 The following policies are identified as having negatives effects on local water bodies and/or ground water (SA Objective 6): R1, R6, R8, R9, R10, R12, R13, R15, R16, R18, R20, R22, R23 and R26. It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would be able to mitigate these effects to be only minor negative. Policies R1, R15 and R20 would require the creation of new wastewater treatment works, ensuring these policies potential negative effects on local water resources/environment are further mitigated.
- 1.1.95 Policies R1, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R22, R24, R25, R26 and R27 are identified as being in an area not at risk of flooding (SA Objective 7) and therefore are scored as having a significant positive effect as it creates new development in flood safe areas.
- 1.1.96 Policies R10 and R23 are identified as being within an area at risk of flooding (SA Objective 7) and are therefore scored as having a significant negative effect. Policies R2 and R21 would both support development in areas at risk and not at risk of flooding (SA Objective 7) and would therefore have a mixture of significant positive and significant negative effects.
- 1.1.97 Policy R28 allows for the creation of development within rural areas and therefore it is not known if it would allow for development at risk of flooding. Uncertain effects are therefore identified (SA Objective 7).
- 1.1.98 All of the policies would encourage or result in development at some point and any amount of development would result in the production of waste (SA Objective 8). The policies are therefore assessed on the basis that they would have minor negative effects. It is assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would ensure any waste generated by these policies is kept to a minimum, with waste being properly recycled and disposed of as necessary.
- 1.1.99 The minor negative effects resulting from policy R26 would be temporary to only be during the reservoirs and Country parks construction. Upon the developments completion it would be enhance surrounding heritage assets (SA Objective 9). A minor negative effect with uncertainties is therefore identified and policy R1 would also have similar effects.
- 1.1.100 Policies R1, R4, R6, R8, R10, R15, R18, R20, R22, R23, R25, R26 and R27 have been identified as having potential negative effects on local heritage and/or archaeological assets. Policies R1, R4, R6, R8, R10, R12, R13, R15, R16, R18, R20, R24, R25, R26, R27 and R28 identify a need to protect heritage assets, listed buildings, archaeological assets and/or conservation areas as appropriate, mitigating the potential effects of these

policies to some degree. The other policies of the Local Plan would also aid in reducing the potential negative effects of these policies. The remaining policies have been identified as having a neutral effect.

- 1.1.101 Policies R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R11, R12, R13, R14, R15, R16, R17, R18, R19, R20, R21, R22, R23, R24, R25 and R27 would result in the creation or encourage the creation of housing (SA Objective 10) and would therefore have either a significant positive or minor positive effects.
- 1.1.102 Policies R1, R4, R8, R12, R13, R15, R18, R19, R22, R23, R25 and R27 are all identified as having significant negative effects (some with uncertainties) due to these policies likely resulting in the loss of important soil resources (SA Objective 11). Policies R2, R3, R7, R9, R11, R16, R17, R21 and R24 would have a mixture of minor positive and significant negative effects due to the types of soil resources (SA Objective 11) these policies would result in using. Policy R14 would have a mixture of significant negative and significant positive effects, with policy R20 having a mixture of significant positive and minor negative effects. Policy R10 would have a significant positive effect with policy R6 having a minor positive effect.
- 1.1.103 Significant positive effects are assessed for the economy (SA Objective 12). Policies R1, R7, R8, R9, R10, R14, R21 and R24 would provide or support the provision of some form of economic development (SA Objective 12) and are therefore identified as having a significant positive effect. The policies would cumulatively provide housing which will support continued growth and healthiness of the local economy.
- 1.1.104 Many of the policies would create accessibility and transportation improvements across Canterbury to ensure their respective developments are accessible places by sustainable and active travel methods (SA Objective 13). Such improvements are wide ranging from walking and cycle routes, Public Rights of Way improvements, bus routes and priority for public transport to name a few. However, the policies would also place a strain on the existing infrastructure and public transport. The developments are broadly considered to have a minor to significant positive and negative effects against SA Objective 13.
- 1.1.105 The policies all seek to create safe spaces that allow local communities (SA Objective 14) to grow and thrive. The policies often contain considerable requirements for open space and/or community, health, and educational facilities, which are all fundamental to local communities. The policies also seek to ensure their respective developments are accessible by sustainable and active travel means, ensuring communities are interconnected and highly accessible. Some of the policies govern small sites, but even these sites seek to ensure proportionate land and build contributions are secured for early years, primary, secondary and SEND education plus proportionate contributions for primary healthcare and other necessary off-site community infrastructure. However, it is recognised that during the construction phase negative effects will be experienced. A range of minor positive and negative effects is assessed, besides for policy R28, which would have only minor positive effects and R1 which would have minor positive and significant negative effects.

### **Mitigation**

- 1.1.106 Policies R10 and R23 could include specific reference to addressing flood risk (SA Objective 7). Although Policy R23 refers to development taking place in the east of the site, this could include specific reference to avoiding development in areas of flood risk.

### **Assumptions**

- 1.1.107 It has been assumed that the other policies of the Local Plan would aid in reducing and negative effects of these policies against air quality (SA Objective 1), emissions (SA Objective 2), biodiversity (SA Objective 3), landscape (SA Objective 5), water resources (SA Objective 6), waste (SA Objective 8) and heritage assets (SA Objective 9).
- 1.1.108 Land use (SA Objective 11): It has been assumed that sites with the potential to affect agricultural land, but updated site specific agricultural land information is not known, that quality agricultural land would be affected.

### **Uncertainties**

- 1.1.109 Biodiversity (SA Objective 3): The potential effects of policies R3, R5, R7, R11, R14 and R17 on biodiversity designations is not known and therefore uncertainties are identified against these policies.
- 1.1.110 Biodiversity (SA Objective 3): Uncertainties exist around the potential effects of policy R28 on the CCC areas biodiversity as it might not result in development and does contain mitigation.
- 1.1.111 Mineral resources (SA Objective 4): Uncertainties exist regarding how likely policies R1, R9, R10, R12, R15, R16, R23 and R26 would compromise mineral resources.
- 1.1.112 Flood risk (SA Objective 7): Policy R28 allows for the creation of development within rural areas, subject to criteria, and therefore it is not known if it would allow for development at risk of flooding. Uncertain effects are therefore identified.
- 1.1.113 Housing (SA Objective 10): Policy R28 allows for new residential development within rural areas subject to criteria. The effects of this policy are uncertain as the scale of development that may come forward is unknown.
- 1.1.114 Land use (SA Objective 11): Updated agricultural land information is not available for all sites and the potential effects of policy R28 are not known as it is not possible to quantify where the development it could potentially cause would be located.