

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015/2016

Consolidated Document



Shepway Local Development Framework

Folkestone

Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council



www.shepway.gov.uk

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

2015/2016

Contents Page

1. Introduction
2. Glossary of Terms and abbreviations
3. Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)
4. 2015/16 SHLAA assessment criteria
5. Analysis of results

1. Introduction

1.1 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is an important evidence source in the preparation of Local Plans and is a requirement in the NPPF¹. The purpose of the assessment is to:

- Identify sites and broad locations with potential for development;
- Assess their development potential; and
- Assess their suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward (the availability and achievability).

1.2 This document provides the methodology and results of Shepway District Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2015/2016. It is the role of the assessment to provide information on the range of sites that are available to meet the overall housing need.

1.3 The District Council has carried out a previous SHLAA in 2009/2010 and updated this in 2011/2012. This formed part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy that was adopted in May 2013. The SHLAA helped to identify residential sites to meet the Core Strategy (2013) housing target of 8,000 new homes.

1.4 Work began on this SHLAA in 2013/2014. The criteria and methodology used to assess these sites has been updated in light of adopted policies in the Shepway Core Strategy (Core Strategy) and changes in government guidance. Details on the changes made are set out within this document.

1.5 The Council is currently undertaking work on its Places and Policies Local Plan which will replace the Local Plan Review – Saved Policies with its adoption scheduled for April/May 2018.

¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

1.6 The SHLAA assessment does not determine whether a site should be allocated for development because not all sites considered in the assessment will be suitable (e.g because of policy constraints or if they are undeliverable). It is the role of the assessment to provide information on the range of sites that are available to meet the overall housing need (irrespective of whether it is market housing or affordable), but it is for the Places and Policies Local Plan to determine which of those sites are the most suitable to meet those needs.

1.7 The following sites have been assessed using the new criteria influenced by policies in the Council's Core Strategy and other relevant planning documentation. The 'successful' sites will still be required to go through a more detailed assessment of considerations such as their economic viability and if there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed now or in the future.


2. Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Achievable | The third set of Shepway <i>SHLAA</i> criteria, which are generally financial considerations: marketing factors, development and private infrastructure costs, and delivery rates. |
| Adj. | Adjacent to. |
| Affordable Housing | Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. |
| AMR | Annual Monitoring Report: an analysis of the performance of planning policies, in particular taking account of core indicators set out in terms of existing policies. It also refers to the <i>LDS</i> and the milestones contained within the scheme. |
| Available | The second set of Shepway <i>SHLAA</i> criteria, such as: legal or ownership constraints. |
| Core Strategy | Sets out the long-term vision for the district's development, the spatial objectives and strategic policies to deliver that vision. It is the <i>LDF's</i> primary <i>Development Plan Document</i> |
| Deliverable | A site that is available, in a suitable location with a reasonable prospect of delivery within 5 years. 'Successful' sites from the <i>SHLAA</i> may be deliverable (or <i>developable</i>). |
| Developable | A site that is in a suitable location with a reasonable prospect of development within a given timescale. 'Successful' sites from the <i>SHLAA</i> may be developable (or <i>deliverable</i>). |
| Development Plan | The development plan is made up of the Regional Spatial Strategy, which for Shepway is the <i>South East Plan</i> (2009), and <i>Development Plan Documents</i> produced by local planning authorities within the <i>LDF</i> . |
| Environment Agency (EA) | A national public body delivering the environmental, water management and flood risk priorities of central government. |
| Evidence base | A collection of information supporting <i>Development Plan Documents</i> . Choices made by a plan in the <i>LDF</i> must be backed up by fact. |
| (The) Local Plan saved | The Shepway District Local Plan Review was adopted by the council on 16 March 2006. As part of the transitional arrangement (set out in the Planning and Compulsory |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| policies | Purchase Act 2004) for the move over to <i>LDFs</i> , the council made a request to the central government to continue to use (most) specific policies. These policies 'saved' in 2009 remain part of the Development Plan and will remain saved until they are replaced by specific LDF policies. |
| N (or E etc.) | North, East, South and West. |
| Opp. | Opposite. |
| Preferred Options | This is a non-statutory phase of public participation mid-way through <i>Core Strategy</i> formulation. |
| R/ O | Rear of. |
| SDC | Shepway District Council |
| SFRA | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: This study, required under <i>PPS25</i> , provides an analysis of the main sources of flood risk to the District, together with a detailed means of appraising development allocations and existing planning policies against the risks posed by coastal flooding over this coming century. |
| SHLAA | Strategic Housing land Availability Assessment: The process, covered in Shepway by this Consolidated Document and the Shepway LDF SHLAA Project Methodology, is required under <i>PPS3</i> . Local authorities and their partners assess the scale of potential housing land opportunities over 15 year (or more) period. It cannot allocate land or grant planning permissions, but leads to a pool of possible key future housing sites to inform future planning decisions and the <i>LDF</i> through further public consultation and additional evidence. |
| SHMA | Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Provides an understanding of how housing markets operate within a given area, showing housing need and demand. For Shepway, the applicable SHMA, as required by <i>PPS3</i> , was produced for the East Kent Housing Market Partnership in 2009 (which also included Canterbury, Dover, Swale and Thanet Councils and organisations from other sectors). Kent County Council also chose to produce a broader document, which they called a SHMA, a draft of which is referred to in this Consolidated Document as the Draft 'DTZ Assessment'. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Suitable | The first set of Shepway <i>SHLAA</i> criteria: sustainability, key policy restrictions, physical problems or limitations, major potential impact, environmental conditions for prospective residents. |
| Sustainability Appraisal (SA) | A legal requirement examining the social, economic and environmental impacts of policies and proposals contained within the <i>LDF</i> . Shepway's SA is under preparation by LUC. |

3. Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA)



3.1 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for the East Kent Sub-region SHMA was produced in 2009² and informed the Core Strategy, and has therefore been used in conjunction with this SHLAA.

3.2 The Council is in the process of updating the SHMA, which will be used to inform the review of the Core Strategy³.

3.3 The full consideration of the SHMA is set out in the previous SHLAA. The key conclusion of the SHMA is that for clear socioeconomic reasons there is major housing need in Shepway. The evidence is strong that planning strategies need to

² [http://www.shepway.gov.uk/media/2911/Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment-of-East-Kent-Doc-Ref-A6/pdf/Strategic_Housing_Market_Assessment_of_East_Kent_\(Doc_Ref_A6\).pdf](http://www.shepway.gov.uk/media/2911/Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment-of-East-Kent-Doc-Ref-A6/pdf/Strategic_Housing_Market_Assessment_of_East_Kent_(Doc_Ref_A6).pdf)

³

<http://www.shepway.gov.uk/moderngov/documents/s19974/rcabt20160630%20Places%20and%20Policies%20Local%20Plan%20preferred%20options.pdf>

recognise the challenges of isolation and regeneration within specific parts of East Kent.

3.4 It can be concluded SHMA data on the district's housing stock suggests that the SHLAA results will need to be taken forward in the context of addressing issues in the quality, nature (size) and cost of market housing provision.

4. Changes to the SHLAA assessment criteria

4.1 The updated SHLAA criteria can be categorised into 5 key stages. These are:

- Stage 1- Initial Assessment on suitability

This stage eliminates sites that are not suitable in principle due to their location within sensitive areas (such as a National Nature Reserve) or are smaller than 0.17ha and therefore unable to achieve the development of five or more dwellings.

- Stage 2 – Detailed Assessment on suitability

This stage assesses the remaining sites against further suitability criteria, such as if the site is contrary to adopted Core Strategy Local Plan Policies (such as the Settlement Hierarchy). This stage also assesses the impact that potential development could have on the townscape and landscape of the site and physical or infrastructure constraints.

- Stage 3 – Availability

The third stage is to assess if there are any issues relating to a site, such as ownership problems or operational requirements that would stop the site being developed.

- Stage 4 – Achievability

This is a judgement on the economic viability of the site and if there is a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed now or in the future.

- Stage 5 – Conclusions

The conclusion reflects stages 1 to 4 and raises any particularly important issues, such as if a site is considered necessary for the regeneration of the area. Comments were also sort from specific bodies including KCC Highways and Natural England.

4.2 The SHLAA assessment form is set out in Appendix 1 that was used to assess each individual site against the updated criteria.

4.3 The ‘call for sites’ identified potential plots of land that officers went out to assess. Desktop studies were also carried out, assessing each site against criteria set out in the assessment form.

4.4 On completion of the forms, the sites were scored using a ‘traffic light’ system. Sites that met the majority of the criteria were awarded with a ‘green’ rating; sites that met some of the criteria and did not have significant constraints such as flood risk were awarded with a score of ‘amber’, and sites that had many constraints or did

not meet the site threshold of 0.17ha (suitable for the development of 5 or more dwellings) were awarded with a 'red' score.

4.5 The 'green' and 'amber' assessment forms were returned to the relevant Land Owner and/or Agent for their comments or any further information they could provide about the site. The individual assessment forms were also sent to other organisations for their comments such as Highways England, Natural England and Kent Downs AONB.

4.6 This assessment found 120 sites to be 'successful'. Site locations are set out in maps in Appendix 3. For a full list of successful sites, see Appendix 2.

4.7 Whatever the SHLAA finding, if it is to be delivered every site will be subject to testing and scrutiny in the planning process (via the Local Plan or individual applications) if this has not already happened. This will include formal public participation opportunities.

5. Analysis of Results

5.1 Appendix 4 sets out the results of the SHLAA. Each stage in this table is a reflection of the criteria set out in the assessment form.

5.2 SHLAA sources identified a total of 187 potential plots of land for assessment, including planning applications, plus approximately 145 specific submissions of land by landowners or agents.

5.3 Accounting for duplicated land, and discounting land that fails the essential qualifying criteria, 343 sites were assessed for their suitability (subsequently availability and achievability if suitable).

5.4 Land is entered to SHLAAs from various origins and can process successfully through SHLAAs at differing stages of planning. It is common to illustrate this through reference to whether or not a site 'is within the planning process'. The national guidance for SHLAA defined this as:


- Existing housing allocations and site development briefs
- Permissions for housing (under implementation or outstanding)
- Land allocated (or with permission) for employment or other land uses which are no longer required for those uses.

5.5 On this basis, 38 of the deliverable/developable sites were regarded as within the planning process/system.

5.6 The SHLAA found 123 sites to be deliverable/developable i.e. suitable and available and achievable. Further analysis shows the majority of these can be considered as already 'in the planning process'.

5.7 These deliverable/developable sites (excluding those considered as already 'in the planning process') are calculated as holding the potential to yield **3,660 dwellings in 2015/16 – 2026** (inclusive), without addressing the possibility of 'windfall' types of supply or sites producing under five dwellings (net).

5.8 The diagram below sets out the proportion of deliverable/developable sites by area:



5.9 It is evident that although the majority of deliverable/developable ('successful') sites are urban, there is a significant proportion of sites in rural areas. Despite there being the highest proportion of 'successful' sites in Folkestone and Hythe, the North Downs Area and the Romney Marsh Area contain several large sites that can accommodate a substantial number of dwellings.

5.10 To give a more detailed idea of the prevalence of successful SHAA sites within Shepway, a ward-based analysis can be used.

Table 1: Number of Deliverable/Developable (D/D) dwellings relative to land area in selected wards

| Ward | Number of D/D SHLAA sites | Number of D/D dwellings to 2026 | D/D dwellings per hectare (average) |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| East Folkestone | 2 | 141 | 62 |
| Folkestone Central | 3 | 193 | 43 |
| Folkestone Cheriton | 4 | 206 | 29 |
| Folkestone Harbour | 3 | 235 | 80 |
| Folkestone Park | 2 | 92 | 37 |
| Broadmead | 2 | 292 | 55 |
| Sandgate & West Folkestone | 3 | 131 | 19 |

| | | | |
|------------------------|----|-----|----|
| Hythe | 10 | 712 | 25 |
| Hythe Rural | 2 | 137 | 5 |
| North Downs East | 11 | 428 | 17 |
| North Downs West | 14 | 499 | 12 |
| Romney Marsh | 5 | 283 | 24 |
| Walland and Dengemarsh | 9 | 213 | 26 |
| New Romney | 12 | 881 | 18 |

Appendix 1:

Below is the SHLAA assessment form that sets out the new criteria.

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|--|
| SHLAA Ref: | | SDC Ward: | |
| Site Name/Address: | | Source: | |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Completed by

Signed

Date

Appendix 2: Lists of sites found to be ‘green’, ‘amber’ and ‘red’.

Green Sites

| Ward | Reference Number | Address of site |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| East Folkestone | 27B | Shepway Close, Folkestone |
| | 346 | Former Gas Works, Ship Street, Folkestone |
| Folkestone Central | 46 | Ingles Manor, Castle Hill Avenue, Folkestone |
| | 625 | 3-5 Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone |
| | 689 | Westbrook School playing field, Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone |
| Folkestone Cheriton | 602 | Land between Valebrook Close and Valestone Close, Folkestone |
| | 637 | Brockman Family Centre |
| | 687 | Cherry Pickers, Cheriton |
| | 425C | Affinity Water, Land at Cherry Garden Avenue, Folkestone |
| Folkestone Harbour | 45 | Car and Coach Park, Marine Parade, Folkestone |
| | 342 | Rotunda Car Park, Lower Sandgate Road, Folkestone |
| | 382 | East Station Goods Yard, Southern Way, Folkestone |
| Folkestone Park | 458 | Highview School, Moat Farm Road, Folkestone |
| Broadmead | 103 | Royal Victoria Hospital, Radnor Park Avenue |
| Sandgate & West Folkestone | 113 | Former Encombe House, Sandgate |
| | 636 | Shepway Resource Centre. Sandgate |
| | 405 | Coolinge Lane Land, Sandgate |
| Hythe | 317 & 416 | Land off Range Road (Fishermans Beach), Hythe |
| | 137 | Smiths Medical, Boundary Road, Hythe |
| | 158 | Vale Farm (The Piggeries) Horn Street, Folkestone |
| | 621 | Land opposite 24 Station Road, Hythe |
| | 313 | Foxwood School, Seabrook Road, Hythe |
| | 155 | Rectory Field, Eversley Way, Seabrook, Hythe |
| | 153 | Princes Parade, Hythe |
| 1018 | St Saviours Hospital | |
| Hythe Rural | 457 | Land opposite Rock Cottage, Botolphs Bridge Road, Hythe |
| | 209 | Former Lypne Airfield, Lypne |

| | | |
|----------------------|---------|--|
| | | |
| North Downs East | 635 | Camping and Caravan Site, Minnis Lane |
| | 1002 | Land at Spitfire Way, Hawkinge |
| | 1003 | Land adjoining 385 Canterbury Road, Densole |
| | 656 | Land at Duck Street, Elham |
| | 244 | Former Officers Mess, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge |
| | 344 | Mill Lane r/o Mill Farm, Hawkinge |
| | 388 | Land west of Canterbury Road, Hawkinge |
| | 404 | Land adj Kent Battle of Britain Museum, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge |
| | | |
| North Downs West | 605 | Land South of Canterbury Road, Lyminge |
| | 623 | South of Ashford Road, Taylor Wimpey lands, Sellindge |
| | 618 | Land west of Jubilee Cottage, Swan Lane, Sellindge |
| | 402 | The Piggery, Main Road, Sellindge |
| | 1005 | Land at Barrow Hill, Sellindge |
| | 1007 | Silver Spray, Sellindge |
| | 418 | Etchinghill Nursery, Etchinghill |
| | 419 | Land adjacent the Golf Course, Etchinghill |
| | 204A | Folkestone Racecourse (parts), Westenhanger |
| | | |
| Romney Marsh | 004 | Former Sands Motel, St Mary's Bay |
| | 289A | Romney Marsh Potato Company, New Romney |
| | | |
| Walland & Dengemarsh | 390 | Peak Welders, Romney Marsh, Lydd |
| | 195 | Station Yard, Station Road, Lydd |
| | 306A | Land at Kitewell Lane, Lydd |
| | 306B | Land at Kitewell Lane, Lydd |
| | 431 | The Old Slaughterhouse 'Rosemary Corner', Brookland |
| | | |
| Romney Marsh | 462 | Land rear Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone |
| | 437 | Cherry Gardens, New Romney |
| | 1013 | Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone |
| | 403 | Land west of Ashford Road, New Romney |
| | 415/430 | Land east of Ashford Road, New Romney |
| | 409 | Land at Cockreed Lane, New Romney |
| | 638 | Marsh Academy, Station Road, New Romney |
| | 639 | St Nicholas Playing Field, Rolfe Lane, New Romney |
| | 1020 | New Romney Southern Extension |
| | 230 | Land RO The Old School House, Church Lane, New Romney |

Amber Sites


| Ward | Reference Number | Address of site |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Broadmead | 656 | Silver Spring, Park Farm |
| | | |
| Sandgate & West Folkestone | 674 | Digby Road, Folkestone |
| | | |
| Hythe | 615 | Land north west of Blackhouse Hill, Hythe |
| | 622 | Saltwood Care Centre, Tanners Hill, Hythe |
| | 640 | Adj 43 Horn Street, Folkestone |
| | | |
| North Downs East | 303A | Land south of Little Densole Farm, Densole |
| | 617 | Black Horse Caravan Site, 385 Canterbury Road, Densole |
| | | |
| North Downs West | 328 | Sellindge East, Sellindge |
| | 610 | Grove House land, Main Road, Sellindge |
| | 627 | Land rear of Brook Lane Cottages, Brook Lane, Sellindge |
| | 613 | Land rear Barnstormers, Stone Street, Stanford |
| | 423B | Land east of former railway, Teddars Leas Road, Etchinghill |
| | | |
| Romney Marsh | 373 | Land west of Cockreed Lane, New Romney |
| | 1014 | Craythorne Farm |
| | 1015 | Brickyard Poultry Farm, New Romney |
| | | |
| Walland & Dengemarsh | 335 | Fisher Field, Dengeness Road, Lydd |
| | 620 | Land at Harden Road, Lydd |
| | 329 | Pepperland Nurseries, Boarmans Lane, Brookland |
| | 407A | Land N Pod Corner, Brookland |
| | 612 | Land adjacent Moore Close, Brenzett |
| | | |
| New Romney | 379 | Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone |
| | 436 | Land at Church Road, New Romney |

Red Sites

| Ward | Reference Number | Address of site |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|
| East Folkestone | 688 | Upper Works Site, Castle Hill |
| | | |
| Folkestone Park | 338 | Black Bull Road Allotments, Dolphins Road, Folkestone |
| | | |
| Sandgate & West Folkestone | 608 | West Grove, Wellington Place, Sandgate |
| | | |
| Hythe | 603 | Land off Spanton Crescent, Hythe |
| | 444 | Land north west of Rectory Lane, Saltwood |
| | 463 | Hotel Imperial Golf Course land, Hythe |
| | 630 | Land adj. 10 Spring Lane, Seabrook, Hythe |
| | | |
| Hythe Rural | 624 | Bluewater Caravan Site, Dymchurch Road, Hythe |
| | 626C | Land at Lyell Close (s), Hythe |
| | 601 | Burmarsh Rd land 'Sunnyside', Hythe West |
| | 175 | Land south west of Nickolls Quarry, Hythe |
| | 632 | Elms Farm, Ashford Road, Newingreen |
| | 326 | Land Adjacent The Willows, Ashford Road, Newingreen |
| | 690 | Red House Farm, Newingreen |
| | | |
| North Downs East | 1001 | Land at Canterbury Road, Hawkinge |
| | 261 | Limuru, Cowgate Lane |
| | 316 | East Hawkinge Lands, Hawkinge |
| | 616 | Land north east of Hawkinge Cemetery, Hawkinge |
| | 399 | adj 252 Canterbury Road, Hawkinge |
| | 634 | Mill House, Oak Hill, Swingfield, Swingfield |
| | | |
| North Downs West | 428A | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Northern), Sellindge |
| | 428B | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Southern), Sellindge |
| | 606 | The Mount, Barrow Hill, Sellindge |
| | 628 | Rhodes House, Main Road, Sellindge |
| | 619 | Land west of Trust Cottages, Moorstock Lane, Sellindge |
| | 633 | Hilltop Farm, Woodland Road, Lyminge |
| | 1006 | Otterpool Quarry, Sellindge |
| | 691 | Land adjoining Lyndon Hall, Lyminge |
| | 327 | Land off Teddars Leas Road, Etchinghill |

| | | |
|----------------------|------|--|
| | 423A | Land east of former railway, Teddars Leas Road, Etchinghill |
| | 204A | Folkestone Racecourse (parts), Westenhanger |
| | 614 | Land at Newingreen Estate, Stone Street, Stanford |
| | 1008 | Land at Great Priory Woods |
| | | |
| Romney Marsh | 347 | Land W High Knocke, Dymchurch |
| | 349 | Land r/o Crimond Avenue 'Redoubt and Fleet Hythe', Dymchurch North |
| | 350A | Pear Tree lane Land, Dymchurch |
| | 350B | Pear Tree lane Land, Dymchurch |
| | 351A | Land N Hythe Road, Dymchurch |
| | 351B | Land N Hythe Road, Dymchurch |
| | 352 | Land NE Nesbit Road 'Jesson Farmland', St Mary's Bay |
| | 380 | Land off Jenners way, St Mary's Bay |
| | 604 | Land east of Eastbridge Road, Dymchurch |
| | 391 | The Old Rectory, Burmarsh |
| | 611 | Former piggery, Brooker Farm, Newchurch |
| | 600 | Land West of Burmarsh, Burmarsh |
| | | |
| Walland & Dengemarsh | 378 | Land at Mullberry Cottage, Lydd |
| | 451b | Kitewell Lane, RO Ambulance Station, Lydd (Site A) |
| | 622 | Land north of Sycamore Close, Lydd |
| | 609 | Land adjacent Framlea, Rye Road, Pod Corner, Brookland |
| | 1016 | Land North Of Boarmans Lane, Brookland |
| | 1017 | Land South of Boarmans Lane, Brookland |
| | | |
| Romney Marsh | 1009 | Land North of Littlestone Golf Course (Site 1), Littlestone |
| | 1010 | Land at Coast Road (Site 2), Littlestone |
| | 1011 | Land at Coast Road (Site 3), Littlestone |
| | 1012 | Land at St Andrews Road (Site 4), Littlestone |
| | 435 | Land north of Avonlea, Dymchurch Road, New Romney |
| | 607 | Land adjacent to Church Lane, New Romney |
| | 1021 | Land North East of New Romney |

Folkestone Parish



Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
2136/PT01/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016

0 1,250 2,500 Meters

Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council




N



Drawn at 1:19,875 on A4

Sandgate Parish



Drawn Date:
05 Oct 2016

Drawn by:
Brian Harper

Drawing ref:
1935/PTQ/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019877 - 2016




Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Hythe Parish



Drawn on:
 05 Oct 2016
 Drawn by:
 Brian Harper
 Drawing of:
 1534/PTON/H


Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right
 Shepway District Council 100019877 - 2016



Folkestone
 Hythe & Romney Marsh
 Shepway District Council



Saltwood Parish



Drawn date:
06 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
1835/PTO/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council




N



Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Hawkinge Parish



Elham Parish



Drawn date:
06 Oct 2016

Drawn by:
Brian Harper


Drawing ref:
1743/PTO/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Newington Parish



Drawn date
05 Oct 2016

Drafter
Brian Harper

Drawing ref
1837/PTO/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Folkestone

Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council



Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Stelling Minnis Parish



Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016

Drawn by:
Brian Harper

Sheet(s) of:
1446/PTO/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Folkestone

Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council



Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Swingfield Parish



Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016

Drawn by:
Brian Harper

Drawing ref:
2145/PTO/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council



Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Lyminge Parish



Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
1540/PTO/IH

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council

www.shepway.gov.uk

N

Drawn at 1:17,502 on A4

Lympne Parish



Drawn date:
08 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
1135/PTQ/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Drawn at 1:12,500 on A4

Newchurch Parish




Drawn date
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by
Brian Harper
Drawing no.
0530/PTO/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Stanford Parish



Drawn on
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by
Brian Harper
Drawing of
1237/PTO/HH

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019877 - 2016

0 750 1,500 Meters

Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council




N



Drawn at 1:12,000 on A4

Sellindge Parish



Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016

Drawn by:
Brian Harper

Drawing ref:
1037/PTO/DS

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
District Council



Drawn at 1:12,500 on A4

Burmarsh Parish




Drawn on:
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
1031/PTQ/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

New Romney Parish



Date: 05 Oct 2016
 Drawn by: Brian Harper
 Drawing ref: 0725/PTOMH

Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right
 Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Folkestone
 Hythe & Romney Marsh
 Shepway District Council

www.shepway.gov.uk




Drawn at 1:22,000 on A4

St Mary in the Marsh Parish



Drawn date:
 05 Oct 2016
 Drawn by:
 Brian Harper
 Drawing ref:
 0726/PTQ/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right
 Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Folkestone
 Hythe & Romney Marsh
 Shepway District Council




N



Drawn at 1:20,000 on A4

Brenzett Parish




Drawn date:
05 Oct 2016
Drawn by:
Brian Harper
Drawing ref:
0027/PTO/1H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



Brookland Parish



Drawn on: 06 Oct 2016
Drawn by: Brian Harper
Drawing ref: 9925/PTO/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
© Crown copyright and database right
Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016




Folkestone
Hythe & Romney Marsh
Shepway District Council




Drawn at 1:10,000 on A4

Lydd Parish



Drawn on: 05 Oct 2016
 Drawn by: Brian Harper
 Drawing ref: 0520/PTOR/H

Contains Ordnance Survey data
 © Crown copyright and database right
 Shepway District Council 100019677 - 2016



| | | | | |
|------|--|---------------------|--|---|
| 687 | Cherry Pickers Cheriton | Folkestone Cheriton | | This site is located within a residential area and is in close proximity to Cheriton High Street and near a large supermarket (Tesco). There are no evident constraints to its development, with development of the site improving its current appearance as the pub on site is vacant and derelict. |
| 425C | Affinity Water, Land at Cherry Garden Avenue, Folkestone | Folkestone Cheriton | | Possible constraints to the capacity of the development on the site include buried infrastructure and risk of flooding on the southern edge of the site. It is not in close proximity to services but is opposite an already existing residential development. If development were to take place here it could be deliverable in 2-3 years. |
| 45 | Car and Coach Park, Marine Parade, Folkestone | Folkestone Harbour | | Site is within a conservation area and is surrounded by listed buildings - however, the harbour area is allocated for regeneration and therefore no constraints should be placed on the development of this site. |
| 342 | Rotunda Car Park, Lower Sandgate Road, Folkestone | Folkestone Harbour | | Site is suitable for residential development, providing that the style of development fits with the character of the dwelling currently in the Conservation Area. There is a focus on regeneration in the Harbour area, with the designation of this site as a SHLAA site helping to regenerate the area. |
| 382 | East Station Goods Yard, Southern Way, Folkestone | Folkestone Harbour | | Site was considered suitable in the previous SHLAA and could deliver 50-70 dwellings. It is within close proximity to services. There are constraints on the site; it is unknown whether or not there is contamination due to the historic use of the site - remediation may need to take place. |
| 338 | Black Bull Road Allotments, Dolphins Road, Folkestone | Folkestone Park | | Site is still currently in use as allotments and has been for over 50 years. This use is unlikely to cease in the foreseeable future and should therefore not be considered suitable for this SHLAA. |
| 458 | Highview School Moat Farm Road, Folkestone | Folkestone Park | | Only significant restraint is need for survey to assess whether or not there is buried infrastructure. The site is currently a school but is in the process of relocating - when this happens, the site will be vacant. |
| 103 | Royal Victoria Hospital, Radnor Park Avenue | Broadmead | | The proposed site has no significant constraints that could prevent residential development. It would need to be considered in any policy that the existing buildings should be retained and converted as part of any residential scheme. The site is situated in a relatively central location and is within close proximity to local services such as doctor's surgeries and primary schools. Residential development of this area could significantly improve the area as the site |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | currently lies vacant. |
| 656 | Silver Spring, Park Farm | Broadmead | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | Despite this sites allocation in the adopted ELR, it is currently being updated therefore this allocation could change. There could be scope for residential development on this site, as it is within close proximity to services. The surrounding area consists of a mixed use of light industrial and business uses along with residential development further south of the site. For residential development to take place on this site, the retaining wall to the west of the site should remain. There are no significant constraints on the site found through this initial assessment, and although the site is slightly sloped, it has been cleared of the Silver Spring building that once occupied it. |
| 113 | Former Encombe House, Sandgate | Sandgate & West Folkestone | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | The site has relevant planning permission and any constraints on the site have been resolved under the terms of the planning permission. The site is situated within an attractive location that would significantly increase the land value and provide 36 dwellings. |
| 608 | West Grove, Wellington Place, Sandgate | Sandgate & West Folkestone | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | The site is unsuitable as it is too small. Half of the garden cannot be developed on due to the steep bank and the TPOs in close proximity to the north and eastern edges of the site are a major constraint on the site. |
| 636 | Shepway Resource Centre, Sandgate | Sandgate & West Folkestone | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | This site adjoins the army camp and would need screening to separate the development from the main road. The site is not within close proximity to key services such as a doctors surgery and primary school. There is currently a building on site, but there are no significant constraints that would lead to this site not being suitable for allocation. |
| 674 | Digby Road, Folkestone CT20 3NB | Sandgate and West Folkestone | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | There are few constraints with this site; the impact residential development here may have on the commercial properties close by may need to be assessed. However, the site is suitable. |
| 405 | Coolinge Lane land, Sandgate | Sandgate & West Folkestone | Vertical grid pattern (green, yellow, grey, red, black columns) | Site is large enough and suitable for the development of 5 or more dwellings and poses no significant constraints. Advised that only half of the site should be allocated as housing and the front of the site should be kept as community open space. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|-------|--|---|
| 155 | Rectory Field, Eversley way, Seabrook, Hythe | Hythe | | <p>The site is suitable, within built confines, with access to local services, and relatively free of constraints. It is not allocated as public open space/village green, but it should be acknowledged that development may be seen as a removal of this amenity. It would also be subject to any particular process for the disposal of school land. However, it must score highly in terms of its ability to deliver overall sustainable development.</p> |
| 153 | Princes Parade, Hythe | Hythe | | <p>Although there may be certain abnormal costs involved in developing this site, this would bring previously developed land in a desirable location back into use. It is the preferable part of this section of coast to develop given its 'nil' flood hazard as noted in the SFRA, and given its proximity to local services. While potential capacity reduction and consideration will be required to avoid impact on the SM, there is a strong case for this site's allocation. The site is in a reasonably sustainable and attractive location. It enjoys access to some services, and development could address contamination issues on site. However, consideration should be paid to the site's local wildlife site designation, and any design would have to deal incredibly sensitively with the adjacent Scheduled Monument, increasing access and enhancing the feature through design.</p> |
| 630 | Land adj. 10 Spring Lane, Seabrook, Hythe | Hythe | | <p>This site is allocated Ancient Woodland in its entirety, and benefits from local wildlife site and landscape character area status. Allocation for development would not be appropriate.</p> |
| 1018 | St Saviours Hospital | Hythe | | <p>The initial assessment suggests that the site is suitable for residential development, incorporating the existing building into the residential scheme. There does not appear to be any significant constraints on this site, albeit for the TPO's particularly to the northern boundary, being within an area of archaeological potential and latchgate area. The site lies within an Area of Special Character; the surrounding dwellings are set back from Seabrook Road and consist largely of moderately sized single dwellings with an element of flatted accommodation. Development of this site to residential is deemed appropriate as the current use of the building as a Spires Hospital has ceased and the surrounding area is mainly residential. Consideration will need to be given to this site being within the Latchgate Area and land of archaeological potential.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|---|-------------|--------------------|---|
| 457 | Land opposite Rock Cottage, Botolphs Bridge Road, Hythe | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | This site adjoins the settlement boundary for Hythe, and contains one of the only areas of 'nil' flood hazard in the locality. While at present it is remote and would not be sustainable location-wise, it adjoins the limits of the Nickolls Quarry/Martello Lakes development which is well under construction. It also comprises contaminated land that development could serve to improve. While the adjacent permitted development is currently under construction, it does not have the best access to services, but this should be remedied in the near future with the development of a proximate local centre. Development should ensure, however, that housing is not constructed in the small area of 'significant' flood hazard on the easternmost part of the site. |
| 624 | Bluewater Caravan Site, Dymchurch Road, Hythe | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | This site suffers from 'extreme' flood hazard to 2115 as highlighted by the SFRA. The SE remainder of the site suffers from 'significant' flood hazard. Allocation would therefore not be appropriate. |
| 626c | Land at Lyell Close (s), Hythe | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | The site does not meet the size threshold for allocation. |
| 601 | Burmarsh Rd land 'Sunnyside', Hythe West | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | This site offers 'extreme' flood hazard to 2115 as per the SFRA. Therefore, allocation would not be appropriate. |
| 175 | Land south west of Nickolls Quarry, Hythe | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | This site cannot come forward as the majority comprises extreme flood hazard, and the remainder 'significant'. In any case, it is remote from services and would not be able to deliver sustainable development. |
| 209 | Former Lympe Airfield, Lympe | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | While this location scores well on sustainability indicators, an appeal inspector for a recent previously refused application noted that development of this size and location "would have serious and harmful consequences, especially in terms of the environmental dimension of sustainability". She states that 250dw is more appropriate for a higher order settlement, but that "Villages such as Lympe clearly have to play their part to accommodate growth." This site should come forward for development as an extension of Lympe, but with significant capacity reductions and the allocation of a significant area for local amenity space. |
| 632 | Elms Farm, Ashford Road, Newingreen | Hythe Rural | [Color-coded grid] | While this site offers few constraints, and development here would be contiguous with the ribbon development along Ashford Road, it would also constitute intensification of development and urbanisation of the countryside. Newingreen is not a recognised settlement in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, and offers no services. It is situated well outside a recognised settlement boundary. The distances to the closest services mean that |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | significant landscaping. Outline application Y15/0741/SH |
| 388 | Land west of Canterbury Road, Hawkinge | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping. | |
| 404 | Land adj Kent Battle of Britain Museum, Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The sites impact on the AONB and CO24 designation requires specific consideration however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping. | |
| 616 | Land north east of Hawkinge Cemetery, Hawkinge | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Significant land polygon near the northern part of the A260 Hawkinge bypass. It doesn't immediately adjoin the settlement boundary (CO1) and is in the open countryside of the AONB. It is hard to see how any development could integrate satisfactorily whilst maintaining the settlement's compact form and without unacceptable impacts. | |
| 617 | Black Horse Caravan Site, 385 Canterbury Road, Densole | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | AONB land immediately adjoining the settlement boundary. The site is well located to the services that exist at Densole, and may perform as well as any site in the village in terms of compactness and walkability. Landscape impact is a serious issue but given its size and form, it cannot be concluded at present that five or more dwellings is necessarily unacceptable. | |
| 399 | adj 252 Canterbury Road, Hawkinge | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This site is in open countryside not adjoining an existing settlement, the site would in effect be a free standing estate in the AONB, albeit with the facilities in Hawkinge relatively close by and accessible. | |
| 634 | Mill House, Oak Hill, Swingfield, Swingfield | North Downs East | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This is a rural site well within the AONB. It adjoins extensive agricultural land but is on the edge of a small cluster of residences which has no relevant facilities. A small residential site has been developed nearby as a 'rural exception' (affordable housing) on a plot tightly bound by roads/properties. Close proximity to the A260 and its bus routes, but no facilities are walkable. This is not a sustainable location to take forward through the SHLAA, and the impact of development would be unlikely to be found acceptable. | |
| 328 | Sellindge East, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Large greenfield site not justified with current Core Strategy requirements. A broad location has already been allocated in Sellindge and outline planning permission granted. However the site could accommodate five or more houses. | |

| | | | | |
|------|---|------------------|--------------------|---|
| 428A | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Northern), Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Would appear highly improbable given the form of the land. Barrowhill part of the parish has the physical and perceived divide from the main village where the services are related; significant residential development is unlikely to be sustainable. |
| 428B | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Southern), Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Would appear highly improbably given the form of the land. The site would go against the current urban form in the area and be encroachment into the open countryside. The Barrowhill part of the parish has the physical and perceived divide from the main village where the services are related; and the southern end is not served by any walkable facilities. Does not appear scope for close integration of 5 or more new dwellings within the site. |
| 605 | Land south of Canterbury Road, Lyminge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration. However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping. |
| 606 | The Mount, Barrow Hill, Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Advice from KCC regarding burial mound needs to be sort. Once this has been established it may be possible to design a small limited low density design that could avoid impacting on the burial mound and other substantial adverse impacts. Sellindge is an important and increasingly well served village for the western part of Shepway. |
| 610 | Grove House land, Main Road, Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | The site is very rural and open in character and until the broad location is built out this site does not integrate well with the existing settlement. In addition the site completely wraps around a large characterful detached country house. There are also concerns regarding further sporadic development along the A20. |
| 628 | Rhodes House, Main Road, Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Although the site is well located in Sellindge it would be heavily constrained because of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building. The land to the front of Rhodes House along the A20 would need to be preserved but it might be possible to get 2 or 3 dwellings on the north of the site. However it is not clear how access would be provided to the highway for these dwellings. |
| 623 | South of Ashford Road Taylor Wimpey lands, Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Site is in a broad location identified in the Core Strategy and has outline Planning Permission, therefore any issues highlighted above have already been resolved. |
| 627 | Land rear of Brook Lane Cottages, Brook Lane, Sellindge | North Downs West | [Color-coded grid] | Access to be double checked, however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings. |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| 618 | Land west of Jubilee Cottage, Swan Lane, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>Site adjoins a Grade II listed building, this could result in significant capacity reductions. The site is also far removed from the central area identified for development in the Core Strategy (CSD9). However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings.</p> |
| 619 | Land west of Trust Cottages, Moorstock Lane, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>Site is outside the confines of the settlement boundary, development here would be an encroachment in to the open countryside. Although some facilities may not be great distance to travel to, they are not easily walkable as Moorstock is linked to Sellindge by a country lane without a footpath. It cannot be concluded this is a sustainable location for five or more units as the site does not relate to a compact or walkable defined settlement and would increase the urbanising of a small rural hamlet.</p> |
| 633 | Hilltop Farm, Woodland Road, Lyminge | North Downs West | | | <p>This is a highly rural site in the centre of the AONB. It is, from all perspectives, countryside. Although the site is claimed to be rundown and brownfield the location is simply not sustainable for five or more private dwellings.</p> |
| 402 | The Piggery, Main Road, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>Site has been submitted with a tight focus on the existing piggery buildings and its immediate cartilage. It wraps tightly around the back of 'Springfield' and extends parallel to land associated with 'Orchards End'. Its therefore well integrated to these properties which are part of a small 'island' of defined settlement between the designated parts of Sellindge i.e. the central village and Stone Hill. Its location on the eastern side of this means it is more walkable than most other locations outside the central Sellindge area to the village facilities, most immediately the Pub.</p> |
| 1005 | Land at Barrow Hill, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>Although the site is situated a fair distance from the central Sellindge facilities, they are walkable as there is direct pavement access. This site is also well contained.</p> |
| 1006 | Otterpool Quarry, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>No, this site is poorly located in open countryside. In addition the site adjoins a SSSI, developing this site might have an adverse effect.</p> |
| 1007 | Silver Spray, Sellindge | North Downs West | | | <p>Site is very well located within the potential core development area in Sellindge (See Policy CSD9 Core Strategy 2013)</p> |
| 691 | Land adjoining Lyndon Hall, Lyminge | North Downs West | | | <p>The site acts as a soft boundary between the urban area and open countryside/AONB, it marks the beginning of the Elham Valley from the north of Elham. In addition the site has a number of additional constraints such as the negative effect on the setting of a listed building and the blanket TPO covering the whole site. The only positive point with this site is that it is well located to benefit from the existing facilities in Lyminge.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------|--|------------------|--|--|
| 613 | Land rear Barnstormers, Stone Street, Stanford | North Downs West | | This is backland development located behind houses fronting Stone Street and Kennett Lane, so bounded by gardens on two sides and open countryside - would act as a freestanding estate. The access isn't clear and there are other potential constraints on site such as the site is in an area of archaeological potential, possible agricultural grade 2 or 3 and adjoins Stanford Windmill a Grade II listed building. |
| 614 | Land at Newingreen Estate, Stone Street, Stanford | North Downs West | | The site does not score well for residential development of 5 or more units in overall sustainability terms, due to its location. It does not appear there is a case for an exception, and there is the prospect that any such development would be a housing estate isolated from any recognisable village. |
| 1008 | Land at Great Priory Woods | North Downs West | | Site is on the edge of the village of Sellindge (a rural centre). Development here would be encroachment into the countryside and there are more favourable sites within Sellindge for development. |
| 423b | Land east of former railway, Teddars Leas Road, Etchinghill | North Downs West | | Site is bounded by gardens, the railway track and SSSI/Ancient Woodland. The site impacts on the AONB, SSSI and Ancient Woodland requires specific consideration. |
| | | | | |
| 4 | Former Sands Motel, St Mary's Bay | Romney Marsh | | Site has been considered suitable for development previously. Attention should be paid to the site's relationship to the SSSI, and any development should work to improve the setting of the SSSI from the present state. |
| 347 | Land W High Knocke, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | | Not sufficiently related to either adjoining developments. |
| 349 | Land r/o Crimond Avenue 'Redoubt and Fleet Hythe', Dymchurch North | Romney Marsh | | Development on this site would be inappropriate given that this estate is significantly separated from the main Dymchurch service centre, and is located on an area of extreme flood risk. It would not be possible to achieve sustainable development on this site. |
| 350A | Pear Tree lane Land, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | | Development on the site would have to pay due attention to the TPO, the context of adjacent listed buildings and on-site flood risk - there is a potential in particular for development that can incorporate local services on site. |
| 350B | Pear Tree lane Land, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | | There is a challenge posed by flood risk, combined with the lack of locally-available services, means that this Greenfield site would not be suitable for allocation. |
| 351A | Land N Hythe Road, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | | There are areas of extreme flood risk on the site, while the majority of it suffers from significant flood risk, which there are notable patches of water on site. The land is Greenfield, and is almost entirely designated as a local wildlife site. |

| | | | | | |
|------|--|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| 351B | Land N Hythe Road, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | The site suffers from areas of significant flood risk. Current access is insufficient. |
| 352 | Land NE Nesbit Road 'Jesson Farmland', St Mary's Bay | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | Access to the site is doubtful, and the adjacent plot's layout means that vehicular access cannot come from the north, meaning that it is not a deliverable site. |
| 380 | Land off Jenners way, St Mary's Bay | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | Allocating the whole of the site would be inappropriate given that this would result in intrusion of development into the countryside and create pressure for infill on neighbouring parcels. It is noted that flood hazard is greatest on the part of the site adjacent to Jenner's Way and closest to the settlement. |
| 604 | Land east of Eastbridge Road, Dymchurch | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | Development here would set a precedent for the expansion of the Dymchurch development beyond the confines of the railway line, and would consolidate the urbanisation of what at present is an area of rural ribbon development along Eastbridge Road. |
| 289A | Romney Marsh Potato Company, New Romney | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | Given its adjacency to existing residential development in New Romney, this site is considered sustainable, and an opportunity to improve the existing site. It is sufficiently well located to be able to access a full range of local services, and has few physical constraints. |
| 373 | Land west of Cockreed Lane, New Romney | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | Development of this site would constitute to encroachment into the countryside. |
| 391 | The Old Rectory, Burmarsh | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | A quarter of the site is subject to TPO, and has a body of water, meaning that the area nearest to the settlement could not be developed, leading to an encroachment into the countryside. Other constraints of the site include flood risk and setting of listed buildings. |
| 611 | Former piggery, Brooker Farm, Newchurch | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | This site is a Greenfield site in the wider countryside only marginally related to a secondary village without services, this site cannot be allocated for development. |
| 600 | Land West of Burmarsh, Burmarsh | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | The site has the challenge of significant flood risk and development would notably extend the built area of the village into open countryside and would necessitate the upgrading of the main road through the village. |
| 1014 | Craythorne Farm | Romney Marsh | [Color-coded grid] | [Color-coded grid] | This site would spread development beyond Cockreed Lane and it has not been previously allocated for housing. |

| | | | | |
|------|--|----------------------|--|---|
| 1015 | Brickyard Poultry Farm, New Romney | Romney Marsh | | This site is considered unsuitable for development early in the plan period given both the context (rather than the raw distance) of its separation from the main settlement - it is not in the same administrative ward, and there is a significant amount of undeveloped open space between. While this open space has been submitted for designation, this is proposed to be phased over 10 years and so allocation in the first part of the plan period would not be appropriate. Designation may be appropriate for later in the plan period if sites 415, 430, 639 and 409 are developed. Therefore, in sum, development would currently constitute encroachment into the countryside and should not be allocated at this time. |
| 335 | Fisher Field, Dengeness Road, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | Allocation would depend on the ability to design beyond the site's constraints - its situation in Fold Zone 3, with the 'significant' SFRA hazard could mean the site is unsuitable. In addition to this, it is a minerals safeguarding area. |
| 378 | Land at Mullberry Cottage, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | The site is proximate to Lydd's local services, but constraints include the site's relationship with the adjacent listed building and SSSI. In addition, access arrangements could prove challenging given the restricted access to the High Street. However, the site is firmly within the settlement boundary. |
| 390 | Peak Welders, Romney Marsh, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | The northern edge is designated as a local wildlife site and there is a prospect of land contamination. This site is located a significant distance from local services and is beyond the settlement boundary. |
| 620 | Land at Harden Road, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | This site is some distance from local services and is adjacent to newly developed housing and, unlike a lot of land in this ward, is not in flood zone 3 (is flood zone 2), and poses little flood hazard under the SFRA. This development of this site has potential for encroachment into the countryside. |
| 195 | Station Yard, Station Road, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | The site is some distance from local service however it is otherwise free from constraints, and has been proposed for release from protection in the latest Employment review. |
| 451b | Kitewell Lane, RO Ambulance Station, Lydd (Site A) | Walland & Dengemarsh | | The site's constraints include its proximity to the SSSI and designation as a local wildlife site which, combined with considerable distance to local services, means that it would be rather difficult to develop the remainder positively or sustainably. |
| 662 | Land north of Sycamore Close, Lydd | Walland & Dengemarsh | | This land is unsuitable for allocation given that is entirely located within n the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1017 | Land South of Boarmans Lane, Brookland | Walland & Dengemarsh | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The sites constraints include the presence of wiring on site, TPOs, watercourses on site, flood zone 2 and 3 situation, controlled water area, and relationship to listed buildings and a conservation area. It does not benefit from access to services within the settlement, and therefore it is not among the select sites for Brookland. Allocation here would constitute unacceptable encroachment into the countryside. |
| 1009 | Land North of Littlestone Golf Course (Site 1), Littlestone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The whole site is within the SSSI. |
| 1010 | Land at Coast Road (Site 2), Littlestone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The site should not go forward given its situation wholly within the SSSI and the fact that it does not meet the minimum size threshold for allocation. |
| 1011 | Land at Coast Road (Site 3), Littlestone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This site is unsuitable given its situation wholly within the SSSI. |
| 1012 | Land at St Andrews Road (Site 4), Littlestone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This site should not go forward as it does not meet the minimum size threshold. |
| 462 | Land rear Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | There are relatively few constraints on this site, and development here could consolidate the streetscape on Coast Drive, but access to school and GP services do not exist locally. This would not preclude use of this land for the infill of up to five dwellings. |
| 379 | Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Some capacity reduction could ne required, given constraints such as APP, and part of the site being 'significant' as a result of the SFRA, there are relatively few other constraints on the site itself, and development could improve the design quality of the local area. |
| 437 | Cherry Gardens, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | The setting and relationship of the site with the SSSI is of paramount importance in considering this site. Part of it is also subject to TOP, and is situated without easy access to local services. However, this is an established residential area, and small-scale development that rounds-off the settlement could make a visual improvement to the area. |
| 1013 | Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This site is in both flood zones, the SFRA estimates only a low probability of future flooding issues. While the range of services able to be accessed from this location is limited, it is adjacent to an existing residential area on previously developed land (car park) and should be brought forward to the next stage. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 403 | Land west of Ashford Road, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Site is within easy reach of a mid-level service centre with access to a range of services and transport links. The site was previously judged as suitable and deliverable, and remains so now. While it is situated in Flood Zones 2 & 3, the SFRA shows it as offering nil risk, while other constraints are limited to attention to Archaeological potential and biodiversity enhancement opportunities.</p> |
| 415/430 | Land east of Ashford Road, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Site is within easy reach of a mid-level service centre with access to a range of services and transport links. Situated in Flood Zones 2 & 3, but the SFRA shows it as offering 'nil' risk, while other constraints are limited to attention to Archaeological potential and biodiversity enhancement opportunities. The multiple ownership of the site is to be noted, and an equalisation agreement should be sought between parties to ensure this issue does not hold up development.</p> |
| 435 | Land north of Avonlea, Dymchurch Road, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the site offers access to a range of services due to its location in New Romney. It would not be suitable for development as it would result in encroachment into the countryside.</p> |
| 436 | Land at Church Road, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Site benefits from relevant outline planning permission.</p> |
| 607 | Land adjacent to Church Lane, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>The site neighbours residential development, however allocation would result in encroachment into the open countryside and would therefore have an adverse landscape impact. In addition to this, capacity reductions would result from the presence of an electricity substation and of electrical and telegraph wiring above ground on the site.</p> |
| 409 | Land at Cockreed Lane, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>The site is on Flood Zone 2 & 3, meaning a need for at least two-storeys.</p> |
| 638 | Marsh Academy, Station Road, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>The site does not meet the size criteria for the development of at least five dwellings, and therefore cannot be considered for allocation.</p> |
| 639 | St Nicholas Playing Field, Rolfe Lane, New Romney | New Romney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <p>Should be noted that the site is in Flood Zones 2 & 3, meaning a need for at least two-storeys. Policy LR12 encourages the protection of school playing fields but this policy also supplies criteria allowing for their redevelopment in certain cases.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------|---|------------|--|--|--|
| 1020 | New Romney Southern Extension | New Romney | | | <p>This is a substantial strategic site hugging the southern part of the main historic settlement of New Romney. It is to be noted that part of this site overlaps with the already submitted site 607. The spatial aspiration for New Romney in the Core Strategy was for northward expansion, but allocation of this whole site would be appropriate if strategic infrastructure could be delivered within this site connecting the Mountfield Road industrial estate with Lydd Road, thus removing traffic from the main High Street. Numbers for this site should remain low, and public open space provided, to maintain and enhance the character of the locality. Given the size of the site, local stakeholders should be involved in master planning and design review stages. I note the proposed delivery of 20 units per year over 20 years to enable the delivery of associated infrastructure. This seems a long period of time. However, there is scope for the allocation of this site to meet a strategic need not only in the district but for the area as well.</p> |
| 1021 | Land North East of New Romney | New Romney | | | <p>Development of this site would constitute encroachment into countryside, expansion of the settlement well beyond strategic direction promoted by the Core Strategy, and would constitute excessive urbanisation of the settlement removing the gap between the built area and other development. The site does not benefit from easy access to local services, especially in relation to other submitted sites, is located in flood zones 2 and 3, and has high voltage electricity on site and across the only feasible access to the site. This site should therefore not go forward in the local plan allocation process.</p> |
| 230 | Land RO The Old School House, Church Lane, New Romney | New Romney | | | <p>This is a sustainably-located site with very few constraints (save for one TPO) that brings brownfield land back into residential use. It is therefore ideal for housing, with the only provision that site design should be integrated to enable that neighbouring plot (SHLAA ref 436) to come forward for development.</p> |

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 27B | SDC Ward: | East Folkestone |
| Site Name/Address: | Shepway Close Folkestone | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 0.79 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes - was previously regarded as deliverable/developable in the last SHLAA <100 dwellings past estimate Y05/0072/SH and Y05/1331/SH proposed the redevelopment of the representation site along with an adjoining and smaller area of brownfield land. The Former Youth Club Site. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes - site was regarded as suitable in previous SHLAA, has had planning permission and is of suitable size to accommodate 5 or more dwellings. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | | |
| i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | | Yes |
| ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | | Yes |
| iii) Is there water supply? | | Yes |
| iv) Is there sewerage? | | Yes |
| v) Is there electricity supply? | | Yes |
| vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | | No |
| vii) Is there contamination? | | No |
| viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | | No |
| ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | | No |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | | Gradual slope |
| xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | | No |
| xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | | No |
| <p style="text-align: center;">If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant</p> | | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| i) Townscape | | Currently unused land acting as open space but with little value. There is no public access to the site as it is fenced off. |
| ii) Landscape | | No |
| iii) AONB and its immediate setting | | No |
| iv) Kent BAP sites | | No |
| v) Tree Preservation Orders | | No |
| vi) Heritage Assets | | No |
| vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | >800m to a train station 50m to a bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 200m Mundella |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 250 m [Foord Tesco/ Blackbull Rd shops] |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 450m 2 Downs Road |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The only impact it would have would be on the loss of open space, but this is of poor quality so there would be no significant loss. Furthermore, the representation made, proposes a mixed development – approximately half the site to be developed with housing and the remainder as Open Space/play area. Part of the site has planning permission for 9 houses and 3 flats. The Gasholder Site and the Former Youth Club Site have now been developed with new housing. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | One owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Agents are actively perusing the site. |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | As above |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No- disused open space |
|--|---|------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available There are no constraints to this site and it should be deliverable. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes within a residential area |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Low - CIL Charging Zone- £0 |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Low - CIL Charging Zone- £0 |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There are no obstacles to the preparation of the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No abnormal costs are expected in developing the site |
| | iii) planning policy | Possible mitigation for loss of open space |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specific requirements |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | High density development consisting of terrace, semis and flats. |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Undeveloped site within the urban area with active developer and planning permission |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a sustainable location in the middle of Folkestone. A suitable access could be provided for a total of 50 dwellings. There are good pedestrian and cycle links to / from the site and Folkestone Town Centre. There is however a lack of emergency access in Shepway Close and you should therefore contact the emergency services on their thoughts on the lack of this given that there would be a total of 80 or so dwellings served from one access point.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No objection. Outside FZ3 but surface water issues will need careful consideration.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

- **Sport England**

This site includes (or potentially includes) existing sports facilities

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located within an urban area with few constraints and suitable for development.

Issue of open space may need to be considered as part of any policy.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 346 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | East Folkestone |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Former Gas Works, Ship Street Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Former Gas Works Site | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Land was 'successful' in the SHLAA previously. >100 dwellings past estimate. Site is allocated Policy HO2 (2006 Local Plan) |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes – no constraints at this stage |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes- but remediation undertaken between 23 Feb 2009 and 2 October 2009. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Buried infrastructure- unknown whether it is significant but plans are available from the applicant. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Yes slight change in levels – should be easily overcome |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Eastern edge partly in flood zone 2. |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Eastern edge partly in flood zone 3 | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Disused gas holder site within a predominantly residential area |
| | ii) Landscape | No issues |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Railway viaduct adjacent to the site is Grade 2 listed |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Allocated for residential development in Saved 2006 Local Plan. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Train Station - 500m Bus Stop – 100m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 350 m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | 10 m [Tesco, Foord Road] |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | 170 m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | There are possible issues with contamination and buried infrastructure but the site is considered suitable. (Remediation 2009). |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Site was partly owned jointly by National Grid Property Limited by Southern Gas Networks but is now owned by Shepway District Council. |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | SDC is looking to develop site |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | SDC is looking to develop site |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Use has already ceased – cleared site. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available Now Yes proceed to next stage as there are no overarching issues that would rule out the site. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Site is located within an urban area |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Low - CIL Charging Zone- £0 |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Low - CIL Charging Zone- £0 |
| | iv) Demand | The site has been empty for a number of years. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Remediation is currently being undertaken |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | As above |
| | iii) planning policy | Contamination and affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specific requirements |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | High density developments consisting of terrace, semis and flats. |
| | ii) Quantity | Approx 75 at 50 dwellings per ha. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Allocated site with remedial works currently being undertaken. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No objection. Small part of the site lies within FZ3a. Surface water issues will need careful consideration.

The EA is aware that this site is affected by contamination, and has been in discussions with Shepway District Council regarding any potential future redevelopment.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Brownfield site located within the urban area which is allocated in the 2006 Shepway Local Plan. Site went through remediation in 2009 but need to check that it is now completed. Site is considered suitable for development as it was allocated in the Local Plan.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Folkestone East

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 688 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Folkestone East NEW SHLAA APP |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Upper Works Site Castle Hill | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes Est. of 50-80 dwellings (flats & houses) |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No planning history |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year | SSSI SAC Small scheduled Monument on site (pillbox) Adj to scheduled monument (medieval) |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 2115) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | There are a number of constraints on the site which include SAC, Ancient Monument and SSSI. For this reason the site would be unsuitable for residential development and should not proceed to the next stage. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Buried infrastructure |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Reservoirs |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- wooded hillsides |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes – the site is within the AONB |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | Site is on land of archaeological potential |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 to 80 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways
- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of constraints on the site which include SAC, Ancient Monument and SSSI. For this reason the site would be unsuitable for residential development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form-

| | | | |
|------------|-----|--------------|--------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 625 | SDC Ward: | Folkestone Central |
|------------|-----|--------------|--------------------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------|
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | 3-5 Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | Sub |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant building that was previously used as offices. | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.15ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | The site is suitable to accommodate 5 or more dwellings as a flatted development. |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | New Site |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument | The site does not contain any of these designations. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes – proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes, there are two possible options as the site fronts both Shorncliffe Road and Christ Church Road. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes, Shorncliffe Road is an 'A' road and there are other routes available within the vicinity. |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes, there is an empty building located on the site. |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes, there is an empty building located on the site. |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes, there is an empty building located on the site. |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Unknown |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Unknown |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – the site is situated on Shorncliffe Road in a predominately residential area. Residential development of this site could significantly improve the current vacant building, bringing it back to life. Surrounding dwellings are typically three storey of which many have been converted into flats. |
| | ii) Landscape | There would be no detrimental impact on the surrounding landscape. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site falls partly within the Conservation Area. |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Yes – this site is allocated within the adopted ELR. However, this is currently under review and is being updated. The site scores relatively low in the ELR compared with other employment sites within the district. There is, therefore, an opportunity for this site to be developed for residential use. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | <p>Approx 150m from bus stop</p> <p>Approx 320m from Folkestone Central train station.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 350m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | 220m away from Co-Op 100 Cheriton Road |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | 450m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes, the site is in a sustainable location being within the urban area, located close to local facilities and is on brownfield land. The only issue would be the loss of employment land to residential. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No, the site is owned by SDC. |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | None. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | The owner is willing to sell as the site is on the market. |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes, there are no reasons why the site would not be deliverable. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – the site is situated within a predominately residential area and some |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | businesses close by. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development of this site could significantly increase land values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | The site is in an attractive central location within an urban area. It is within close proximity to the town centre and good bus and train links. |
| | iv) Demand | The site is within CIL Zone B which is £50 per sqm for residential development. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There appears to be no significant site preparation costs other than, if necessary, the demolition of the existing building. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There does not appear to be any abnormal costs associated with the development of this site |
| | iii) planning policy | The site is currently used as offices. If there is a positive review ELR then the site might have to be retained for employment. Permitted development rights would, however, allow the conversion to residential. |
| | iv) infrastructure | None. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Flatted development |
| | ii) Quantity | 20 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | The site is currently vacant therefore it is realistic to say that the site could be |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| | | developed in the next 1-5 years. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health.**

- **KCC Highways – Assessed as being too small for the SHLAA**

- **Highways Agency – None.**

- **Environment Agency – No comments**

- **Natural England – No comments**

- **Kent Downs AONB – No comments**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust – No comments**

- **HSE** – No comments
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

Flatted development on this site would allow for approximately 20 dwellings. The site is situated within a residential area therefore residential development would be compatible. Part of the site falls within the Conservation Area, however this is the only constraint. There are good bus links and Folkestone Central train station in close proximity, along with the town centre.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Folkestone Central

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 46 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Folkestone Central |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Ingles Manor, Castle Hill Avenue Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.9 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for | Yes SHLAA Consolidated Document |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | <p>housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | <p>(2010), SHLAA Update (2011), Housing... Technical Note (2012) the land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. Allocated in the Local Plan. Southern part of the allocation (excluded from SHLAA) has been developed (Y12/0767/SH)</p> |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | <p>The site does not fall within any of the designations identified.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes - the site is considered suitable at this stage. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Site is within an area occupied predominantly by a few small businesses; however there is a small amount of residential development near the site. |
| | ii) Landscape | No issues |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPO's in close surrounding area |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – site contains a Grade II listed manor house and barn. Site is within a conservation area |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | Yes – see above. |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Potentially protected species/habitats |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | (Shepway ELR Final Site Assessment Sheets) – site is developed, allocated employment site. Partly allocated for housing and partly for employment in the Local Plan. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | --- |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No, the site is over 900m away from the nearest school |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | The site is within 800m from the town centre |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Manor Clinic and Central Surgery are within 1km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Fasttrack through. Amend/check boundary so not whole site and total to exclude any counted in the 13/14 supply NA</p> <p>Part of the site adjoins a conservation area and contains a Grade II listed building, with TPO's in a close surrounding area. However, part of the site is allocated in the Local Plan for housing and was regarded as developable in the previous SHLAA.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | One owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Existing businesses on site |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Part of the site has already been developed for residential. |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Existing businesses could be moved. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available Now |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Reasonably compatible with existing residential uses. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Intensification of use for residential could increase land values, but unlikely to impact significantly |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive setting. Listed building, and surrounded by high design-quality dwellings set amid well laid out streets. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL rating B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | there is nothing currently on the site which would have a significantly negative impact on site preparation |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There is no evidence of any abnormal costs |
| | iii) planning policy | Allocation for residential development. |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specific requirements |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Approx 18 units to be flats/apartments based on the approval of planning permission Y12/0767/SH |
| | ii) Quantity | 46 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 1-3 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment • Environment Agency Fisheries and Biodiversity no comment No flood risk comments |
|--|

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the site being in a conservation area and containing a Grade 2 listed building, it has been previously regarded as deliverable and has been allocated in the Local Plan; therefore the site should be considered suitable for residential development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 689 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Folkestone Central |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Westbrook School playing field Shorncliffe Road, Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | School playing field | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.47 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over | Yes |
|----------|---|-----|

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Outline planning permission was granted for the development of 127 residential units on the site and an 80 bedroom nursing home to the south west of the site in August 2012 (Y10/0077/SH). Subsequent detailed planning applications for the development have been submitted and approved and development has commenced. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Site has started development. Proceed to Stage 2. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Large detached houses |
| | ii) Landscape | Site is within an urban area |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes the edge of the site contains TPO's, especially along the eastern edge of the site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | Site is a designated school playing field in the Local Plan. The loss of open space could be a potential issue. |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated Question |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes (Christ Church C of E Primary School & Sandgate Primary School) |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes (to local shops on Bouverie Road West) |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes (Central Surgery, Manor Surgery and Sandgate Road Surgery) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The only constraint is the designation of the site as a school playing field. The site is in a good sustainable location within walking distance of local facilities. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes (Bellway Homes) |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | The site was a former playing field. Work has commenced on this development. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes - The site is currently under construction. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Residential |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Housing would increase the value of the land as it is currently a designated school playing field |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Zone C £100 per sq m [High] |
| | iv) Demand | CIL Zone C £100 per sq m [High] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There is nothing currently on the site that would lead to constraints in site preparation |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There are no unforeseen abnormal costs |
| | iii) planning policy | Designated school playing field, Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | No significant issues to be overcome |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Large detached and semi-detached dwellings are in the surrounding area |
| | ii) Quantity | Approx 105 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Development has already started. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site has a detailed planning permission as has been bought by Bellway homes. The access arrangements for this site have been agreed with KCC Highways.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No flood risk comments
Fisheries and Biodiversity no comment

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

- **Sport England**

The site includes (or potentially includes) existing sports facilities

CONCLUSIONS

The main constraints of the site are the TPO's, particularly to the eastern edge of the site. The site is allocated in the Local Plan as a School Playing Field in saved policy LR12– however it has not been in use for 5 years. The site is in a sustainable location being close to local services and is in an attractive location, with the CIL charge rate being £100 per sq m.

The site has planning permission and is under construction.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Cheriton

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 425C | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Cheriton |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Affinity Water, Land at Cherry Garden Avenue Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Affinity water building | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.875 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | A small area is identified on the southern edge of the site as Flood Zone 2 and 3 but there is no Extreme Flood Hazard identified. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Land regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously There is a small area to the southern boundary which is identified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 but there is no flooding identified in the SFRA Hazard mapping. The site should proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Not known |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Buried infrastructure on the site (according to submitted form) |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Not known |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Gradual slope on site |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes (small area) |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Yes Southern edge of site is in flood zones 2 & 3 If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant There is no flood risk identified in the SFRA Hazard Mapping (Nil) | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Land to south/south-east of Cherry Garden Lane is residential (detached and semi detached dwellings). Land to north of Shearway Road is business activities. To the south there are also allotment gardens. |
| | ii) Landscape | No – screening may be necessary |
| | iii) AONB | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – one TPO as well as what appears to be numerous mature trees. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Allocated employment site in Saved 2002 Local Plan. Will be considered as part of the ELR. This is an operational land site under Par X1 of the 1990 TCPA (s263) in which it does not formally constitute an employment site. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus stop >400m Railway Station - >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 650 m Morehall |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Shops on Cheriton Rd are just over 800m away. |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | The site is just under 1km away from the White House Surgery, Cheriton Rd |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | There is known buried infrastructure but it is not known how significant it is. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Yes, the site in a good location, just within walking distance of local facilities or public transport.</p> <p>There could be constraints to development due to buried infrastructure but its significance is unknown. TPO's and other tree groups would also need to be considered as part of any development.</p> <p>Site will need to be considered as part of the ELR to see if it is still suitable for release for residential.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | The site is still in use but by the company who has submitted the form. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Affinity Water has submitted the site to be considered for redevelopment. |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | None identified |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Site could cease. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | The site is still in use by Affinity Water but this use could cease or be moved. The company has submitted the site to be considered as part of the SHLAA. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | To the east of the site is residential development consisting of large detached houses – and to the north of the site is a business park. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | CIL Charging Zone A = £0 |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone A = £0 |
| | iv) Demand | CIL charging suggests lower demand. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There is buried infrastructure on the site and a TPO to the east of the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | The buried infrastructure could be a potential restraint |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing, mixed of development to include 3 bed homes. |
| | iv) infrastructure | Buried Infrastructure relating to current use could have implications on development. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Mixed development including detached homes. |
| | ii) Quantity | 120 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | The company has suggested that the site would be available between 2-3 years. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

The site is in a sustainable location within the urban confines of Folkestone and reasonably close to local facilities. There are already 3 existing access points serving the site. A new footpath would be required along the southern part of Shearway Road in order to connect up with the local footpath network. The site could accommodate the number of dwellings suggested.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No flood risk comments. Adjacent to 'main river'. Flood risk activity permit requirements will apply.
Ground Water and Contaminated Land. This site is located in a Source Protection Zone 1 for confined groundwater abstraction, and is therefore in a sensitive location from a groundwater protection point of view.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Close to AONB boundary, but surrounded by existing built development

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

The site is suitable for development being in a reasonable location being just within the parameters of walking distance to local services and employment.

Possible constraints to the capacity of development on the site include buried infrastructure and the results of the ELR which could seek the retention of the site for employment uses.

The company has suggested that the site could be available within 2-3, however, this would be subject to any issues with regard to the buried infrastructure.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Cheriton Ward

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 602 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | FC |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land between Valebrook Close and Valestone Close Folkestone, Horn Street. | <i>Source:</i> | Submitted |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant farm land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.98 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No - new site |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: | No |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | The site is considered suitable on this initial assessment. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Located between Horn Street and the outskirts of Folkestone, a Sub-Regional town to accommodate substantial development. Adjacent to settlement boundaries of Horn Street and Folkestone. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes, the site fronts onto Horn Street. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes Horn Street is a C Road |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Available in the adjacent highway |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Available in the adjacent highway |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Available in the adjacent highway |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Part of site is in latchgate area – identified on Atlas. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | None |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No - The site forms part of the Seabrook Valley and is gently undulating. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes- The Seabrook Stream descends the valley at the western side of the |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | There is a small area of standing water in extreme conditions. This can be accommodated within a development. However, it is not in flood zones 2 or 3. |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | The western part of the site falls within Sandstone safeguarded area (KCC 2015) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site consists of open land between two settlements set in a rural location. Development of this land would lead to the loss of the open space between, which would be detrimental to the rural character of the valley area. |
| | ii) Landscape | The site is within the Local Landscape Area. Development could be detrimental to the wider landscape due to coalesce of the two settlements leading to greater urbanisation of the countryside. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | None |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | There are Two blocks of woodland protected by TPO's adjacent to the site. The proposal avoids these areas. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site is within land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No, but part of the area falls within the Shorncliffe Garrison allocation (SS7) for 'natural area'. |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| | | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| | | Repeated Question |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Railway >800m Bus Stop >400m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 700 m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | No >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | Primarily no, but the site is within the identified area of potential instability as some of the site is in a latchgate area identified on Atlas. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>The site is close to a primary school and is not within the AONB or any other nationally designated sites.</p> <p>The site is not, however, in particularly sustainable location being over 800m away from other local services.</p> <p>There are other potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. These relate to water courses, the latchgate area and adjacent TPOs. The site also contains land of archaeological potential and falls within a mineral safeguarding area.</p> <p>Development of the site could also lead to coalesce of two settlements in a rural location, which could be detrimental to the rural character and the Local Landscape Area (locally designated policy). The site would have to be tested against this policy before the site is allocated in the Places and Policies Plan.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | There are two owners of the land, both being represented by the same agent |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes – work has already been undertaken on studies |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | There are no issues that would suggest that the site would be undeliverable. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | The site would be compatible as there is residential to the north and south and countryside to the west and east. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | The land is currently unused. The value of the land would be increased with a residential allocation. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive location as it is in a rural setting. CIL charging area C – second highest charge reflecting the area. |
| | iv) Demand | Considered to be a low risk site in a good locality providing semi-detached and detached dwellings. Demand likely to be high. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | The site is undeveloped. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | None identified |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Homes provision Partly falls within natural area designation for Shorncliffe Garrison strategic allocation in Core Strategy (SS7) Local Landscape Area Latchgate Area |
| | iv) infrastructure | Should be able to connect to existing infrastructure |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Low density detached or semi-detached |
| | ii) Quantity | 45 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | There are no issues that could delay development of this site if it is considered suitable. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

Site could potentially accommodate up to 45 dwellings, off one access. Visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres would be required out of the access. There is a footpath along the eastern side of Horn Street. Site is close to the existing bus stops on Horn Street.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No flood risk comments. There may be significant surface water issues at this location. Adjacent to 'main river' flood risk activity permit requirements will apply. No comment from the Fisheries and Biodiversity.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

- **Sports England**

The site includes (or potentially includes) existing sports facilities

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located close to the local primary school and is within 800m of a bus stop. It is also not located within any national designations, such as AONB.

A small water course, the latchgate area and adjacent TPOs are constraints on the site. The site also contains land of archaeological potential and falls within a mineral safeguarding area. These constraints are likely to reduce the overall capacity of dwellings on the site.

The negative aspects of the site are that, apart from the school, there are no other local facilities within walking distance (which would encourage the use of the car) and that development could lead to the loss of open, undeveloped land which contributes to the rural character of Horn Street. It is, therefore, likely that development would be contrary to the Local Landscape Area designation in the 2006 saved Local Plan policy.

A reduced capacity may result in a lower detrimental impact on setting of the countryside and Horn Street, so may not necessarily join the two settlements. This would, however, need to be considered before the site is allocated in the emerging Places and Policies Local Plan.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 637 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | FC |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Brockman Family Centre | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Currently vacant buildings that were used as a family centre | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.87 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; or | New site |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| | been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | This site is a new submission and hasn't been previously allocated for housing, been identified as suitable in previous assessments or had planning permission. However the site is of suitable size and there are no initial constraints – proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located within the Folkestone area, which has been identified as a Sub-Regional town in the 2013 Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes – the site currently has vacant buildings on site |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes – the site currently has vacant buildings on site |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes – the site currently has vacant buildings on site |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No - telegraph poles run along the eastern boundary. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – the site is flat |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site consists of land between a residential development and a car park for business use land. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Railway >800m Bus <400m |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | 600 m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 150 m [Tesco Superstore] |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>To the south, east and west the uses consists of residential and a hotel.</p> <p>To the north there is the M20, which could result in noise and air pollution. The northern boundary of the site currently has line of mature trees.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Brownfield land site located on the edge of an existing residential area. Although the site is on the edge of the urban area and some distance from the town centre, it is located close to a convenience store and within walking distance of a primary school and bus stop.</p> <p>After visiting the site it appears that it is suitable for development, and it may be possible to incorporate the vacant buildings into the sites redevelopment.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | The property is no longer used. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | There is willingness for the owner to sell. |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | None known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | The site is vacant. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | There are no issues that would suggest that the site is unavailable. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | To the east of the proposed site there is a residential development that would be compatible with the residential development on this site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development of this site will lead to an increase in the land value as the current buildings on the site are vacant. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charge Zone A £0 |
| | iv) Demand | CIL Charge Zone A £0 [Low] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There are buildings already on the site – demolition costs |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No abnormal costs are expected in developing the site |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable homes |
| | iv) infrastructure | Unknown whether or not there is any buried infrastructure |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Adjacent to the site is a housing development that consists of high density attached and semi-detached houses |
| | ii) Quantity | 26 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | There are no constraints that would suggest that the site is not deliverable within the first five years. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site is in a sustainable location close to Tesco and the existing facilities on Horn Street. There is a bus route along Cheriton High Street and Horn Street. The site has an existing access point which could accommodate 26 dwellings.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comment from the Fisheries and Biodiversity.
No flood risk comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The site is situated between residential development and a car park for business use. However there are few restraints to the site itself. Therefore this site is suitable for the development of five or more dwellings, with the vacant buildings on the site perhaps being incorporated into its redevelopment.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form (2015)

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 687 | SDC Ward: | Folkestone Cheriton |
| Site Name/Address: | Cherry Pickers Cheriton | Source: | |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 0.223 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Y15/0134/SH for existing public house to be demolished |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Size of the site is suitable for the development of 5 or more dwellings and does not pose any constraints at this stage. |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located within the Folkestone urban area which has been identified as the Sub-Regional Town |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No- The site is within a residential development and close to Cheriton High Street |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 483m to All Souls C of E Primary School |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 482m Co-op |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | White House Surgery (Cheriton High Street) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No- the site is situated within a residential area. Development on this site would improve its current aesthetic. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Site is situated within a residential area and is currently vacant. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | 2 owners |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Buildings to be demolished |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes, there are no issues that would suggest that the site is not deliverable. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes- adjacent to the site is a residential development |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | CIL Charging Zone A= £0 |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone A= £0 |
| | iv) Demand | The CIL evidence suggest that that there is medium demand in this area. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There are no obstacles to the preparation of the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No abnormal costs are expected in developing the site |
| | iii) planning policy | Possible mitigation for loss of open space |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specific requirements |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Possibly a mixed development e.g flats, 1-2 bed starter homes |
| | ii) Quantity | 12-15 houses, 20-30 Flats |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – est. 18 months |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

There is an existing access serving this site, although it has substandard visibility due to cars parked on Ashley Avenue. Any proposals would need to provide double yellow lines as the proposals will result in an increase in the use of this access. The site is situated in a sustainable location, close to existing local facilities and bus services.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No flood risk comments

No Fisheries and Biodiversity comments

This site is located on the border between Source Protection Zone 2 and Source Protection Zone 3 for a portable abstraction to the northeast, and is therefore in a sensitive location from a groundwater protection point of view.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located in a residential area and within CIL charging Zone B (£50). It is in close proximity to Cheriton High Street and near a large supermarket (Tesco). There are no evident constraints to its development, with development of the site improving its current appearance as the pub on site is vacant and derelict. The former pub is to be demolished.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Folkestone Harbour

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 45 | SDC Ward: | FH |
| Site Name/Address: | Car and Coach Park, Marine Parade Folkestone | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 0.7 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | The site is within a regeneration area. Planning application for the erection of two blocks of self contained flats with integral car parking and landscape/amenity area approved with conditions. Y04/1600/SH |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | The site is within a conservation area however, the site falls into the area that has been allocated for redevelopment and therefore should proceed to stage 2. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Site is within high density residential area of the Harbour which consists of modern day flats (four stories) and Victorian town houses/hotels of four and five stories. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes Listed buildings: 1-14 Marine Crescent and 10-15 & 5-9 Marine Parade, all Grade II listed. Conservation Area: Folkestone Leas & Bayle. Site contains land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus stop is 320m away |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes 483m St Eanswythe C of E School |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes- Iceland is 322m away |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes- Central Surgery |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>The top edge of the site is within a latchgate area and the site is within a conservation area and adjoins listed buildings. The site is also within land of archaeological potential.</p> <p>This area is designated for regeneration – residential development of this site would need to incorporate the character of the street scene of the adjoining buildings. Development on this site could improve the area therefore should not be ruled out on the basis that it is within a conservation area.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|--------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | SDC Car Park |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------|
| | | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No – site is vacant |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available Now |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Adjacent |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development on this site would increase the land value significantly. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone A = £0 |
| | iv) Demand | Low - CIL Charging Zone A = £0 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No constraints on site preparation |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There is no evidence of any abnormal costs. |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 65 (based on current planning permission) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 1-2 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a sustainable location next to the Folkestone Harbour and Seafront development site. The car park is currently not well used and there are parking restrictions along Marine Parade and so there are no highway safety implications from the loss of the car park. The existing access point from Marine Crescent should be used together with an emergency access point from Lower Sandgate Road.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comment Fisheries and Biodiversity.
No objection from flood risk. FRA will need to examine if there is risk from the Pent Stream.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located in the harbour area which is allocated for regeneration. It is also within a conservation area with a number of listed buildings surrounding it.

Development provides and opportunity to improve the built form in the Conservation area and to help regeneration of Folkestone.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 342 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | FH |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Rotunda Car Park, Lower Sandgate Road Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.02 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Land regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously >100 dwellings past estimate |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage | Majority of the site is within the Latchgate Area identified on Atlas and |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|----|--|
| 2? | was regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously with >100 dwellings being the past estimate. There are no significant constraints at this stage so can proceed to stage 2. |
|----|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Yes – majority of the site is within the Latchgate Area identified on Atlas. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | no | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Site is within high density residential area of the Harbour which consists of modern day flats (four stories) and Victorian town houses/hotels of four and five stories. Development would improve the townscape of the area. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- 1-14 Marine Crescent and 10-15 & 5-9 Marine Parade, all Grade II listed. Adjoins a conservation area – Folkestone Leas & Bayle |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 250m St East's |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 150m Iceland/FTC |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 600m 31 Manor Rd |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The site is within/adjoining a Conservation Area and adjoins listed buildings.– Folkestone Leas & Bayle. However, this area is the focus of regeneration and is an opportunity to improve the townscape of this area. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Car Park |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| | | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No – vacant land |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No constraints – proceed |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Surrounding area is residential |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Harbour area focused on regeneration |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone A =£0 |
| | iv) Demand | Low - CIL Charging Zone A = £0 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No unforeseen costs |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There is no evidence to indicate that there will be abnormal costs for the development of this site. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Homes, Larger homes |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specialist infrastructure required. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Higher density flats or town houses reflecting existing townscape |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Site will take 1-3 years to develop once commenced |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a sustainable location next to the Folkestone Harbour and Seafront development site. The car park is currently not well used and there are parking restrictions along Lower Sandgate Road and so there are no highway safety implications from the loss of the car park. The existing access point from Lower Sandgate Road should be used together with an emergency access point from Lower Sandgate Road.

- **Highways Agency**

No comments

- **Environment Agency**

No comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is suitable for residential development, providing that the style of development fits with the character of the dwellings currently in the Conservation Area. There is a focus on regeneration in the Harbour area, with the designation of this site as a SHLAA site helping to regenerate the area.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 382 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | FH |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | East Station Goods Yard, Southern Way Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Redundant railway goods yard. | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Site was considered deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously. Current application being considered for 41 residential units and employment uses (Y14/0928/SH). |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Site was regarded as deliverable/developable in SHLAA previously. Proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – in highway |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No- in highway |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes - due to historical uses of the site |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Yes- due to its historical pattern of uses |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Site slopes down from north towards Southern Way in the south, where there is a significant change in level. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – screening could be necessary to separate residential development from |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | the main road. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Part of the site contains land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | (Shepway ELR Final Site Assessment Sheets) Vacant, undeveloped, allocated employment site. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 130m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 520m Castle Hill |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 300m Dover Rd Tesco |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 580m 128 Canterbury Rd |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Yes- proximity to railway lines |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Yes – brownfield site in a good location within walking distance of local services.</p> <p>Possibility of contamination remaining and the residential amenity of prospective or adjoining occupants would be heavily prejudiced by the railway lines on two of the three sides of the site, leading to capacity reduction.</p> <p>There is a chance of hazardous risk due to the sites historical use, difficult topography and part of the site contains land of archaeological potential.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | One owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Site is vacant |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes, current application involves Housing Association |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Vacant |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – site is surrounded by residential area. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | The value of the land would be increased with residential allocation. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Low CIL (Charging Zone A = £0) |
| | iv) Demand | Local development interest in land as a housing site for small dwellings Low CIL (Charging Zone A = £0) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Site is currently vacant |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Remediation of site due to possibility of contamination |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable homes, larger homes, loss of employment land |
| | iv) infrastructure | Would need to be provided. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Higher density to reflect neighbouring properties |
| | ii) Quantity | 50-70 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-3 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

Only one access could be provided into the site, which would limit the amount of dwellings to 50. The access is wide off and would be from Southern Way. There is a good footpath network surrounding the site and it is close to local amenities. KCC Highways have previously commented on the planning application submitted for this site, (Y14/0928/SH).

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

The site was considered suitable in the previous SHLAA and could deliver 50-70 dwellings. It is within close proximity to services. There are constraints on the site; it is unknown whether or not there is contamination due to the historic use of the site – remediation may need to take place. The site should be regarded as suitable.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Folkestone Park

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 656 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Folkestone Park |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Silver Spring, Park Farm, Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | Other |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Redundant employment site | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.31ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | This is a new site put forward for residential development following the closure of Silver Spring in 2012. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any | There are no designations on this site. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes – proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes, the site has direct access onto the highway network. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes, the site was used previously for business. |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | iii) Is there water supply? | The site was previously developed so it should be possible to reconnect to the network |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | The site was previously developed so it should be possible to reconnect to the network |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | The site was previously developed so it should be possible to reconnect to the network |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No – there are three electricity substations on the site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Unknown |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | The previous industrial building was demolished in 2013 and the site has been cleared since. On inspection of the site there are no apparent adverse ground conditions. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Unknown |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | The site has been cleared and the ground is mostly flat – there is no significant difficult topography within the site. There is, however, a large retaining wall on the western boundary and a change in height between the two parcels of land. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the | |

| | |
|--|---|
| following? | |
| i) Townscape | <p>The proposed site is located within a light industrial and retail area. The surrounding buildings are mainly large warehouses and retailers. There could be conflict/neighbour issues between these uses and residential.</p> <p>Beyond the industrial land to the south, there is residential development – consisting of semi detached bungalows and chalet bungalows on the main road and a new development on the old Park Farm Primary School site mainly consisting of terraced two storey dwellings.</p> <p>The site has been vacant and cleared since 2013 – development of this site would significantly improve the aesthetic of the area.</p> |
| ii) Landscape | No – the site is previously developed land occupied by Silver Spring and the Builder Centre until these ceased operation in 2012. |
| iii) AONB | No |
| iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | <p>The site is currently identified to be retained in the ELR – however this is currently undergoing a review and subsequently this allocation could potentially be retracted. This allocation is for the Park Farm Industrial Site as a whole, not just for the redundant Silver Spring site. Furthermore, the ELR suggests that ‘on balance, this is a reasonably good industrial location but proximity to residential uses, lack of new space and lack of nearby services gives it an average ranking overall’.</p> <p>The site is currently of mixed-use including B1, B2, B8 and retail warehouse use.</p> <p>The site is likely to feature in the ELR review which is currently being drafted.</p> |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 1.3km from Folkestone Central train station |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 650m from Folkestone Primary Academy |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | Within close proximity of Sainsbury’s in Park Farm |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – New Surgery, Canterbury Road |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external | A buffer area would be required as the site is situated within the Park Farm |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>Estate (consisting of small industrial and retail buildings). It is proposed that the retaining wall to the west of the site remains.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | <p>Yes. Although the site is generally suitable in terms of the SHLAA, there could be conflict between residential and the neighbouring retail and business uses.</p> <p>There is also the outstanding issue as to whether the site would be required for future employment use. The decision as to whether this site should come forward would need to be based on policy.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | <p>No, one owner.</p> |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | <p>None, the site is cleared and unoccupied</p> |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | <p>Pre-application work has been undertaken which signifies a willingness to sell.</p> |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | <p>Pre-application work has been undertaken which signifies a willingness to sell.</p> |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | <p>The site is cleared.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | The adjacent uses are primarily small industrial and business uses. However, there is scope for housing development to work within this area as there is residential development further to the south of this proposed site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential land values would be higher than land allocated for employment. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | The site is located in a business park which is not that attractive. |
| | iv) Demand | This site is within the lower mid range of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Zone B which is £50 per sqm for residential development. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | The majority of the site has been cleared. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Not known. There could be issues relating to the change in levels between this site and neighbouring sites to the west. |
| | iii) planning policy | The site is within a business park. |
| | iv) infrastructure | The site is previously developed and so the infrastructure should be available. It is not known whether any additional requirements would be needed for 250 dwellings (please see below). |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | The size of the site could provide a mixture of types of dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | If considered at 60 dwellings per hectare, for the whole site, this would result in 250 |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | dwellings. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | If the site is considered suitable, then it could start development within the next five years as it is within the urban area and is brownfield land. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways – no comments received on this site**

- **Highways Agency – No site specific comments**

- **Environment Agency – No comments**

- **Natural England – No comments**

- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Despite this sites allocation in the adopted ELR, it is currently being updated therefore this allocation could change. There could be scope for residential development on this site, as it is within close proximity to services. The surrounding area consists of a mixed use of light industrial and business uses along with residential development further south of the site. For residential development to take place on this site, the retaining wall to the west of the site should remain. There are no significant constraints on the site found through this initial assessment, and although the site is slightly sloped, it has been cleared of the Silver Spring building that once occupied it.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Folkestone Park

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 338 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Folkestone Park |
| <i>Site</i> | Black Bull Allotments, | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>Name/Address:</i> | Dolphins Road Folkestone | | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Allotments | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.6 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | New site. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Site does not contain any constraints that could prevent development at this stage. Proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
|----------|--|-----------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Site is situated within a residential area of high density semi-detached dwellings. Capacity on the site would need to reflect local character and the linear form of the site. |
| | ii) Landscape | The loss of open space would have an impact on the surrounding residents. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | Yes - allotments |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes Bus - <400m Railway Station - >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 500 m Castle Hill & Academy Primaries |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes- Tesco Express Dover Road |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 150 m 'New Surgery' 128 Cant Rd |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Development of this site could lead to overlooking as gardens of houses in Dolphins Road and Canterbury Road would back onto the development. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Development of this site to residential would fit with its surrounding area and there are limited restraints. The site is within close proximity of services and primary schools, so is a suitable location. Proceed to next stage. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Allotment holders |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Still currently in use. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Site is currently still in use as allotments – so therefore could not be allocated until this use has ceased. |
|----------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes- residential |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development of this site would significantly increase land values compared to its existing use as allotments. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone B = £50 |
| | iv) Demand | Medium - CIL Charging Zone B = £50 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Clearance of the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There are no evident abnormal costs for the development of this site. |
| | iii) planning policy | Loss of open space, affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | Would need to be connected to existing facilities but would not be significant |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Large semi-detached houses are in the surrounding residential area. |
| | ii) Quantity | 65 (based on SHLAA submission) Density at 30 units per hectare |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 1-2 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>Only one access could be provided into the site, which would limit the amount of dwellings to 50. The access is wide off and would be from Dolphins Road. There is a good footpath network surrounding the site and it is close to local amenities.</p> |
|---|

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comments for Fisheries and Biodiversity. The loss of the green infrastructure (allotment gardens) and wider benefits that this offers at this site is unfortunate. No flood risk comments.

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Site could deliver up to 65 new dwellings in the space of 1-2 years. It is within a residential area of high-density semi-detached dwellings, and would therefore fit into the townscape as the size of the site would lead to similar linear development to adjacent roads.

However, it is still currently in use as allotments and it is unclear that this use will cease as the allotments have been in use for over 50 years already. Therefore there are more suitable sites that are more likely to come forward in a shorter time span.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|-----------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 458 | SDC Ward: | East Folkestone |
| Site Name/Address: | Highview School Moat Farm Rd, Folkestone | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | School | Area (ha): | 0.9 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | The land was regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | The land was regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA previously. There are no constraints on the site at this stage that would prevent its development. Proceed to stage 2. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Unknown |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Survey required to see if there is buried infrastructure |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Unknown |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Site is surrounded by residential development of detached and semi-detached bungalows and low two storey houses. There is a school playing field opposite the site that is gated. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | Part of site is a school playing field but the school is relocating so this may not be an issue. |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 482m to bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes Stella Maris 800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No 1000m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes- The New Surgery, 128 Canterbury Road |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | The site is within close proximity to the gardens of houses in Downs Road. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Survey is required to see whether there is buried infrastructure – however there are no other constraints. Proceed to stage 3. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Currently used as a school |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No – will be vacant once the school decants and relocates, which it is in the process of doing so. |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage | The site will be vacant in due course – the school is moving to a new |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|----|-----------|
| 4? | location. |
|----|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Land values will be greater as residential |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium CIL Charging Zone B =£50 |
| | iv) Demand | Medium CIL Charging Zone B =£50 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There are no constraints to the preparation of the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No abnormal costs are expected in developing the site |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable homes, larger homes |
| | iv) infrastructure | No specific requirements |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Surrounding area is a mixture of low density semi-detached dwellings to the west of the site and high density attached dwellings to the south of the site. |
| | ii) Quantity | Approximately 35 (40dph) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Up to 5 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>Only one access could be provided into the site, which would limit the amount of dwellings to 50. The access is wide off and would be from Southern Way. There is a</p> |
|---|

good footpath network surrounding the site and it is close to local amenities. KCC Highways have previously commented on the planning application submitted for this site, (Y14/0928/SH).

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Only significant restraints to the site appear to be the need for a survey to assess if there is any buried infrastructure. The site is located near residential development but would not significantly affect the amenity of residents. However, the development may back onto the gardens in Downs Road. The site is currently a school but is in the process of relocating – when this happens, the site will be vacant.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Sandgate

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|------------------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 608 | SDC Ward: | Sandgate and West Folkestone |
| Site Name/Address: | West Grove, Wellington Place Sandgate | Source: | |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | did not say |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes (there are no exact measurements) |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Y99/1097/97 and Y00/0851/SH for the erection of a 2 nd dwelling (in garden grounds fronting Sunnyside road) - Refused |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Issues regarding whether the site is large enough or not Half of garden area undevelopable due to steep bank |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Site is within latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Surrounding area is residential including detached, semi-detached and terraced, over 1/2/3 floors. |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPOs within close proximity to north and east edges of site |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Applicant owns 50% of freehold land |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available subject to owners agreement |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High CIL Charging Zone C = £100 |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | High CIL Charging Zone C = £100 |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Flats / apartments |
| | ii) Quantity | 8-10 flatted / apartment dwellings |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 1 year |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency |
|---|

- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the site is unsuitable as it is too small. Half of the garden cannot be developed on due to the steep bank and the TPOs in close proximity to the north and eastern edges of the site are a major constraint.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 113 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Sandgate and West Folkestone |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Former Encombe House Sandgate | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.6 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for | Planning permission Y11/0122/SH for |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | erection of 36 2 and 3 bedroomed flats. |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | <p>Y11/0122/SH allowed on appeal Site is large enough for the development of 5+ dwellings and has relevant planning permission.</p> <p>Proceed to Stage 2.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Yes – site is sloped but resolved in application |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | North – escarpment and Risborough Barracks East – detached houses and bungalows South – detached houses and bungalows West – wooded scarp face |
| | ii) Landscape | Resolved under terms of planning permission |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – resolved under terms of planning permission |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Site is within land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Site contains land with unstable ground conditions – however this has been resolved under terms of planning permission, along with issues regarding TPO's.</p> <p>Site contains protected species and habitats but this has been resolved under terms of planning permission.</p> <p>Not within close proximity to services.</p> <p>Proceed to Stage 3.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Expressions of interest have been sought and offers are under consideration |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | vacant since 1980's |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Site is vacant and has been since the 1980's with one owner – proceed to stage 4. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Residential development to the South of the site |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential would higher than other uses |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | High CIL Charging Zone C £125 |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Demand | High CIL Charging Zone C £125 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Site contains land of archaeological potential and land instability. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Land instability and is of archaeological potential |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | Would need to be linked to existing infrastructure. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses |
| | ii) Quantity | 36 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-5 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>This site already has planning permission and KCC Highways are satisfied that the access arrangements are acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Downs AONB <p>No comments</p> |
|--|

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site has relevant planning permission, and any constraints on the site have been resolved under the terms of the planning permission. The site has been vacant since the 1980's.

The site is situated within an attractive location that would significantly increase the land value and provide 36 dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 405 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Sandgate and West Folkestone |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Coolinge Lane land Sandgate | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.54 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Large site to accommodate 5+ dwellings. Development would lead to a significant loss of open space – as the open spaces opposite are not open to the public and are school playing fields. Land was regarded as deliverable/developable in previous SHLAA – proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – development of this site would fit in with the residential development currently surrounding it. |
| | ii) Landscape | No- screening would be needed for residential backing on to Coolinge Lane. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – Hedgerows and Tree groups -no TPO's |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 500m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes 50m Sandgate School |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes 600m 180 Sandgate Rd |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Site is within close proximity to services and majority of site surrounds residential development. There are no significant constraints that could prevent the development of this site. Proceed to stage 3. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No – one owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Owner looking to sell site |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Was Harvey Grammar School playing field – no longer in use |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available - Pent Valley School own the land & are looking to sell the land. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | The large open space site is surrounded by residential development and then Sandgate Primary School to the West of the site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development on this site would improve the value of the land significantly. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | This site is in an attractive location, with it being in charging Zone C at a rate of £100 per sq m. |
| | iv) Demand | This site is in a highly sought after location (CIL band C £110 per sq m.) |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | There appear to be no abnormal costs. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There appear to be no abnormal costs. |
| | iii) planning policy | The site is currently a school playing field – although no longer in use policy will need to be checked. |
| | iv) infrastructure | Development of this site could link to current infrastructure. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 54 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

KCC Highways have given pre-application advice on this site for a proposal for 40 dwellings. This was found to be suitable. A proposal for 54 dwellings would require one access and an emergency access onto Coolinge Lane. There are footpaths in the local area which take you to Folkestone West train station and also Sandgate Primary School, Folkestone School for Girls. The site is therefore in a sustainable location.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

- **Sport England**

The site includes (or potentially includes) existing sports facilities

CONCLUSIONS

Site is large enough and suitable for the development of 5 or more dwellings. However, perhaps only part of the site should be allocated as housing and the front of the site (facing onto Coolinge Lane) should be kept as community open space. The residential development would therefore remain within a residential area and would be screened from the main road, with suitable access from Bathurst Road onto the site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 636 | SDC Ward: | Sandgate and West Folkestone |
| Site Name/Address: | Shepway Resource Centre Sandgate | Source: | |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 0.64 |
| | | Site Visit: | 13.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | enable the development of five or more dwellings) | |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | There are no constraints at this stage & site is large enough to accommodate the development of 5+ dwellings. Proceed to stage 2. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Buried infrastructure – 30 metres underground cable. 6 months notice required |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Opposite the Shorncliffe Household waste site. In light industrial area. |
| | ii) Landscape | Buffer zone around site due to light industrial use of surrounding area? |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Small part on Southern Edge of site contains land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes- 120m to bus stop |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Buffer zone would need to be created to separate residential development from light industrial use of surrounding area |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No significant constraints on the site. Allocation would lead to residential development within an industrial site. Residential development is within close proximity but would not be attached to this development – therefore a possible constraint? |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No- one owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Proceed to stage 4 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Light industrial surrounding the proposed site. Residential development is near the site, but not front facing and with a lot of landscaping |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development would lead to an increase in land value compared to |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | existing use |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | High CIL Charging Zone C = £100 |
| | iv) Demand | High CIL Charging Zone C = £100 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Demolition and clearance of the current building would need to take place before development. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | High-density detached and semi-detached dwellings (compatible with surrounding residential area) |
| | ii) Quantity | 41 dwellings |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>The site is in a sustainable location close to the existing employment facilities on Military Road. There is a bus route along Military Road. The site has an existing access point which could accommodate 41 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England |
|---|

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site adjoins the army camp and would need screening to separate the development from the main road. The site is not in close proximity to a number of key services including a doctor's surgery and primary school. There is currently a building on site, but there are no significant constraints that would lead to this site not being suitable for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 674 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Digby Road, Folkestone (closest postcode) CT20 3NB | <i>Source:</i> | Submitted |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Car park (30+ years) | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.17 (form indicated 0.05 but this appears to be incorrect) |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------|--|
| | | Site Visit: | |
|--|--|-------------|--|

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No relevant planning applications |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Proceed to stage 2- the size of the site is large enough to accommodate 5+ dwellings and there are no significant constraints at this stage. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No connection to site, however, Potable water runs along boundary of site |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No connection to site, however, Southern Water sewer runs along boundary of site. |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No connection to site, however, UKPN cable runs along boundary of site |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | The site is within the latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No structures on the site |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The immediate adjoining land use is the Golden Valley Car Park Land surrounding the car park, and site is a mix of residential and commercial properties. Properties in the vicinity vary from 1 storey bungalows, to 4 storey blocks of flats. |
| | ii) Landscape | No- residential and commercial in the surrounding area. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes- Sandgate Primary School |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Surrounding uses include residential and commercial. Residential development could be suitable here but alternative car parking may need to be sourced for the commercial units surrounding the site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development on this site would significantly increase the land value compared to its current use as a car park. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | CIL Charging Zone C = £100 per sq m |
| | iv) Demand | Site is in a location of high demand due to its high CIL band of £100 per sq m |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Housing would be in keeping with adjacent properties at similar densities. |
| | ii) Quantity | 9 homes? |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-3 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways

This is a well used car park serving the local centre and the loss of this car park would not be acceptable without car parking surveys being undertaken to determine the current usage of the car park. KCC will not support any development that results in the loss of

car parking as this will result in overspill parking on Enbrook Valley.

- **Highways Agency**

Not seek to object to any of the sites currently included within the assessment

- **Environment Agency**

No comments

- **Natural England**

No comments

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comments

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

No comments

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

There are few constraints with this site; the impact residential development here may have on the commercial buildings close by may need to be assessed. However, the site is suitable.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Hythe

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 137 | SDC Ward: | Hythe |
| Site Name/Address: | Smiths Medical, Boundary Rd, Hythe | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | B1/B2 | Area (ha): | 3.2 |
| | | Site Visit: | 16.6.14 23.3.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | New Site |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes, the site is of a suitable size and does not contain any of the specific constraints. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located within Hythe which is identified as a Strategic Town for Shepway. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes - asbestos and decommissioned serialisation plant. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | The site is flat. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes – The northern end (the largest area within the site) is within 'significant' hazard flood zone. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site consists of office/industrial units which are adjacent to residential properties. Development would improve the townscape. |
| | ii) Landscape | The site is located on the edge of the urban area. Redevelopment would not have a detrimental impact on the wider landscape. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Yes – SE part in Hythe Ranges local wildlife site |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | The site is covered by Policies E1 and SS4. |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 185m on Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 400m Hythe Bay |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 350m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 780m Oaklands, Stade St |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The site is located within Hythe, a Strategic Town, and the settlement confines. It is also located within walking distance of the towns facilities (including public transport). The site is, however, within a 'significant' flood risk as identified in the SFRA and this would need mitigation. . |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | One owner |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes - relocation |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Not known |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | At the time the site was submitted the site was partly occupied. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | The site is considered to be deliverable |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Neighbouring uses consists of residential properties, farm land and open space/recreation. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Land values would rise if allocated for residential. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | The site is located on the edge of the town close to the coast. |
| | iv) Demand | High - There would be demand in this location [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Site will need to be cleared, Asbestos decontamination |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Flood risk mitigation |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing requirement Potential for Starter Home use. |
| | iv) infrastructure | As it is PDL, infrastructure is already provided. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | There are terraced houses to the north and terraced/semi-detached to the south. Site is of a size that could provide a mix |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | including larger properties to meet Core Strategy Policy CSD2. |
| | ii) Quantity | 122 proposed. This would be suitable given the size and location of the plot |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | The site is considered to be deliverable. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | -- |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

No comments

- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a sustainable location on previously developed land. The site will require 2 access points as it served by more than 100 dwellings. We would wish to see one access point from Fort Road and one from Range Road. New footpath provision will be required along Fort Road. KCC Highways will not support any access points onto Boundary Road as it is a narrow road and has parking along one side.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Occupies former part of Hythe Ranges, now developed for industrial use A possible WD boundary stone survives on the site's western boundary along Fort Road. Wartime APs show shooting range and ancillary buildings on site. An 'Old Gravel Pit' is shown on historic Ordnance Survey maps in the northern half of the proposed allocation area. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Close to AONB boundary. Brownfield site. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located within Hythe, a Strategic Town, and the settlement confines. It is also located within walking distance of the town's facilities (including public transport). The site is, however, within a 'significant' flood risk as identified in the SFRA and this would need mitigation. It is considered a deliverable and sustainable site, making use of previously developed land and contributing to an improvement of land and design quality of the locality,

and is therefore to be considered a preferred site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 153 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Princes Parade, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | open land, former domestic refuse waste disposal | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 7.2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Royal Military Canal SM adjacent on N (and local wildlife site). |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic settlement for Shepway |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes (SUB) – limited by heavy vegetation |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – south bank of RMC |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – rising main through site. |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No – beyond RMC |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – WM010 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | 4.5m above natural ground level as a result of its use for refuse. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Yes – gases and contamination as a result of former use |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No, but land levels are uneven due to previous uses |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Royal Military Canal to N |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes – storm beach gravel | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Development would change the coastline landscape at this location, but may be preferable to its previous use |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | as a refuse site. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | SM adjacent to N. AAP along N edge of site. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Local wildlife site SH26 adjacent to N |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | As above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 135m bus at Seabrook Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 160m Seabrook Primary |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 160m Seabrook News |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 2km Hythe. |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No – see remediation plan |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The site is in a reasonably sustainable and attractive location. It enjoys access to some services, and development could address contamination issues on site. However, consideration should be paid to the site's local wildlife site designation, and any design would have to deal incredibly sensitively with the adjacent Scheduled Monument, increasing access and enhancing the feature through design. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Developer interest |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | No – nearest residential is beyond RMC |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential would increase values compared to landfill |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive coastal location with heritage interest |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Remediation for contamination and land levels |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Remediation for contamination |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Local wildlife site |
| | iv) infrastructure | Southern Water Rising Main |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | 50:50 houses / flats. Must ensure minimum raising of houses above |

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------------------|
| | | ground. |
| | ii) Quantity | 150dw and recreation uses |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-3 years estimate |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | -- |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a sustainable location along Princes Parade and is close to Hythe and Sandgate. The site will require 2 access points as it serves more than 100 dwellings. Princes Parade does however currently suffer from significant parking issues and these would need to be addressed through any site allocation. KCC Highways would like to see new lay-by parking provided along Princes Parade. Princes Parade should be reduced in speed limit to 30mph together with an appropriate traffic calming scheme to ensure these appropriate vehicle speeds.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 1. Proposed allocation site is situated directly in front of the Scheduled Monument of the Royal Military Canal. The open setting of the canal makes a major contribution to the significance of the monument and the ability to appreciate its function. Development here would have a major impact on the monument's setting. The beach front here was heavily fortified during WW2 and a number of defensive features can be seen on the site on wartime aerial photographs that may survive as buried archaeological remains. Allocation for development would not be appropriate due to the harm to the significance of the Scheduled Royal Military Canal through change to its setting.

- **Environment Agency**

As mentioned in our comments through planning, this site is located on a historic landfill site. The impact on receptors from this historic use must be assessed (we understand Shepway District Council have already authorised investigations at this site).

The WFD water body "Royal Military Canal" (WFD ID GB70710007) is located to the north of this site and development here should take this into consideration.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

Although there may be certain abnormal costs involved in developing this site, this would bring previously developed land in a desirable location back into use. It is the preferable part of this section of coast to develop given its 'nil' flood hazard as noted in the SFRA, and given its proximity to local services. While potential capacity reduction and consideration will be required to avoid impact on the SM, there is a strong case for this site's allocation.

The site is in a reasonably sustainable and attractive location. It enjoys access to some services, and development could address contamination issues on site. However, consideration should be paid to the site's local wildlife site designation, and any design would have to deal incredibly sensitively with the adjacent Scheduled Monument, increasing access and enhancing the feature through design.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Hythe Central

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 142 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe Central |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Hythe swimming pool, South Road | <i>Source:</i> | Submitted |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Swimming Pool | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.5ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | New site |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | The site is within close proximity to a conservation area and is surrounded by land of archaeological potential. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | The site is within close proximity to land of archaeological potential which would need to be taken into account; however the site is large enough for the development of five or more dwellings and should therefore proceed to the next stage. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is within the upper tier settlement of Hythe |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Not known at this stage but existing use would result in car movements |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Not known |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Not known |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Generally flat with a slight change in levels between the site and Marine Parade |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No – the site adjoins land predicted to be in flood zones 2 & 3 by 2115 but does not fall within this zone itself |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site is situated on South Road and is surrounded by residential development. To the north of the site is open space which can be accessed by the public. The site is set back from the beach and would be an attractive location for residential |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | development. |
| | ii) Landscape | Hythe Swimming Pool is currently situated on the site and therefore this land is previously developed (brownfield). |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | There are no TPO's present on this site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site is adjacent to a conservation area. There are no listed buildings in close proximity to the site. The site is surrounded by land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No – this site is not protected open space |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | The site is approximately 800m from a bus stop |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | 0.8 miles to Hythe Bay C of E Primary School |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | Waitrose and Aldi are approximately 800m away from the site. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – Oaklands is around 950m away |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | On initial assessment of this site there does not appear to be any evidence that the amenity of residents could be adversely affected by any external environmental factors. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes there are no overriding issues that would prevent the site from being developed. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | The site is owned by Shepway District Council |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | The Hythe Swimming Pool is currently situated on this site. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes subject to creation of new swimming pool |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No developers identified at this stage |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | The site is currently in use as a public pool. If this site were to come forward, an alternative site would have to be provided for a new facility |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available in the longer term |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | The area surrounding this site is residential and therefore residential development on this site would be compatible. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential development of this site could significantly increase the land value. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | The site is within the area of Hythe and is within CIL zone C which is £100 per sqm for residential development. |
| | iv) Demand | CIL Zone C is £100per sqm for residential development, reflecting the area as a sought after location for residential development. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | The existing building would need to be cleared from the site. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | At this initial assessment stage, there does not appear to be any abnormal costs associated with the development of this site. |
| | iii) planning policy | Policy associated with the development of this site to residential would require an alternative site for the swimming pool to be |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | demonstrated. |
| | iv) infrastructure | At this stage no additional infrastructure would be required |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | A mixture of housing types to reflect the existing townscape |
| | ii) Quantity | This site would be suitable for the development of approximately 50 dwellings. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | No |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency |
|--|

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site would be suitable for future development once it has become redundant and an alternative facility has been identified.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 155 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Rectory Field, Eversley way, Seabrook, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Remote school playing field | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.75 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 13.6.14 23.3.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage | Land was regarded as deliverable/developable in the SHLAA |
|-------------------------|---|

| | |
|----|------------|
| 2? | previously |
|----|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – from Ian's Walk |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Unknown |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Unknown |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Unknown |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – site slopes up E-W |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone – Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development here would remove a significant amount of local open space. |
| | ii) Landscape | No – urbanised area |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | As above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus stop – 50m Highridge; 75m Spring Lane Railway Station - >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 355m Seabrook |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | 370m – Seabrook News |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 2km to Sun Lane, Hythe. |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Significant open space This site offers few constraints in an established settlement, and is available for development. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Currently used as school playing field for Seabrook Primary |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | KCC willing to dispose of asset |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Currently used as school playing field for Seabrook Primary |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available, subject to process for disposing of school land |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Surrounded by residential uses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase land values compared with existing open space |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive suburban village Location |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Dealing with gradient |
| | iii) planning policy | LR12, Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses/ flats |
| | ii) Quantity | Up to 50 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site is located in a relatively sustainable location close to Hythe. There is however access issues in the site being served from Ian’s Walk and so a parking restriction scheme would be required in order to provide suitable access to the site from Naildown Road. Only one point of access is required.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Site lies in an area of general archaeological potential. There has been some historic (nineteenth century) quarrying at the northern end of the site. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Sport England**

Planning Policy Objective 1 within Sport England’s Land Use Planning Policy Statement ‘Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives’

(http://www.sportengland.org/media/162412/planning-for-sport_aims-objectives-june-2013.pdf), aims to prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site is sustainable, within built confines, with access to local services, and relatively free of constraints. It is not allocated as public open space/village green, but it should be acknowledged that development may be seen as a removal of this amenity. It would also be subject to any particular process for the disposal of school land. However, it must score highly in terms of its ability to deliver overall sustainable development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|--|
| SHLAA Ref: | 158 | SDC Ward: | Hythe |
| Site Name/Address: | Vale Farm (The Piggeries), Horn Street Folkestone | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Vacant piggery | Area (ha): | 4.6 (1.3 developable) |
| | | Site Visit: | May 22 2014 Structures not too bad. Southern part integrate ok. 23.3.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local landscape area, and TPO on S of site. |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Integration vs regeneration Part of site is in nature conservation Yes |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | While Horn Street is not a recognised settlement on the hierarchy, it is in close proximity to the Sub-Regional Town of Folkestone, and the Strategic town of Hythe |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No (SUB) |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – HU-177 Piggery, on Southern part of site. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Sloping to down to W from a high ridge. The south of the site is in a low basin. |
| | | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? |
| xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | ii) Landscape | Sandgate Escarpment and Seabrook Valley Local Landscape Area. Development would erode the rusticity and rurality of the location. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – across southern part of site |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Yes - rear part local wildlife sites. |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | Yes |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus Stop – 100m on Horn Street Railway Station - >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 750m Seabrook |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Circa 650m Shorncliffe Convenience Store |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes - >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | <p>To its East at the top of the valley slope is Shornecliffe Garrison, a strategic allocation in the Core Strategy. Land between the Garrison and the proposal site is steeply sloping and wooded.</p> <p>Immediately to the North West and West of the site is residential development forming part of the Horn Street settlement. Seabrook Vale comprises largely two storey dwellings of ragstone construction.</p> <p>Land to the west of Horn Street forms the Western side of the Seabrook Valley a mix of agricultural land and residential uses.</p> |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would substantially increase values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Contamination remedying |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | CO5 |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | Local landscape area Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | Road improvements if large-scale development |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses only that reflect character of Horn Street – immediate vicinity. |
| | ii) Quantity | 26dw proposed – this is considered suitable. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Proposed 2 years |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>This site is relatively constrained due to the geometry of Horn Street and the lack of a footpath along the eastern side of Horn Street. The only possible location for an access would be in the middle section of the southern part of the site fronting Horn Street if it is deemed to be a site suitable for allocation. A northern access would not be suitable due to the constrained nature of Horn Street in this location. A suitable cross point in the form of a central island across Horn Street would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Site lies in an area of general archaeological potential. The site lies in an area used for military training and it is possible that this activity extended into the site in question. Wartime aerial photographs show a possible WW2 period anti-invasion/anti-tank ditch heading towards the proposed allocation site. The site includes ‘walled gardens/enclosures’ that are first shown on the First Edition Ordnance Survey Map. The Cheriton Tithe Map shows the location of the now demolished Sea Brook Farm within the proposed allocation site. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions. Further assessment and recording of walling adjacent to Seabrook Vale is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comments</p> |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

There is a tension in this site – it comprises Greenfield land, but its previous agricultural uses have left areas of contamination. Its derelict agricultural buildings offer a certain beautiful decay which currently looks well in this protected local landscape area. The Southern part, subject to a TPO, is the area of highest contamination. The applicant proposes avoiding development of the Western part of the site to avoid the stream. Development on the Eastern part of the site should be avoided to prevent encroachment into countryside and coalescence of settlement. Development of the area around existing buildings, incorporating existing structures into the design of a characterful and interesting place, would be most welcome.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 313 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Foxwood School, Seabrook Rd, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | School (moving) | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 6.3 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 7.4.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar | No |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic Town (Hythe) |
|---|--|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – from Seabrook Road. Access may also be possible from Cliff Road. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – potential to improve area |
| | ii) Landscape | No – already developed as school |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | AONB to N outside site |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Listed building to S of site; AAP on N part of site. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – bus outside site entrance. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.3km to Hythe Bay |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 750m Waitrose |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 750m Sun Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes The site is not especially close to Hythe's services, but there are relatively few constraints on site, and it is located on a main |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | distributor road with good transport links. This is a brownfield site located by residential uses, and therefore suitable. |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Yes – school. New site currently under construction at Park Farm Road, Folkestone |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Surrounded by residential uses – large detached properties in generous settings; and The Childrens Centre to SW. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase land values compared to current school use. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive tree-lined site in verdant suburb of Hythe. |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Yes – demolition of existing school buildings |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Latchgate area – deeper foundations |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | Latchgate area Area of Special Character (Cannongate Road/Cliff Road/Seabrook Road, Hythe) |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Detached dwellings would be most appropriate in this suburban area. |
| | ii) Quantity | 126dw indicative |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Up to 5 years – depends on progress of new building for school |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Highways <p>The site is previously developed and close to the local facilities in Hythe. The site also previously had a significant amount of traffic using it being a school. The site would require 1 point of access and an emergency access and it would need to be demonstrated that the existing junction has adequate capacity to remain as just a priority junction. No vehicular access can be taken from Cliff Road as this is a private road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Site lies in an area of general archaeological potential, with Iron Age and Romano-British finds having been made a short distance to the north-east. A pillbox is recorded in the HER as having been present within the site, but this does not appear to be still extant. The School (then known as Seabrook Lodge School) is recorded as having been requisitioned by Canadian Troops who were based here during the Second World War. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>Outside of AONB, but close to boundary and within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB. Woodland within the site must be retained and development be of a low density to correspond to existing surrounding development and provide for adequate separation between development and trees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> |
|--|

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This would be a preferred site as the redevelopment of previously developed land (former school) close to Hythe, free of the majority of constraints and close to local services.

While the school's new site, in Park Farm Road, Folkestone, is still under construction, a timeframe for the cessation of activity on this site is not firmly assured.

The site is not especially close to Hythe's services, but it is well within reach of these. There are relatively few constraints on site, and it is located on a main distributor road with good transport links. This is a brownfield site located by residential uses, and therefore suitable.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Hythe Central

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 416 (317&416) | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land off Range Rd Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.7 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- Site benefits from relevant planning permission (Y11/0284/SH) |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |
|----------|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | <p>Fasttrack to availability</p> <p>Site benefits from relevant planning permission (Y11/0284/SH) for a mixed use development of 60 dwellings, 9 commercial and recreational huts. Site is under construction.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Western half of site Storm Beach Gravel |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Listed building off SE corner of site. Martello Towers (SM) to W of site. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------|
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Repeated Question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | NA |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Developed by Kentish Projects |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available now |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | To West - SWS Treatment Works a substantial single building and Hythe Military Ranges beyond; To North – Various large buildings forming Range Road Industrial Estate and two storey dwellings; To South – 1 and 2-storey dwellings and a single storey scout hut. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase land values. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive coastal location |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | i) site preparation | HU-168 Land contamination |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Stabilisation of shingle? |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Mixed houses and apartments |
| | ii) Quantity | 60 (Permission granted) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>The site already benefits from planning permission. (Y11/0284/SH). There are no highway issues associated with this development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency • KCC Heritage <p>Score 4. Occupies former part of Hythe Ranges, now developed for industrial use A possible WD boundary stone survives on the site's western boundary along Fort Road. Wartime APs show shooting range and ancillary buildings on site. An 'Old Gravel Pit' is shown on historic Ordnance Survey maps in the northern half of the proposed allocation area. Archaeological</p> |
|---|

mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Close to AONB boundary. Brownfield site. High quality design and appropriate scale, layout, landscaping and mitigation required.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Site benefits from relevant planning permission (Y11/0284/SH) for a mixed use development of 60 dwellings, 9 commercial and recreational huts. Site is under construction.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 621 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land opposite 24 Station Road, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.25 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 16.6.14 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---------|
| | | | 23.3.16 |
|--|--|--|---------|

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes - 96/0654/SH Outline permission granted for a 24 bed hospice. Not implemented |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Local landscape area Previous permission is well lapsed, and allowed very low density development on site |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic Town (Hythe) |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Yes – Latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – enters site along W boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No – touches on W boundary |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No – touches on W boundary |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Local landscape area. Development on the southern part of the site could constitute appropriate development, but given the Northern part opens up to open and protected garden and countryside areas, development here would erode the natural setting of the locality and begin encroachment into the countryside. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes and arboricultural report undertaken. TPOs along and beyond E, N and W boundaries. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP encroaches on SW part of site |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No, but Local Landscape Area |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus - <400m Train - >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes 420m Hythe TC / Waitrose |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes 600 m Sun La. |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. The Mill Lease valley is protected by policy CO5 of the Local Plan 2006. Any development proposition should be sensitive to this. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|---------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Views along N and W boundaries present as inherently rural. North – some development with substantial gardens, heavily screened by trees East – residential houses and chalet bungalows South – residential houses West – substantial grounds of Saltwood Care Centre, in entirety subject to TPO. No development beyond this on NW part of the site |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase land values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive suburbs with heavily rural feel to N |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Deeper foundations and ground preparation – Latchgate area |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Latchgate area Local landscape area |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | 30-50% flatted proposed, but this would not be appropriate in this suburban rural location characterised |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | by individual dw in larger plots |
| | ii) Quantity | 30-60dw proposed. Would suggest 10-15 max in lower part of site to mirror neighbours. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-5 years (sub) |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>A suitable vehicular access into the site could be provided but a pedestrian access cannot due to the water course to the west of the site and 3rd party land ownership issues. The site is currently remote from local bus services and therefore the site is not particularly sustainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Site lies in an area of general archaeological potential. The line of the Roman road between Folkestone and Lympne is projected to pass near the site to the south. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>Outside of AONB but within setting. The landscape here is of high quality and shares its characteristics within the adjacent AONB. Development here would be harmful to the AONB. Not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comments</p> |
|---|

CONCLUSIONS

This site is available and developable, but offers certain environmental constraints, in particular the impact on the local landscape area should be tested. Development should be restricted to the southern part of the site, closest to the strategic settlement of Hythe and furthest from the constraints. It should mirror the density of surrounding development insofar as this area comprises mostly individual houses in large gardens.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 615 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land north west of Blackhouse Hill, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural / materials storage | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 17.6 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | <i>22 May. 5 units may fit in bottom of site on Gypsies, much of n/e site very prominent</i> |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | New site |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA | No – Adjacent to Ancient Woodland |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes - The site has not been assessed before and does not fall within any of the identified constraints. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located just north of Hythe, which is identified as a Strategic Town for Shepway. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – The site fronts the Blackhouse Hill. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No – within adjacent highway |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone and Limestone safeguarding |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site lies to the north of a residential development consisting of detached houses. |
| | ii) Landscape | The site is situated within the AONB, and lies adjacent to a tree belt to the south and west. To the north there is an open field. To the north of this field is another tree belt. However, due to the size of the site this would still represent a large encroachment into the countryside bringing urban form (street lighting and roofscapes) that would be visible in the wider countryside. The remaining part of the field, not art of this submission, would also be put under threat from further development.. A small area in the bottom of Blackhouse Hill corner may may be suitable for some development . |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iii) AONB | Yes - the site falls within an area |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Yes – Part – could be an opportunity to improve biodiversity in the area. |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes -the site includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No – adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus >400m Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |
|--|--|----|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | <p>Development of the whole site would be detrimental to the countryside and the AONB. There could also be an impact on neighbouring local wildlife designations.</p> <p>There may be potential for a smaller area to be developed that would have a reduced impact on the AONB and which could contribute to improving the Biodiversity in the area.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| A | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | Single ownership |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | No |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | Yes |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | Developer promoted scheme |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | No |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | Available |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – the neighbouring uses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential would be the highest vale. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | High attractiveness due to countryside location. |
| | iv) Demand | High due to location. |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Site is undeveloped |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No abnormal costs (infrastructure is available in road) |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing & possible habitat improvements |
| | iv) infrastructure | Infrastructure is available in road. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Mixed development but could provide larger dwellings in line with Core Strateg policy. |
| | ii) Quantity | Smaller area???? |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Deliverable |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

Not suitable for development as this is a red site. However, two points of access would be required onto Blackhouse Hill. This would require two right hand turn lanes which would significantly widen Blackhouse Hill and have impacts on the local landscape. A footpath would be required along Blackhouse Hill and significant improvements would be required to local bus services in order to serve the site with Hythe Town Centre. There are also capacity constraints at the A259 / Blackhouse Hill junction which would need to be addressed.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Within AONB. Development here would be unrelated to existing settlement pattern and represent a major expansion into high quality landscape that would fail to conserve or enhance the AONB as well as impacting on important views to Saltwood Castle. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site should not be considered a preferred site for development given its extensive natural constraints, situated within the AONB and adjacent to a variety of other designations. Development would constitute a significant encroachment into the countryside, and would consolidate the principle of development north of Blackhouse Hill. It is also some significant distance from local services. If any development is required in this location, it would have to be restricted to the very southern point of this site, be of low density and low quantity.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 622 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Saltwood Care Centre, Tanners Hill, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Care Centre and substantial treed garden | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 23 rd March 2016 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a | No – Substantial planning history on site related to its use for a Care Centre. Undecided Y15/0720/SH Outline application for the erection of 84 extra |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | care flats with access and landscaping. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Local landscape area |
|----------------------------|----------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic Town (Hythe) |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – existing on Tanner’s Hill |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – gently sloping in general, but with significant slope to E. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – along E boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No – some encroachment on E boundary |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No – some encroachment on E boundary |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – extension into countryside, and would threaten TPOed trees. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Blanket TPO across whole site. Arboricultural report accompanies submission. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP across South and on W boundary. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No – Local Landscape Area |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | As above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus adjoins site |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 780m Saltwood |

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 380m Hythe TC / Waitrose |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 600m Sun Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No – tranquil area |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>There are constraints on site that would be showstoppers, including the encroachment into the countryside given that this site is outside of the Hythe settlement boundary. There is a blanket TPO across the whole site, and the presence of substantial diverse mature species. Development of open market housing would be at odds with the character of the area. The only acceptable development on this site would be the proportionate expansion of the existing care services, designed to respect the environmental and design constraints of the site.</p> <p>The development of open market housing on the site would create undue pressure on the environmental constraints on the site, and would create pressure to sever the care home land uses from the wider amenity space of the site. This is a designated local landscape area, and development outside of the exceptional need for the care home to expand for viability reasons should be resisted.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Care Home on South of site, and largely self-contained retirement housing to west of this. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available, but only for care home expansion (C2 use). Otherwise, open market C3 use would constitute encroachment into the countryside, and would be contrary to Paragraph 118 of the NPPF given the presence of significant mature species subject to TPO on site. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | North – open farmland East – open grazing land; and single storey and two storey dwellings in Blackhouse Hill South – two storey terraced houses at Mulberry Court and four storey care home West – Tanners Hill/Tanners Hill gardens – 2 storey semi detached houses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase land uses compared to existing treed valley exponentially. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive suburban / semi-rural area |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Removal of TPOed trees |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Root and general tree protection areas required. Latchgate area – deeper foundations |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Flats proposed |
| | ii) Quantity | Circa 90 apartments proposed |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | 2-5 years (SUB) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>A planning application has been received for extra care apartments on this site, which we raised no objections to. This site is however not suitable for market housing as stated in the attached notes as a footpath link could not be provided to link in with the care home due to separate ownership issues. There are known to be capacity issues at the junction of Station Road and the A259 which would need to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Site lies in an area of general archaeological potential. The line of the Roman road between Folkestone and Lympne is projected to pass near the site to the south [subject to recent application Y15/0720/SH AR1 condition recommended]. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comments</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| CONCLUSIONS | <p>This site would not be suitable for open market housing, and would be a clear encroachment into the countryside at the expense of trees deemed worthy of retention. An application has been submitted for several blocks of apartment accommodation; however this is to be considered an inappropriate location for such high density accommodation and its associated infrastructure impacts.</p> |
|--------------------|---|

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 640 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|-------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Adj 43 Horn St, Folkestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Kitchen vegetable garden; play area | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 13.06.14 23.03.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Local landscape area |
|----------------------------|----------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Between Sub-regional and Strategic towns, adjoining the settlement boundary. |
|----------|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Craythorne Close is a private road. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Gentle slope (SUB). Access to site may be an issue for construction vehs. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone – Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – increased urbanisation of semi-rural location |
| | ii) Landscape | Impact on local landscape area |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP on eastern sliver of site |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Local landscape area |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 60m bus stop at Horn Street |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 850m to Seabrook Primary |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 825m Shorncliffe Convenience |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No >800m – Hythe Sun Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This would not be a preferred site as a result of its distance from services, its physical separation from the settlement of Horn Street, and its extension of the built area further to the West into the Countryside. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Two ownerships |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Resi to North; Recreation land to S and E; Grazing land to W |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase land values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive countryside location related to hamlet |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Servicing of site; removal of trees on site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Engineering of road access |
| | iii) planning policy | Local landscape area saved policy of 2006 Local Plan |
| | iv) infrastructure | May require upgrade of private road to s38 standards |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses proposed |
| | ii) Quantity | 7-8dw proposed |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | -- |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways Access via Craythorne Close would not be suitable due to its limited width and therefore cannot be supported. No other means of access can be provided. • Highways Agency No objection • Environment Agency |
|--|

- **Natural England**
 - **Kent Downs AONB**
- No comment
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
 - **HSE**
- No comment
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**
- No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This would not be a preferred site as a result of its distance from services, its physical separation from the settlement of Horn Street, and its extension of the built area further to the West into the Countryside, and would negatively affect the local landscape area as protected by the Local Plan 2006. Development on the apex of the hill would potentially be visible from afar and would erode the countryside character of the locality without substantial landscape screening.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 444 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land north-west of Rectory Lane, Saltwood | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | "Rough ground with Christmas Trees" | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No – the site was assessed previously and was considered to be unsuitable for development. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No - The site was previously been considered unsuitable due to its location within the AONB and being divorced from the settlement. Development would also be detrimental to the setting of the adjacent conservation area through the loss of open land that contributes to its special character. The situation has not changed. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located just north of Hythe, which is identified as a Strategic Town for Shepway. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Single country lane may have to be upgraded. |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | To neighbouring properties |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | ? |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | To neighbouring properties |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | ? |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes - Sandstone |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The site is adjacent to four large properties set in large plots of land in the open countryside. Development here would change this character. |
| | ii) Landscape | The site is located within the open countryside. Development would be detrimental to the wider landscape as it would introduce urban form into the countryside. |
| | iii) AONB | Yes development would be detrimental |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes, along the road frontage. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No – Adjacent to conservation area and two listed building. Their setting would be detrimentally affected by any development. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes - Sandstone |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Highways <p>Not suitable for development as this is a red site. Nonetheless Rectory Lane is narrow and of poor alignment and therefore not capable of accommodating any development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency <p>This land is located to the south of a historic landfill site, therefore the impacts of leachate and landfill gas must be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>Within AONB. Development here would be unrelated to existing built form of settlement and result in inappropriate encroachment of development into the AONB. Not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust |
|---|

- HSE

No comments

- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The site was previously been considered unsuitable due to its location within the AONB and being divorced from the settlement. Development would also be detrimental to the setting of the adjacent conservation area through the loss of open land that contributes to its special character. The situation has not changed.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|-------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 463 | SDC Ward: | Hythe |
| Site Name/Address: | Hotel Imperial Golf Course lands Hythe | Source: | |
| Current Use: | Golf course | Area (ha): | 16.8 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes – Has been found unsuitable previously due to flood risk and loss of open space. However, Hazard Mapping has reduced the scale of flooding so the situation has changed. |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Part of the site falls within the Extreme Flood Hazard. |
|----------|---|---|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Although the site was found unsuitable previously, the site should be considered again due to the new information relating to flood risk. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located in Hythe, which is identified as a Strategic Town for Shepway. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | The site fronts onto Princes Parade |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | If the whole site was developed this could yield around 500 dwellings. A transport survey (??) would have to be undertaken and this could have implications for the wider highway network. |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Site falls within Flood Zone 3 – Sequentially preferable sites should be considered in the first instance and the site should be subject to the Exceptions Test SFRA Hazard mapping - the majority of the site falls outside of the flood risk. There is mainly 'significant' flood hazard along the southern boundary (frontage along Princes Parade). Within this area there is a small area of 'extreme' hazard flooding. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | There is a small element of storm beach gravel |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | This is an open part of the town |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | Not affected |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | None identified |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | None |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site is adjacent to the Royal Military Canal, which lies to the north of the site. This is a scheduled monument. The open character of the site forms part of the setting to this scheduled monument and its loss to development would be highly detrimental. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | None |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | The site lies adjacent to a local wildlife site (it runs along the length of the canal). |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | The size of the site is substantial, especially given its location with respect to central Hythe, in the order of 15 ha or more. ANGSt standard confirms the significance of this – |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | value of accessible open space of any significant size. Alternative open space nearby is not of the same scale, quality or as accessible. The scale could be seen as increasing the possibilities of finding alternative use(s) within the site, however there is no actual or emerging proposal to consider. It is recognised that the owner has not foreclosed other options such as business or community use; but a judgement with respect to residential development and planning policy is required here. |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes - the site is less than 400m away from a bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – the site is 700m away from a primary school |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – the site is more than 800m away |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – the site is more than 1km away |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>No - The hotel forms the easternmost extent of the built form of central Hythe that extends to the coast (West Parade/ South Rd). The Royal Military Canal, a scheduled monument, lies to the north and the sea to the south beyond Princes Parade.</p> <p>The land is considered to be important for the setting of the scheduled monument and for accessible open space with its unique open space features (location, setting and scale). It is considered that, as there is no specific reason to set aside this loss for any community benefit, the site should not proceed to the third stage.</p> <p>The land itself is shown as in flood zone 3 (but only small part is within the 'significant' hazard mapping of the SFRA), so that sequentially preferable site should be considered in the first instance.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The hotel forms the easternmost extent of the built form of central Hythe that extends to the coast (West Parade/ South Rd). The Royal Military Canal, a scheduled monument, lies to the north and the sea to the south beyond Princes Parade.

The land is considered to be important for the setting of the scheduled monument and for accessible open space with its unique open space features (location, setting and scale). It is

considered that, as there is no specific reason to set aside this loss for any community benefit, the site should not proceed to the third stage.

The land itself is shown as in flood zone 3 (but only small part is within the 'significant' hazard mapping of the SFRA), so that sequentially preferable site should be considered in the first instance.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|----------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 603 | SDC Ward: | Hythe |
| Site Name/Address: | <i>Land off Spanton Crescent Hythe</i> | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | <i>Vacant former barracks</i> | Area (ha): | 0.1 |
| | | Site Visit: | <i>13.6.14</i> |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | No |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | The site does not qualify as it is smaller than 0.17Ha. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is adjacent to Hythe` |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Yes – Latchgate area |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No – adjacent to Broom Hill Stream |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Open space on the edge of the built form |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes Bus stop - <401m Railway Station - >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 600 m St Augustine's |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes - 750 m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site does not meet the size threshold for the development of at least 5 dwellings. Any intensification of development in this location would be out of keeping with the locality. Therefore it is discounted from consideration.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 630 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adj. 10 Spring Lane, Seabrook, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------|
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Woodland and six garages | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.49 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Yes – Ancient Woodland Local Wildlife Site SH27 Parker Wood and Seabrook Stream. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No - This site is allocated Ancient Woodland in its entirety, and benefits from local wildlife site and landscape character area status. Allocation for development would not be appropriate. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways
- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site is allocated Ancient Woodland in its entirety, and benefits from local wildlife site and landscape character area status. Allocation for development would not be appropriate.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form- Hythe Rural

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 457 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe Rural |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land opposite Rock Cottage, Botolphs Bridge Road, Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Scrub land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.631 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 23 rd March 2016 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |
|----------|--|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes, but: Locational suitability (first part of plan) Local landscape area Area of flood risk |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Unrelated to any settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – onto Botolph’s Bridge Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – WM001 Botolph’s Bridge Road |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'nil', but eastern and NW part of site 'significant'. Extreme on far E boundary. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes – storm beach gravel Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Development on this site would constitute unsustainable development in the countryside |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP – undated earthworks |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 130m on A259 |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – Palmarsh Primary 1.5km |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – circa 3km Hythe |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – circa 2km Hythe |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site comprises contaminated land that development could serve to improve. It adjoins the settlement confines, and following the completion of the neighbouring development which has commenced, it will have access to a nearby local centre. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Not at present, but will be once commenced Nickolls Quarry development is built out |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase exponentially as land is currently unused scrub |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location with views towards the sea. |
| | iv) Demand | High (CIL band C) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Services will need to be provided to the site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There may be a need for some level of site bunding. Although the majority of the site has lower flood risk, there are parts of that are more susceptible to others, and the surrounding area is shown to have ‘significant’ and ‘extreme’ flood risk. |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD1 Affordable Housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | Potential upgrading to part of Botolph’s Bridge Road from the site entrance to its junction with Dymchurch Road. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Dwellings will need to exceed one storey, given the location in FZ2 and 3. |
| | ii) Quantity | Given the size and location of the site, approximately 12dw is appropriate at 20dph. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | No – currently too remote from settlement |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes – once the Nickolls Quarry development is built out, it will adjoin. |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways
- Highways Agency
- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site adjoins the settlement boundary for Hythe, and contains one of the only areas of 'nil' flood hazard in the locality. While at present it is remote and would not be sustainable location-wise, it adjoins the limits of the Nickolls Quarry/Martello Lakes development which is well under construction. It also comprises contaminated land that development could serve to improve. While the adjacent permitted development is currently under construction, it does not have the best access to services, but this should be remedied in the near future with the development of a proximate local centre. Development should ensure, however, that housing is not constructed in the small area of 'significant' flood hazard on the easternmost part of the site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 175 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe West |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land south west of Nickolls Quarry Hythe | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 14.66 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Area of 'extreme' flood hazard across the majority of the site. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | UNSUIT loc No – extreme flood hazard Local landscape area. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | <i>Bus - <401m Train - >800m</i> |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | <i>>800m</i> |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | <i>>800m</i> |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health <p>No comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Highways <p>Not suitable for development as it is in extreme flood zone, so we will not be commenting further.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>Outside of AONB, but within setting. Development would represent an inappropriate extension of existing built development into greenfield land to the north, bringing it closer to the AONB. Not supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comments</p> |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

This site cannot come forward as the majority comprises extreme flood hazard, and the remainder 'significant'. In any case, it is remote from services and would not be able to deliver sustainable development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 601 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe West |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Burmarsh Rd land'Sunnyside' Hythe west | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 11.7 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 13.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | 'Extreme' flood risk across whole site. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – 'extreme' flood risk across whole site. Integration / SLA |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes [The vast majority of this very large site would not be able to integrate. Any substantial development would be unlikely to be consistent with principles of walkability etc. However with appropriate landscaping etc the potential for a small-scale development should be explore e.g. 'infilling' along the main road frontage. This would not appear to be of 'ribbon form'. This most appropriate location to consider would appear tightly around 'Sunnyside' and ' Tierradentro'] |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Train ->800m Bus - >400m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | >800m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | UNSUITABLE |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

No comments

- **KCC Highways**

Not suitable for development as this is a red site. Site would be accessed from Burmarsh Road which is narrow, has no footpath or street-lighting and is therefore not acceptable.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Immediately adjacent to AONB boundary and within setting. Development here would extend built confines of Hythe to the west.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No objection

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No objection

CONCLUSIONS

This site offers 'extreme' flood hazard to 2115 as per the SFRA. Therefore, allocation would not be appropriate.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 624 (application SHLAA Ref 175) | SDC Ward: | Hythe Rural |
| Site Name/Address: | Bluewater Caravan Site, Dymchurch Road Hythe | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 1.255 |
| | | Site Visit: | 13.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | 'Extreme' flood hazard across majority of site |

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – extreme flood hazard |
|---------------------|---------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|
| | | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Train >800m Bus - <401m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes (250m Palmarsh) |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | UNSUITABLE |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England |
|--|

- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site suffers from 'extreme' flood hazard to 2115 as highlighted by the SFRA. The SE remainder of the site suffers from 'significant' flood hazard. Allocation would therefore not be appropriate.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 626c | SDC Ward: | Hythe West |
| Site Name/Address: | Land at Lyell Close (s) Hythe | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Open green space | Area (ha): | 0.131 |
| | | Site Visit: | 13.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | No |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Risk of flooding is 'significant' |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | 0.05ha Des OS This site is too small to enable development of 5 houses. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Whole site 'significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus - <400m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 550m Hythe Bay |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 600m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 770m Oaklands |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|-------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage | NA |
|-------------------------|----|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 3? | |
|-----------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site does not meet the size threshold for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1023 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe Rural |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Wood Acres, Old London Road, Hythe, CT21 4JE | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Local amenity overgrown garden and woodland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.5ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | 1964 to 1970 – 4 applications for erection of houses/flats refused 97/0350/SH – erection of 24-bed hospice: approved (unimplemented) Y02/1003/SH – erection of replacement dwelling: approved (unimplemented) |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Site is large enough to accommodate the development of 5+ dwellings. It is a new site (2015/2016) but has received planning permission previously. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Broadly related to primary service centre, but well outside settlement boundary |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – London Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – but available in road or nearby |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – but available in road or nearby |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No – but available in road or nearby |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Unlikely |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Latchgate area at SE part |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Land slopes gradually from west to east and from north to south, where it has a long frontage [90m] to London Road. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes – part of proposed site is within flood zones 2 & 3. Whole site 'nil' |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Encroachment into the countryside |
| | ii) Landscape | Land with potential landscape interest |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Adjacent to AONB (north) |

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – TPO No4 1988 across whole site |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | As above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 175m on London Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 250m St Augustine's |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 650m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | The whole of the site is covered in TPOs and the proposed site is outside the settlement boundary, with development to this site being considered as encroachment into the countryside. There is a small area within the site that is suitable for development (has received planning permission) to replace a fire damaged building. Therefore site is not suitable for large scale development and could not accommodate 5+ dwellings. |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Site considered appropriate for Low-Density, High-Quality housing with the northern part set aside as publicly accessible open space / nature reserve; development of 10 dwellings would generate 10 open-market dwellings and 2 affordable. This would take the form of large houses set in substantial plots and maintain the woodland setting. |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|------------|
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2-10 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The whole of the site is covered in TPOs and the proposed site is outside the settlement boundary, with development to this site being considered as encroachment into the countryside. There is a small area within the site that is suitable for development (has received planning permission) to replace a fire damaged building. Therefore site is not suitable for large scale development and could not accommodate 5+ dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

New Romney

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 230 | SDC Ward: | New Romney |
| Site Name/Address: | Land RO The Old School House, Church Lane, New Romney | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Part brownfield former school and hardstanding | Area (ha): | 0.4 |
| | | Site Visit: | 6.4.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Identified in previous SHLAA Y07/1251/SH – outline application for 14dw Y09/0007/SH – details pursuant to outline permission Y11/0146/SH – extension of time to Y07 permission Y15/0235/SH – full application for the erection of 14 dw with associated landscaping and parking, under consideration. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic town |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes, from Church Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Not on site, but HU-072 adjacent on NW boundary. Radon gas class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | There is hardstanding very much overgrown with unmanaged vegetation |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No – New Romney Main Sewer circa 50m to E off site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Single TPO No 17 of 2008 on southern part of site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP across entire site |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 190m High Street |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 470m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 240m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 10m – on adjacent site |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site would constitute infill development in a very sustainable location close to New Romney's services. There are hardly any |
|----------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | constraints on site, save for a tree protected by TPO which should be integrated into any site design. The site is brownfield, and benefits from a successful planning history, albeit one currently undetermined. |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | There is a legal covenant over the land relating to access to the adjoining development land (site 436) |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes – this land is available and, given the need to maintain access to the neighbouring development site, both should come forward together. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Residential uses to the NW, SE and SW, with an area of vacant land also to the SW. To the NE is the surgery fronting Church Lane, and the old school house redeveloped for residential use. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would potentially yield significantly more than vacant land. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive location close to the centre of town with views of the Norman church |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) site preparation | Site clearance of majority of vegetation |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses proposed |
| | ii) Quantity | 14dw proposed, comprising 3-4 bedroom houses. This is reasonable given the site location. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – 1 year |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

We have raised substantial parking issues with this current application as we are of the opinion that the scale of development is too great for the plot of land.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No objection

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No objection

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is a sustainably-located site with very few constraints (save for one TPO) that brings brownfield land back into residential use. It is therefore ideal for housing, with the only provision that site design should be integrated to enable the neighbouring plot (SHLAA ref 436) to come forward for development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 403 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land west of Ashford Road New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.22 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The land is regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No – telegraph poles along boundary and across Ashford Road |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No other contamination Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No – pond on western part of site, and another outside NW boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes, apart from tiny notch at SE |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes, apart from very SE border Nil across site | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | While improvements may well be |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | needed on Ashford Road, this site could provide a neutral contribution as an extension to Romney Marsh |
| | ii) Landscape | No - infill |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – site includes land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m – 195m High Street Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | 275m St Nicholas Primary |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 190m High Street |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 195m High Street 300m Church Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? | No |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – this site is within a short walk of the services of New Romney, and adjoins the broad location established for the settlement in the Core Strategy (CSD8). There are relatively few constraints on site, |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | but design should take account of its presence in flood zones 2 and 3. |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | N/A |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes - Residential to north and south – these generally comprise detached and semi-detached dwellings in generous curtilage. Pasture/grazing to west. Further housing submission to E. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Housing land would yield higher land values than existing agricultural. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – attractive semi-rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing Local landscape area |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | This site would suit development of suburban detached and semi-detached dwellings to match the existing pattern of development in the locality. |
| | ii) Quantity | 45-80dw proposed, including land set-aside for landscaping and flood alleviation [states 90-160dw otherwise] |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Sub states 3-5 yrs. This should come forward within the earlier part of the plan period. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site is in a reasonably sustainable location close to New Romney High Street. A footpath would be required along the frontage with Ashford Road. One access would be required and it is suggested that the existing access is used together with an emergency access further north. A suitable crossing point would be required across Ashford Road in the form of dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Lies to the north of the High Street New Romney Conservation Area. Located in an area of archaeological potential associated with the medieval town of New Romney, with medieval industrial activity having been observed to the south-west of the proposed allocation site. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions. Further assessment of impact of development on the setting of Conservation Area is required prior to determination.

- **Environment Agency**

There appears to be a pond on site. This should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for its loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site would be suitable for allocation for residential development. It is within easy reach of a mid-level service centre with access to a range of services and transport links. This site was previously judged as suitable and deliverable, and remains so now, and forms part of the broad location for New Romney in the Core Strategy. While it is situated in Flood Zones 2 and 3, the SFRA shows it as offering nil risk, while other constraints are limited to attention to Archaeological potential and biodiversity enhancement opportunities.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 409 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Cockreed Lane New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 5.47 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The site was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: | None |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – From Cockreed Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes there is a watercourse. NW boundary, and a small channel on | |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | part of SE boundary. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Vast majority of site 'Nil'. Arc on western boundary 'Low' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield NW Wedge Storm Beach Gravel |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Urbanisation of landscape |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – the site includes land of archaeological potential, and sub notes trial trenching revealed remains of local interest. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m – 65m Dymchurch Road Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 60m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 250m [Sainsbury's] |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 450m High Street |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Yes – this site forms part of the Broad Location for residential development in New Romney as outlined in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>This site is land of archaeological potential and also contains watercourses, hedgerows and groups of trees. It should be noted that a PRow runs across this site, and attention should be paid to its retention.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | N/A |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes - Residential to NE and SE. Former potato factory with permission for redevelopment to 55 dwellings to N. Agricultural uses to NW, and primary |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | school playing field to SW, both also submitted for review. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase land values compared with existing. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – semi rural |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 – supports development here Affordable housing Local landscape area |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses; not flats proposed. This would be in keeping with the current grain of development, and FZ2 and 3 limitations. Adjacent residential sites are exclusively detached dwellings, and recent permission to the N has allowed mainly detached with some semi-detached and terraced dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | 98-125 dw (20-25/ha) proposed |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways

This site already has an outline planning permission (Y15/0164/SH) and KCC Highways are satisfied that the proposed access arrangements are acceptable.

- Highways Agency

No objection

- KCC Heritage

Score 1. Extensive earthworks within the allocation site mark the site of a medieval moated

complex, which is believed to be the site of Craythorne Manor, whilst a smaller enclosure also within the allocation site is possibly the site of Cockreed Manor. Associated fields/enclosures are visible and archaeological remains of thirteenth century date have been found at the site. Not designated, although other moated manor sites on Romney Marsh are protected through scheduling. Development of all or part of the site may not be appropriate. Pre-determination archaeological evaluation is required to determine what development can be achieved (if any). Development of part of site should be avoided.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

While limited constraints on this site would lead to certain capacity reductions, this site offers potential for the managed expansion of New Romney as a service centre offering a range of local services. It should be noted that the site is on Flood Zones 2 and 3, meaning a need for at least two-storeys. Adjoining uses, and the recently permitted redevelopment of the potato company site, also mean that a phased delivery of residential uses could be appropriate here. The site also forms part of the broad location for development in New Romney as outlined in the Core Strategy.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 289A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | RM |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Romney Marsh Potato Company New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Defunct light industrial | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.96 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Has relevant planning permission Outline: Y10/0698/SH RM: Y15/0710/SH |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes – PDL and has relevant live planning permission |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic Towns for Shepway |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – existing, from Cockreed Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No, but poles across site boundary. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – CW-032 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Previously developed site with large areas of hardstanding |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Radon Gas Class 1 CW-032 Point A Borehole |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage sewer to W of site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'Nil'. Intrusion of 'low' at very N. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Storm Beach Gravel on SE half of site. Airfield. |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – potential to improve existing |
| | ii) Landscape | Potential impact with residential development spreading beyond Cockreed Lane |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 310m on Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 500m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 500m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 450m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | While this site enjoys access to the services of New Romney, residential development constitutes large-scale expansion to the north of Cockreed Lane. Ordinarily this would be resisted, but given the fact that this is PDL bringing a vacant site is a sustainable location back into use, redevelopment would address issues of contamination, and there are few other constraints on the site (save flood risk), this site is suitable. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Land owned in full |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Short term contract, occupiers seeking to relocate to Mountfield Road Ind Est. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Negotiations ongoing |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Need to relocate existing storage activities to Mountfield Road Industrial |

| | |
|--|--------|
| | Estate |
|--|--------|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available (now) |
|----------------------------|-----------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | North – open arable land East – residential – 2 storey dwellings South – open land allocated for development as part of “broad location” in Core Strategy West – arable land |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use increases land values compared with potato processing |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location on the fringes of a strategic town |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Need for demolition of existing light industrial buildings. Potential for land contamination resolution. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Flood/SuDS scheme |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 - Supported by broad location for development spatial diagram in Core Strategy |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Individuals dwellings above one storey in height |
| | ii) Quantity | 65dw approved. This is appropriate given size and location of site. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Deliverable within the first part of the plan |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | period – permission already granted. |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site already has planning permission and KCC Highways are satisfied that the access arrangements are acceptable.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Located in an area of multiperiod archaeological potential to the north of the historic port and town of New Romney. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The NPPF supports the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites. Given the previous use of this site as a food processing factory, this site constitutes brownfield land. Given its adjacency to existing residential development in New Romney, this site is considered sustainable, and an opportunity to improve the existing site. It is sufficiently well located to be able to access a full range of local services, and has few physical constraints.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 373 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land west of Cockreed Lane, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural – Grade 2 | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.7 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes UNSUIT loc |
|----------------------------|-------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic Towns for Shepway |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – from Cockreed Lane or Hope Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | No – Road improvements required |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No - Available |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No - Available |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - Available |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – bounded by drainage channels on all sides, with a substantial one along the NW boundary. Small pond on E of site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site ‘low’ with a band of ‘moderate from NW to SE. |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – this would extend the built area into open countryside and would constitute encroachment at this stage. The character of the countryside at this point is very open, and development would detract significantly from this. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | As above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 500m Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 350m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 500m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 550m Oak Hall Surgery 750m Church Lane Surgery |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes At this point, and especially given that sites closer to services in New Romney have not been built out, development on this site to the north of Cockreed Lane would constitute encroachment into the countryside. |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | |
|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? |
|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Single ownership stated |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Agricultural tenant – needs 12 months notice |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | n/a |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Agriculture – 1 year. |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | No - The site is flat open agricultural land on the northern edge of New Romney. It adjoins land also submitted land allocated for housing. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential land would increase values significantly |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 – broad location for New Romney Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Must be greater than one storey, and no flatted accommodation given location in FZ2 and 3 |
| | ii) Quantity | 100dw – 27dw/ha. Including 1ha open space proposed. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | No – both subject to tenancy, and dependent on sites nearer the settlement coming forward. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Sites closer to the town propose phasing over 10 years. Therefore, it is likely that development would only be appropriate later into the plan period. |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

It is unclear what the RAG status of this site is? How many dwellings are proposed? Cockreed Lane is not of a suitable width and geometry to cater for a large amount of dwellings. There is also no footpath along Cockreed Lane and it is subject to national speed limit. Not a suitable site for development therefore.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

There appears to be a pond on site. This should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for its loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Sport England**

Planning Policy Objective 1 within Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement 'Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives'

(http://www.sportengland.org/media/162412/planning-for-sport_aims-objectives-june-2013.pdf), aims to prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This is a relatively large site to the North-West of the New Romney strategic town. However, it is considered unsuitable for development at this stage given both the context (rather than

the raw distance) of its separation from the main settlement – it is not in the same administrative ward, and there is a significant amount of undeveloped open space between. While this open space has been submitted for designation, this is proposed to be phased over 10 years and so allocation in the first part of the plan period would not be appropriate. Designation may be appropriate for later in the plan period if sites 415, 430, 639 and 409 are developed.

Therefore, in sum, development would currently constitute encroachment into the countryside and should not be allocated at this time.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 415 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land east of Ashford Road New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural, and landscaping contracting site | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.54 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Appears to be watercourses on site (e.g. NE boundary) |
| xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes | |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <p>xiii) Is it in flood zone 3?</p> <p>If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Majority of site Nil – band of ‘low’ towards east, and blob of ‘moderate’ on NE boundary.</p> |
| | <p>xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)?</p> | <p>Airfield</p> |
| C | <p>Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Townscape</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>ii) Landscape</p> | <p>This site is in a Local Landscape Area to which any proposal should take account.</p> |
| | <p>iii) AONB and its immediate setting</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>iv) Kent BAP sites</p> | <p>Romney Marsh BOA</p> |
| | <p>v) Tree Preservation Orders</p> | <p>(Hedgerows and groups of mature trees)</p> |
| | <p>vi) Heritage Assets</p> | <p>Yes – land includes land of archaeological potential.</p> |
| | <p>vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>viii) Local Wildlife Site</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>ix) Protected Open Space</p> | <p>No</p> |
| D | <p>Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review?</p> | <p>No</p> |
| E | <p>Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)?</p> | <p>Airfield</p> |
| F | <p>Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria?</p> | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | <p>Bu s <400m High Street Train >800m</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | <p>190m St Nicholas Primary</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | <p>190m High Street</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | <p>180m High Street 380m</p> |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – this site forms part of the Broad Location for residential development in New Romney as outlined in the Core Strategy. The site is within easy reach of the services of New Romney. There are constraints which would impact on any proposal, including archaeological potential and location in FZ2 and 3. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Multiple ownership (The Prior Family, Mr and Mrs Goddard and Mr F. Butcher) |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Unknown |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | -- |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – resi to N & S. School playing field to E. Grazing land to W, but this land has also been submitted for housing/ |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Housing land would yield higher land values than existing agricultural. |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – attractive semi-rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 – supports development Affordable housing Local landscape area |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Must be greater than one storey given flood zones |
| | ii) Quantity | Masterplanned for 101 dw. This could be appropriate for this site given location and size of site, but must take account of any capacity reductions as a result of on-site constraints. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Some – should be masterplanned with adjacent sites. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Submission proposes phasing over 10 years |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site already has an outline planning permission (Y14/1411/SH) and KCC Highways are satisfied that the proposed access arrangements are acceptable. An application has yet to be submitted for the Landscape Garden Centre site (estimated at 14 dwellings) but this site is likely to be acceptable in respect of highway matters subject to linking a footpath between the two sites.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Lies to the north of the High Street New Romney Conservation Area in an area of archaeological potential associated with the medieval town of New Romney. Archaeological remains associated with a demolished late medieval or post-medieval building are recorded

in the south-west corner of the proposed allocation site. No building is shown here on nineteenth or twentieth century maps. The drain in the east of the site and along the north-eastern boundary are depicted on the Hope Tithe Map. Earthworks and other features associated with a probable medieval moated complex can be seen in the adjoining fields. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

There appears to be a pond on site. This should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for its loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site would be suitable for allocation for residential development, and is promoted for this in the Core Strategy. It is within easy reach of a mid-level service centre with access to a range of services and transport links. This site was previously judged as suitable and deliverable, and remains so now. While it is situated in Flood Zones 2 and 3, the SFRA shows it as offering nil risk, while other constraints are limited to attention to Archaeological potential and biodiversity enhancement opportunities.

The multiple ownership of the site is to be noted, and an equalisation agreement should be sought between parties to ensure this issue does not hold up development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 437 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Cherry Gardens, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | OTH (previous SUB) |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Fallow | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.53ha [as measured] |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Previously submitted for 2008 SHLAA. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Adjacent to Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI to north. |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy | Strategic town |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – access from Cherry Gardens |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Nearby |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Nearby |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Nearby |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination on site |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | The development of this plot could 'round off' the settlement of Littlestone to provide a less harsh interface between town and landscape than seen at present. |
| | ii) Landscape | While this site abuts an SSSI, it only does so at its northernmost corner. Development on this plot could soften the settlement boundary into the surrounding landscape. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPO 4/1985 on adjacent plots along eastern and southern boundary of site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 370m to bus stop at Littlestone Road; 550m to tourist rail station |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.2km |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 1.1km |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 1.4km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Buffer area on northern point to safeguard SSSI. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site is relatively free of constraints, and development would spatially round off the settlement here. However, it should be noted that access to services in this location is limited and is very much suburban in character. A buffer area to safeguard the nearby SSSI may be required. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|---------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Unknown |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Unknown |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Need to confirm availability for this SHLAA round. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – bordered on three sides by suburban residential development. Well bounded from open countryside to north. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values compared to existing fallow. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive location related to strategic settlement, with countryside to north and seaside to east. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Previous suggestion for need for land raising to mitigate against flood risk. However, SFRA reveals ‘nil’ risk on site so this may not be necessary. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Local landscape area |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Given location in FZ2 and 3, must be greater than one-storey. This would be compatible with adjacent uses. |
| | ii) Quantity | 10dw at 30dph. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | 2 years previously proposed. Need to establish will for development |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Potentially yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

No highway issues with this site for 10 dwellings, there is already a vehicular access and 2 footpaths into the site. The site is in a sustainable location close to all of the facilities in New Romney.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Located in an area of background archaeological potential. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

The setting and relationship of the site with the SSSI is of paramount importance in considering this site. Part of it is also subject to TPO, and it is situated without easy access to local services. However, this is an established residential area, and small-scale development that rounds-off the settlement could make a visual improvement to the area. Site design should take account of neighbouring residential pattern and design, and should be greater than one storey and have a surface water management plan to deal with location in FZ2 and 3.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 638 | <i>SDC</i> | New Romney |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| | | <i>Ward:</i> | |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | The Marsh Academy, Station Road [SE part of main site], New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Excess school land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.98 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement (Strategic Settlement) |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – to Station Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – a drain runs along the north-eastern boundary of the site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes 'Nil' across whole site | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – brownfield site, on site of previous development |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | (Hedgerows and groups of trees) |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See Above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 40m west of site on Station Road. Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 370m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 250m [Sainsbury's] |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 490m Church Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | There would be potential disturbance from school activities at the western edge. Suggest a small landscaped buffer on the western edge |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – the site is within acceptable distance of local services in New Romney. While it is in FZ 2 and 3, the SFRA reveals no risk on site, and the fact that this is previously developed land may make it suitable for redevelopment. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Marsh Academy School (part) |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes – submitted by Kent County Council Property |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No – existing use will continue on remainder of site |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – residential uses to east and south. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential land would yield more than existing school use. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Reasonably attractive part of strategic town |
| | iv) Demand | Medium [CIL band B] |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Clearing of existing structures |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | As above |
| | iii) planning policy | Legal process for the disposal of school lands. |
| | iv) infrastructure | N/A |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Must be greater than one storey given location in FZ2 and 3 |
| | ii) Quantity | Circa 29 could be appropriate on a site in this location of this size (based on 30dph) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – SoS permission for disposal of |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| | | school land |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | - |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site is in a sustainable location close to New Romney Town Centre and the Marsh Academy. There is a bus route along Station Road. The site has an existing access point which could accommodate 26 dwellings but this would need to be reduced in scale as it does not give priority to pedestrians using it.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No Comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site is brownfield and adjacent to the New Romney settlement boundary. Given these facts, and that other constraints on the site are minimal in relation to other sites in the vicinity, there is potential for the development of housing on this location. The site is well-bounded to the north and north-east so that further encroachment into countryside in the locality is unlikely, and it is well placed to access local services. The applicant has confirmed that existing buildings have been removed from the site, and thus it is available and deliverable within the plan period.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 639 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | St Nicholas Playing Field, Rolfe Lane, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | School Playing Field | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.85 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | No vehicular access possible from Rolf Lane. Vehicular access from Cockreed Lane would have to traverse a drainage ditch |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Unlikely |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – drainage channel along W boundary, and pond off site to SW. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | Airfield Far NW part of site Storm Beach Gravel |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Urbanisation of countryside |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No - (mature trees and hedgerows off site) |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 300m Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 10m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 250m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes- 390m High Street 600m Church Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – this site forms part of the broad location for residential development for New Romney as per the Core Strategy (CSD8). It is within close proximity of local services in New Romney. However, there are constraints on site that would lead to capacity reductions, including the inferior flood risk as compared with neighbouring sites, and the potential for archaeological yields. This land would be subject to procedures for the disposal of school land. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No, but unknown if any covenants on site. |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Unknown |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Unknown |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Unknown |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Check availability |
|---------------------|--------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Currently surrounded by agricultural land, with housing to the south. Adjoining plots have been submitted for allocation. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Value as housing land would significantly increase current value as school amenity land. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – semi-rural location with access to local services |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | May require site raising in places |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | SuDS system / surface water management given SFRA rating |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 – supports allocation LR12 promotes retention of school playing fields. Affordable housing Local landscape area |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | iv) infrastructure | Must be integrated with neighbouring plots |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | A mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings, with a possibility of some terracing, would be appropriate here, masterplanned with adjacent sites. |
| | ii) Quantity | 37dw should be indicative for this site (20dph) given constraints. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Unknown |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Unknown |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site forms part of the wider strategic allocation in New Romney and is linked to sites 409 and 415 which already has outline planning permission. The access issues associated with this site have therefore been resolved.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 2. Extensive earthworks are visible across the site on aerial photographs from the 1940s and 1960s seemingly associated with a probable medieval moated complex to the north-east. Archaeological evaluation in the adjacent fields has revealed evidence for 13thC building and features. Development of all or part of the site may not be appropriate. Pre-determination archaeological evaluation is required to determine what development can be achieved (if any).

- **Environment Agency**
- **Sport England**

Planning Policy Objective 1 within Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement 'Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives'

(http://www.sportengland.org/media/162412/planning-for-sport_aims-objectives-june-2013.pdf), aims to prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE

No comment

- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site can support the residential requirements of New Romney, offering potential for the managed expansion of New Romney in conjunction with neighbouring sites. It should be noted that the site is on Flood Zones 2 and 3, meaning a need for at least two-storeys, and there will be a need for serious measures to address flood risk on site. Adjoining uses, and the recently permitted redevelopment of the potato company site, also mean that a phased delivery of residential uses would be appropriate here in conjunction with neighbouring sites. It should be noted that policy LR12 encourages the protection of school playing fields but this policy also supplies criteria allowing for their redevelopment in certain cases. National legislation regarding the disposal of school lands should also be addressed.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 1020 | SDC Ward: | New Romney |
| Site Name/Address: | Land south of New Romney | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Agricultural | Area (ha): | 22ha |
| | | Site Visit: | 6.4.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is | No |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| | a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic town for Shepway |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Accesses can be created from Lydd Road and Church Lane. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | None on site |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | No – gentle slope | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | There are multiple drains on site, the most significant of which is the New Romney Main Sewer running across the east of the site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Majority of site yes; centre of site outside |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Majority of site yes; centre and west of site outside Majority of site 'nil'. Areas of 'moderate' risk towards east of site; area of 'significant' at west of site. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | This site is entirely in the Romney Marsh Local Landscape Area. Development at this location will inevitably impact on this. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 20m – adjacent to western part of the site on Ashford Road. 230m from eastern part on High Street. |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | 630m from the furthest part. |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | Circa 435m to St Nicholas Primary |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | 275m to Spar |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | Adjacent (5m) from site. 650m to Surgery on Church Lane at furthest point. |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>Attention should be paid to the relationship between light industrial uses and residential. Ideally these should be separated by a buffer.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>This is an incredibly large area, but it should proceed to Stage 3 given the relative lack of constraints on site, and the relatively low numbers of dwellings proposed. Much of this land will be given to public open space and to raise the quality of development in New Romney. The site is within easy reach of local services and infrastructure at all parts of the site, and should be considered sustainable. Flood risk should be mitigated by careful and appropriate design.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Multiple ownerships – applicant in negotiations |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Unknown |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Developer interest noted |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – this site adjoins existing residential in the main, and existing light industrial to the east of the proposed allocation site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values compared with agricultural. Light industrial uses would broadly maintain existing land values. Open space would decrease land values. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Very attractive area with distinctive landscape and within close proximity of historic centre. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | SuDS strategy to manage surface water Extensive masterplanning efforts, design reviews and local participation required. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing Local Landscape Area |
| | iv) infrastructure | Construction of a distributor road E-W across the site. Provision of public open space |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Dwellings should be above one storey given location in flood zones. |
| | ii) Quantity | 400dw proposed over 20 years, with public open space and light industrial units. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | No landowner agreement at this stage |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

KCC Highways would only support 2 points of vehicle access, from the A259 and one from Collins Road. All of the points of access would only be suitable as pedestrian / cycle access points due to the constrained highway network. There are capacity issues at the A259 / Station Road junction that would need to be addressed as part of any planning application on this site. Further details would be required in order to give a more comprehensive response on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

This area covers a number of watercourses and ponds, all of which should be considered if development is to take place here. The ponds should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for their loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This is a substantial strategic site hugging the southern part of the main historic settlement of New Romney. It is to be noted that part of this site overlaps with the already submitted site 607. The spatial aspiration for New Romney in the Core Strategy was for northward expansion, but allocation of this whole site would be appropriate if strategic infrastructure could be delivered within this site connecting the Mountfield Road industrial estate with Lydd Road, thus removing traffic from the main High Street.

Numbers for this site should remain low, and public open space provided, to maintain and enhance the character of the locality. Given the size of this site, local stakeholders should be involved in masterplanning and design review stages.

I note the proposed delivery of 20 units per year over 20 years to enable to delivery of associated infrastructure. This seems a long time period.

However, there is scope for the allocation of this site to meet a strategic need not only in the district but for the area as well.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 436 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Church Road, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Resi and agricultural/paddock | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.44 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The site benefits from a relevant planning permission. Y13/0324/SH. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | The applicant contends three potential accesses can be made, but they all depend on use of third party land and none come direct from the public highway. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | New Romney Main Sewer 50m to SE of site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No - small intrusion at SE |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No - tiny intrusion at SE Entire site – ‘Nil’ |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Consider setting of neighbouring cemetery to W. |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | ii) Landscape | Potential extension into undeveloped countryside. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- the site contains land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 190m High Street |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 470m St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 240m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 10m – on adjacent site |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | In many ways, this is a suitable site with few constraints and within close proximity of New Romney's services. Unlike many sites in the vicinity, this is not in a flood zone 2 and 3. The only, but perhaps showstopping, constraint is provision of an access which is seems to run at present over third party land and is unavailable from the public highway. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Unknown – sub silent |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Unknown |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Likely |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available Now |
|----------------------------|---------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | NW residential; NE redundant school with permission for residential redevelopment; W cemetery; SE agricultural. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Presently vacant land – residential use would increase land values significantly |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – semi-rural with idyllic neighbours to W and SE. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | -- |
| | iv) infrastructure | Access must be provided to public highway – potential land purchase costs to enable this; road to adoptable standards. |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Residential neighbours comprise substantial detached dwellings in generous curtilages. These neighbours are unusually large for New Romney, and limited increase in density could be appropriate, but should remain detached dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | 7-10 dw proposed. 7 more appropriate. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – depending on land for access |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

It would need to be demonstrated to KCC that access to the site could be provided via land to the rear of the Old School House which is currently subject to a planning application. We have raised substantial parking issues with this current application as we are of the opinion that the scale of development is too great for the plot of land. The number of dwellings proposed is therefore too large, a maximum of 8 properties would be more reasonable.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Site lies in an area of archaeological potential associated with the ancient port and town of New Romney. Archaeological investigations close to the south on Tookey Road revealed evidence for possible medieval harbour installations whilst to the north medieval remains including occupation deposits, floors and courtyards have been recorded. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No objection

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No objection

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No objection

CONCLUSIONS

Development on this site should consider the setting of the cemetery to the west and the amenity of surrounding residential dwellings. However, the site has an existing outline planning permission and, with few constraints and with access to a range of services in New Romney it is considered suitable for residential development and deliverable. The issue of site access should be double checked with Kent Highways, as although the site has had permission for development in the past, it is not clear whether the applicant owns the land through which access will be achieved.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 435 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land north of Avonlea, Dymchurch Road, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.51 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 3.7.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes Land was recognised as deliverable or developable in SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve | None |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon gas class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – along NE boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - | Yes - Whole site 'Nil' | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – Dymchurch Road’s southern side is currently heavily screened by trees. Development south of this could open up the street. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – the area South of Dymchurch Road is currently sparsely developed, and allocation here would encourage the extension of the town into the surrounding countryside. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site includes land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m – outside site on Dymchurch Road |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 275m St Nicholas |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | 300m [Sainsbury’s] |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | 750m High Street |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>No</p> |
|--|--|------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | <p>The site benefits from proximate access to local services in New Romney. There are some constraints on site, including location in flood zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>However, due to its position surrounded on three sides by open land, development would be encouraged east of Dymchurch Road beyond the barrier to settlement that this boundary provides. At this time there are multiple preferred sites in New Romney, for example those proposed in the broad location in the Core Strategy (CSD8). This site, therefore, should not proceed at this time.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Market Interests</p> | |
| | <p>i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses</p> | |
| | <p>ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses</p> | |
| | <p>iii) Attractiveness of Locality</p> | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While there are relatively few constraints on this site, save for its location in Flood Zones 2 and 3, and the site offers access to a range of services due to its location in New Romney, I am concerned that allocation here will establish a precedent of development south of the A259.

This site would not be suitable for development at this time as it would result in encroachment into the countryside, and encouraging development beyond the boundary provided by Dymchurch Road, and is considered lower in the sequential hierarchy of sites.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1014 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Craythorne Farm, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant / Agri | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.17 (as measured) |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes - borderline |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic town |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – Cockreed Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No – telegraph pole on northern boundary |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'Nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – spreads development beyond Cockreed Lane |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 370m to bus stop at junction of St Mary's Road and Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 630m to St Nicholas C of E |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 630m to Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No. Two circa 1.3km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site is at the outer limits of the settlement of New Romney, and is outside the settlement boundary. While it is adjacent to existing residential development, it would encourage the spread of development beyond Cockreed Lane, although this has begun following the conversion of the nearby potato factory. While there are relatively few constraints on this site save flood risk common to the whole settlement, it is not a preferred site given the existing broad locations for expansion of New Romney as per CSD8 of the Core Strategy. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | 2 owners – R. Thompson and C. Rand |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Unknown |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Likely |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Broadly – rural detached dwellings to E; residential detached to S; open farmland to N & W. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential would increase values compared to existing agricultural |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location on the outskirts of a service town. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8 establishes broad location in New Romney |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Must be greater than one storey given flood zone 2 and 3 location |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | ii) Quantity | 3 dw proposed by submission. This would be in keeping with surrounding existing dwellings. Site may well be able to accommodate 5 as minimum for allocation |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes - likely |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site is not large enough as it cannot provide for 5 or more dwellings. There is an existing access point, which could cater for 3 dwellings and Cockreed Lane is wide enough and has a footpath along its southern side.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Stage 3. Located in an area of multiperiod archaeological potential to the north of the historic port and town of New Romney. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

While this site has been submitted for 3 dwellings, and it is comparatively further from local services than other allocations, it is still within walking distance of local services in this strategic town. The precedent for New Romney's growth north of Cockreed Lane has been established as a result of planning permission for the redevelopment of the potato company site. The issue of dual site ownership could be resolved through a landowner agreement.

This is not necessarily a preferred site, but it should not be rejected at this stage.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1015 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Brickyard Poultry Farm, New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture – Poultry Farm | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.4 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Existing planning permission for agricultural building Y12/0552/SH |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic town |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes - existing |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Unknown |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Telegraph equipment |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drain / drainage sewers along W, NE and SW boundaries. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'Nil', although a small arc of 'low' on the SW part |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – urban encroachment into countryside (Greenfield) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes - 440m from bus stop at Ashford Rd and Dymchurch Road intersection. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – St Nicholas C of E |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – two |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes At this point, and especially given that sites closer to services in New Romney have not been built out, development on this site to the north of Cockreed Lane would constitute encroachment into the countryside. |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No – available immediately |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Existing residential development to SW, detached in ample cartilage. SW is broad location of development in CSD8. NE and NW is agricultural |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would raise land values compared with existing poultry farm/agricultural use |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Clearance of agricultural buildings on site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD8-compliance Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Above one storey dwellings given flood risk on site. |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | ii) Quantity | 30 to 40 dw proposed. Given site size and location, and given that land will need to be surrendered for flooding/SuDS mitigation, the lower end would constitute the maximum. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2 years proposed, but inappropriate early in plan period as would encroach into countryside. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Would only be appropriate later in the plan period given its spatial relationship to the settlement and current deliverable policy priority of CSD8 |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

Cockreed Lane is not wide enough to cater for 28 dwellings and does not have a footpath on either side. The site is also remote from local services and not sustainable. KCC Highways cannot support an allocation on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

The Wallingham Sewer is to the west of the site and its riparian corridor (8m) should be protected from development.

- **Sport England**

Planning Policy Objective 1 within Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement 'Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives'

(http://www.sportengland.org/media/162412/planning-for-sport_aims-objectives-june-2013.pdf), aims to prevent the loss of sports facilities and land along with access to natural resources used for sport.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site is considered unsuitable for development early in the plan period given both the context (rather than the raw distance) of its separation from the main settlement – it is not in the same administrative ward, and there is a significant amount of undeveloped open space between. While this open space has been submitted for designation, this is proposed to be phased over 10 years and so allocation in the first part of the plan period would not be appropriate. Designation may be appropriate for later in the plan period if sites 415, 430, 639 and 409 are developed.

Therefore, in sum, development would currently constitute encroachment into the countryside and should not be allocated at this time.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 607 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NRT |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adj Church Lane New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.82 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Upper tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – Church Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | There is a substation along NE side. There also appears to be some wooden pylons |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes – Romney Marsh Main Sewer on NW boundary of site. Other drainage channels on southern boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'Nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – this would urbanise this area of the town and remove its semi-rural feel. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – urbanisation of marsh countryside |
| | iii) AONB | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site contains land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400 m – 220m High Street Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 450m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 250m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 50m Church Lane |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | NA |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Subject to an existing agricultural tenancy requiring 12 months notice. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | E – residential N – residential S and W open agricultural |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Housing would increase the value of this land exponentially. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | There would be a need to reposition above-ground wiring on this site. |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 90 dw |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

This is a substantial site on the periphery of New Romney town. While it neighbours existing residential development, allocation would result in encroachment into open countryside and would therefore have an adverse landscape impact. In addition to this, capacity reductions would result from the presence of an electricity substation and of electrical and telegraph wiring above ground on the site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1021a, b and c | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land northeast of New Romney | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | Part A – 2.85Ha Part B – 1.67Ha Part C - 2.3Ha Total = 6.82ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 6.4.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic town for Shepway |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Access from St Mary's Road. The applicant proposes additional access from Dymchurch Road, but this requires use of third party access or traversing a significant ditch. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Unknown |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Unknown |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Unknown |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Yes – wooden high voltage pylons run from west across site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage sewers run along several boundaries, and across the site to separate fields A, B and C. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes 'Nil' across majority of site, with some encroachment of 'low' on northern wedge. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield Storm beach gravel encroaches on east and south |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – development in this location will significantly expand New Romney into the countryside beyond location indicated in the Core Strategy, outside the settlement boundary, and removing the green gap between the settlement and the Marlie Farm Holiday Village. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – impact on local landscape area, and contribution to significant sprawl of the settlement into the countryside. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 160m from site on Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 1.1km St Nicholas |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 750m Sainsbury's |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 1.2km Church Lane Surgery |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | There would need to be a buffer across the eastern boundary separating residential and caravan uses. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>No. Development of this site would constitute encroachment into countryside, expansion of the settlement well beyond strategic direction promoted by the Core Strategy, and would constitute excessive urbanisation of the settlement removing the gap between the built area and other development.</p> <p>The site does not benefit from easy access to local services, especially in relation to other submitted sites, is located in flood zones 2 and 3, and has high voltage electricity on site and across the only feasible access to the site.</p> <p>This site should therefore not go forward in the local plan allocation process.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency |
|---|

- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

Development of this site would constitute encroachment into countryside, expansion of the settlement well beyond strategic direction promoted by the Core Strategy, and would constitute excessive urbanisation of the settlement removing the gap between the built area and other development.

The site does not benefit from easy access to local services, especially in relation to other submitted sites, is located in flood zones 2 and 3, and has high voltage electricity on site and across the only feasible access to the site.

This site should therefore not go forward in the local plan allocation process.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Littlestone

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 379 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land off Victoria Road West, Littlestone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 10.99 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 3.7.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | <p>Yes- The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously.</p> |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | <p>None</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 2?</p> | <p>LARGE / check conv – there would have to be major capacity reductions. Yes</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic towns (Littlestone) |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes – water main on site |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | There is known buried infrastructure of Gas/Water main. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | There are watercourses on site, including drainage channels along the boundaries and within. There is also a small pond on the SE boundary. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Significant on SE part. More northerly parts on each side have nil or low risk. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development of this site would provide a logical extension of Littlestone's linear pattern of development between New Romney and the coast. In particular, with an access along Victoria Road, the existing pattern of development could be continued seamlessly. At present, terraces of faux-georgian dwellings come to an abrupt halt at the site. |
| | ii) Landscape | [This is a very large site, which has been rejected as non preferred in terms of a strategic site. However its size, allied with its location as within a 'corner' partly to the rear of substantial development extending along the coastal route to Dungeness/the B2071 to New Romney town, means it appears probable that part of the site could be investigated to accommodate 5 or more units, without any major impact on the compactness of this built form. There are internal waterways that could provide physical boundaries for sub-division, albeit not ones that directly allay visual impact.] |
| | iii) AONB | No |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- the site includes land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield Area of storm beach gravel to the east of the site. |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 140-155m to bus stops on Littlestone Road and Grand Parade. 420m to New Romney tourist rail station |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.4km (but 600m to Secondary School) |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 170m to Spar; |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 1.4km in New Romney |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions.</p> <p>Site includes land of archaeological potential watercourses and gas and water mains although these might not be of notable significance.</p> <p>Given the above, and the significant flood risk across a large part of the site, only the very northern part continuous with Victoria Road and hugging the existing settlement could be allocated.</p> |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No – currently grazing but available |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | N & E – residential S – Caravan park W & SW – agricultural |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive – semi-rural and coastal accessible |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | - |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Potential need for gas/water main repositioning. SuDS and surface water management measures. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Local landscape area |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Proposed mixed housing, community uses and open space |
| | ii) Quantity | 300dw at 30dw/ha proposed. This would be excessive in this location, and given the constraints on this site. A continuation of Victoria Road West only is appropriate, with large capacity reductions. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Two years proposed |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The only access to the site could be provided from Victoria Road West, which would limit any development to a maximum of 50 units. There are significant on-street car parking problems on Victoria Road West and parking restrictions would be required in order to provide suitable access into the site. The existing dwellings do have off-street parking to the rear but they are seldom used which is why there are on-street parking problems. There are several issues with this site therefore.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Located in an area of general archaeological potential. Historic OS maps show extensive ditches and sea walls across site. A possible WW2 period bomb crater is shown on wartime aerial photographs. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

There appears to be a pond on site. This should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for its loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This significant site could provide suitable land for residential development. While some capacity reduction could be required, given constraints such as AAP, and part of the site being 'significant' as a result of the SFRA, there are relatively few other constraints on the site itself, and development could improve the design quality of the local area. The site does not benefit from access to many services, however, and is situated in both Flood Zones 2 and 3. To avoid encroachment into open countryside, only the north-eastern part of the site which serves as a linear continuation of Victoria Road West will be considered suitable for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 462 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land rear Varne Boat Club, Coast Drive, Greatstone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Open space/demolished toilet block | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.127 [0.23ha measured by MN] |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes – remeasured site meets threshold, however may be that development proposal area does not meet threshold – check. |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes - PDL Adjacent to SSSI. |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary Village (if Greatstone). |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Available |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Overhead wiring on site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development of detached dwellings on this plot fronting Coast Road would continue the pattern of development. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site contains land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 200m to bus stop on Coast Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.2km to Greatstone Primary |
| | • Within 800m of a | Yes – 250m to Spar; 600m to Londis |

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | convenience store | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 2.3km to GP in New Romney |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Yes, there is scope for infill development consolidating the frontage of Coast Drive on previously developed land. While there is limited access to local services in this location, and the site is in FZ2 and 3, but this is an established residential area.</p> <p>Overhead wiring traversing the site and in an area of archaeological potential.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | North and south linear development. E is boat club that requires access to be maintained. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with | Housing would increase land values |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | Existing and Alternative Uses | relative to open space |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Coastal location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Removal of concrete foundations of previous structures |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | None |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing (depending on quantity) |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Two-storey detached and/or semi detached dwellings would match existing pattern of development |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant proposes 5-10dw. Site would support 5 dwellings. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – 1 year |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

Site has just recently been granted planning permission, for which KCC Highways were satisfied that the access arrangements were acceptable.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Located adjacent to open stretch of shingle beach next to the Littlestone Lifeboat Station (built 1977). Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

Right behind inadequate defences (1in20 year) and have been affected by overtopping in 2013. So we object to these.

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

While there are notable constraints on this site, including location in FZ2 and 3, and the absence of local services, development here could consolidate the streetscape on Coast Drive in this established residential area. Design should therefore be approximately two storeys to given the site's flood zone location and to match existing dwellings on the eastern site of Coast Drive. Infill on this site could be appropriate, given that it is PDL, of up to five dwellings. It should be borne in mind that Natural England proposes a route of coastal access on the seaward part of this site, as highlighted in the submission form.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1009 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land North of Littlestone Golf Course (Site 1) Littlestone | <i>Source:</i> | John Bishop and Associates |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye SSSI in its entirety |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No - SSSI |
|---------------------|-----------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Yes |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Vast majority of site 'Nil'. Minor encroachments of 'moderate' at east |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | |
|-----------------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 60 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site should not go forward given its situation wholly within the SSSI.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1010 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Coast Road (Site 2) Littlestone | <i>Source:</i> | John Bishop and Associates |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.13 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | No |
|----------|---|-----------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye SSSI in its entirety |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – SSSI and does not meet size threshold |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | NQ- May be too small! |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 2 |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site should not go forward given its situation wholly within the SSSI and the fact that it does not meet the minimum size threshold for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1011 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Coast Road (Site 3) Littlestone | <i>Source:</i> | John Bishop and Associates |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.33 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more | Yes |
|----------|--|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | dwelling) | |
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye SSSI in its entirety |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No - SSSI |
|---------------------|-----------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
|----------|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | NQ- May be too small! |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 4? | |
|-----------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 4 |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site should not go forward given its situation wholly within the SSSI.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1012 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at St Andrews Road (Site 4) Littlestone | <i>Source:</i> | John Bishop and Associates |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Golf club car park | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.07ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | No |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – does not meet size threshold |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | NQ- May be too small! |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 4? | |
|-----------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 4 |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site should not go forward as it does not meet the minimum size threshold.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Lydd
Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 451b | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Waland and Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Kitewell Lane, RO Ambulance Station Lydd (Site A) | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Flat pasture with scrub | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.79 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Y12/0084/SH permission for residential on adjoining part of wider site. |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None, but adjacent to SSSI on NW boundary. |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Mid/Low tier settlement |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Direct access to Kitewell Lane |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | On adjacent land |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | On adjacent land |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | On adjacent land |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Substantial telegraph infrastructure leading on to site |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination on site, but areas of contamination adjacent to SW and SE. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Railway line to NE. Light industrial uses to S |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Lydd petty sewer on NW boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | NW half only |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | NW half only Majority 'Nil'. Northern corner has low to moderate risk |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including | Airfield |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | minerals)? | Local Wildlife Site (majority) – Lydd Common and Pastures |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | This site is in the more industrial area of north Lydd and, while piecemeal housing development has been permitted here, |
| | ii) Landscape | Development here would detract from the local wildlife site and from the setting of the SSSI |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Yes - Lydd Common and Pastures |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------|
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 110m bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.2km |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 900m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 1.2km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – far from services and subject to several on-site constraints. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | None |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Substantial telegraph infrastructure alongside access on Kitewell Lane |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Site is bounded to the north by the Mill Watering South (Lydd Petty Sewer) which is</p> |
|---|

depicted on the Lydd Tithe Map. Site lies within an area of general archaeological potential, with multi-period remains found to the north at Allen's Bank. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

We understand a well is located on, or in close proximity to the site, and therefore this is likely to be a sensitive location from a groundwater protection point of view. The area is also located close to a landfill site, which could be considered a source of contamination.

The Lydd Petty Sewer is beside the site and its riparian corridor (8m) should be protected from development.

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Permission has been granted on part of the wider site, yet this submission is subject to such constraint, including proximity to the SSSI and designation as a local wildlife site which, combined with considerable distance to local services, mean that it would be rather difficult to develop the remainder positively or sustainably. While the site benefits from direct access from Kitewell Lane, this access leads directly on to the Lydd Common and Pastures Local Wildlife Site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 620 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Harden Road, Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant - residual | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Check integration ok |
|----------------------------|----------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | The most logical point of access would be through Meadow View. However, this is an unadopted private street. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | On adjacent land |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | On adjacent land |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | On adjacent land |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | None evident on streetview |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Light industrial works to SW |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Pond on eastern boundary of site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes – only NW part of site outside |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No – only tiny intrusions along SE of site. Majority of site 'nil'. Margins of SE become 'moderate' | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | It seems probable, in at least part of the site, that 5 (or more) dwellings could be developed with satisfactory integration subject to landscape and design, with likelihood of being bound on one or sides by industrial style property or new residential. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Majority of site AAP, apart from NW wedge |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – Bus stop 80m from site. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m – 850m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | 750m from Spar |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 920m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Potential for noise impact from adjacent light industrial works, but a small newer development to the west of this site has been considered appropriate. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Applicant has been in contact with developer |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | North – The Beeches, 2 storey terraced and semi detached houses East – open countryside South – B1, B2 and B8 buildings West – two storey semi detached houses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential use would increase value of land compared with current residual open space. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location. |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | May need to improve Meadow View to s38 standard. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iv) infrastructure | May need access road upgrade |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Densities and housing types expected to match existing on NW boundary, although a greater prevalence of semi-detached units may be preferred. |
| | ii) Quantity | 15-30dw proposed. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

Meadow view access road currently has parking problems and is of narrow width to cater for additional vehicular traffic. There is also no footway provision on Meadow View. KCC cannot support an allocation on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Site is located in an area of general background archaeological potential. The pond in the eastern corner of the site is shown on the Lydd Tithe Map. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

There appears to be a pond on site. This should be assessed for ecological importance and, if appropriate, compensation for its loss (if this occurs) should be required.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

Although this site is some distance from local services, it is adjacent to newly developed housing and, unlike a lot of land in this ward, is not in flood zone 3 (it is in zone 2), and poses little flood hazard under the SFRA. The light industrial works to the SW will require some mitigation measures and careful site design, while s38 works may be needed to the unadopted access road. There is also a slight concern over this site due to the potential for encroachment into the countryside.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 195 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Station Yard, Station Road Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | PDL – redundant rail station | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.87 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No pylons – telegraph wiring on site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Yes - Railway track to NE |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No 'Nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes – policy TR3 of the current local plan disables development which would prejudice the reuse of Lydd |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | <p>Station as a rail transport interchange.</p> <p>Airfield</p> <p>Storm beach gravel</p> |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | While this area has been previously developed, this was for a historic railway and freight use. Housing in the immediate vicinity is sparse and pedestrian connections to local services are deficient. Development of housing here should seek inspiration from current buildings to maintain an important space of memory in the form of the old station. |
| | ii) Landscape | It is arguable whether the redevelopment of this site for housing could enhance the landscape character of the locality. Any loss of the station buildings and setting, despite their disused state, would be detrimental to local landscape. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Yes (E1 but is the one site directly flagged up for release in the ELR) Core Strategy SS4 |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – Bus 20m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1020m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 1070m from Lydd Spar |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 1200m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | Yes - railway track |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>This site is a significant distance from the services provided in Lydd, and has other constraints including the presence of the seldom used railway line, and the lack of suitable pedestrian infrastructure. However, there is opportunity here to preserve and enhance this characterful site including making use of existing buildings, service provision in north Lydd, and the enhancement of the locality for pedestrian permeability in conjunction with other sites in the vicinity. This is only of the only sites Lydd outside of the flood zones, and therefore suitable for a range of residential options.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Developer has been contacted |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Existing residential uses to SW and W of the site. Railway line to the north of site. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values compared with existing. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Not immediately attractive, but with historic interest on site – retention of structures would be preferable to enhance attractiveness of locality and take design cues from this. |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Structures and hardstanding on site |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | May be reason to require maintenance of existing station |
| | iii) planning policy | TR3 Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | Off-site pedestrian and vehicular links would need to be enhanced. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Neighbouring residential development at present is semi-detached single storey to the south, and detached single storey to the west. Preference would be for a more aspirational type to improve the design quality of the locality and attract services to North Lydd. |
| | ii) Quantity | 42dw proposed, including flatted accommodation. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – 1 year estimated |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The private access onto Station Road has extremely limited visibility due to the presence of the railway bridge. There is however scope to close the access from Station Road onto Harden Road next to the application site and ensure that traffic accesses the site from the junction slightly further south. This part of Harden Road would have to become two-way vehicular traffic but it is wide enough. A footpath connection would be required to link up with Ash Grove. The site is close to bus stops on Harden Road but some way from local facilities in Lydd.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 1. Site of former Lydd Town railway station and station goods yard. The up-platform, main station building, goods shed, and loading dock all survive. Further assessment of non-designated heritage assets needed prior to determination of any planning application. The main station building and goods shed should be retained if possible.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

This site constitutes previously developed (brownfield) land and as such could be considered suitable for redevelopment, yet this need should be considered in the context of its heritage and transport safeguarding roles. While the site is currently some distance from local services, it is otherwise rather free from constraints, and has been proposed for release from protection in the latest Employment review. There may be opportunity here to create a distinctive 'place' through reuse of the existing station buildings and enhancing pedestrian permeability to other sites in the vicinity.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 306a and b | <i>SDC</i> | <i>WDM</i> |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---------|
| | | <i>Ward:</i> | |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Kitewell Lane, Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant (30+ years). Informal footpath on lower site | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.51ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Southern site - <u>Y11/1021/SH</u> undetermined Northern site - Y11/0390/SH undetermined |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | The southern site can be accessed from Kitewell Lane. Access to the northern part of the site is questionable and unlikely given the presence of substantial electricity apparatus. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Northern site – severely restricting access to site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No – adjacent plots are. Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Site level needs addressing. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Potential air quality and noise issues from surrounding light industrial uses |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | In general no, but the ground on the southern site is uneven. |
| | | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Mostly outside – a western wedge of the southern site is in FZ2 |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development on this site could improve the locality |
| | ii) Landscape | Development of these sites would not have any landscape impact since both are bounded by existing urban uses. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No – nearest site is 45m W of the northern site. |
| ix) Protected Open Space | No – informal open space only | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Yes – the southern site is allocated Employment Land |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 75m on Station Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1km |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 700m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 1km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>On the northern site, there is a railway line to the north, but this is used incredibly infrequently.</p> <p>On both sites there is a potential for impact from emissions from light industry.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | <p>Despite certain constraints, development of the southern site (306a) could enhance the locality and create a more pleasant environment than existing. The northern site (306b) should not proceed given its access restrictions and the fact that there are no adjoining residential uses leaving it really rather remote.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|--|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | <p>Yes – applicant has been in contact with developer</p> |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | <p>No - unoccupied</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | <p>The sites are in single ownership, and there is no current activity on the sites. Therefore, having excluded the northern site on access grounds, the southern site should proceed to stage 4.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Market Interests</p> | |
| | <p>i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses</p> | <p>Land surrounding the site is a mix of residential, and light industrial units. Properties in the vicinity are mostly 2 storeys of accommodation.</p> |
| | <p>ii) Land Values compared with</p> | <p>Residential use would increase values</p> |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | Existing and Alternative Uses | enormously compared to current vacant scrub use. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Neutral mixed use area |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | May require earthworks to level ground. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Kitewell Lane could benefit from upgrading |
| | iii) planning policy | E1 / SS4 – employment land allocation Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Could be 1-2 storey dwellings to match neighbouring. |
| | ii) Quantity | 18 homes proposed for both sites. However, for the southern site only 7-10dw would be appropriate |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – 2-3 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The northern part of the site should be accessed off Kitewell Lane and the southern part access from Poplar Lane. No foreseeable issues in relation to highways.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Located in an area of background archaeological potential. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

This submission is for two sites either side of Kitewell Lane. The northern site may be unsuitable for development, given that reasonable access to the site cannot be achieved without using third party land. The situation is different on the southern part of the site. While consideration should be given to the impact of adjoining light industrial uses, upon site visit there were no immediate noise or air pollution issues in evidence. There is also existing adjacent housing, few on-site constraints and an opportunity to improve the locality.

The constraining factor for residential development on site 306a (the southern site) is its allocation for Employment Land. This would have to be rescinded before allocation for residential development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 335 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Fisher Field, Dungeness Road, Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Horse Grazing | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.45 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 3.7.14 23.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. The wider site has had a four-decade history of refused planning applications. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Across the E and W boundaries of site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Eastern two-thirds 'significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Storm beach gravel Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development here could provide a logical extension to the Lydd residential settlement and an improvement in the visual quality of this area to detract from current views of industrial facilities to the south, and the army camp to the west. |
| | ii) Landscape | Development could serve to improve the landscape quality of the locality and serve investment in the immediate site area. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No – only W boundary AAP around Lydd Army Camp |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 40m to bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 280m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 560m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 470m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Not particularly – there are nearby works and barracks uses, but these are already either distant or screened. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site is in a sustainable location, able to access local services in Lydd. However, it cannot be considered highly in the sequential testing based on its flood risk and location in FZ2 and 3. This part of Lydd would benefit from development and an improved design aesthetic for the locality though. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|---------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes – There are adjacent longstanding residential uses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would raise land values significantly |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | While the locality does not benefit from high quality design of the built environment, there is an attractiveness of the semi-rural area of the Romney Marsh. |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | Flooding Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Two storey dwellings only. Flatted accommodation would not be appropriate given its Flood Zone situation; nor would single-storey dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | 12-15 dw with 5 flats proposed. This level of provision (12-13) would be suitable for this site based on surrounding densities and land area, at 30dph. Flatted accommodation would <i>not</i> be appropriate given its Flood Zone situation; nor would single-storey |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------|
| | | dwelling. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>Access would have to be from Tourney Road as Dengemarsh Road is not suitable as an access point due to its limited width and presence of on-street car parking. Pedestrian facilities in the local area are however poor due to the extremely limited width of footpath on the other side of Tourney Road and no footpaths on Skinner Road and the eastern side of Brooks Way. Not a particularly sustainable site and we would not favour an allocation on this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comment</p> |
|---|

| |
|---|
| <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>Development here could provide a logical extension to the Lydd residential settlement and an improvement in the visual quality of this area to detract from current views of industrial facilities to the south, and the army camp to the west. It could also serve to improve the landscape quality of the locality and serve investment in the immediate site area. It is situated within an appropriate distance of local services. However, allocation would depend on the ability to design beyond the site's constraints - its situation in Flood Zone 3, with 'significant' SFRA hazard could mean the site is unsuitable. In addition to this, it is a minerals safeguarding area.</p> |
|---|

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 390 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Peak Welders, Romney Road, Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | B1/B2/B8 | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.07 [assumed miscalculation as 0.7ha] |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes - regeneration |
|----------------------------|--------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – from Station Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – due to light industrial works HU-091 Engineering works Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No - flat |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Majority no – north-western part of site only |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Majority no – north-western part of site only 'Nil' | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Eastern part of site – storm beach gravel Airfield | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Housing development in this |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | location could improve the visual quality of the locality, yet it would result in an isolated development NE of the railway line. |
| | ii) Landscape | Development would impact on a local wildlife site, but this is mitigated inasfar as this is PDL |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Majority of site no; northern wedge part of Lydd Common and Pastures |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Storm beach gravel Airfield. |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 135m at corner of Kitewell Lane |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Circa 1km in Lydd |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Yes – Proximity to railway track Noise impact |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity |
|------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 3? | <p>reductions.</p> <p>There are a variety of constraints limiting development in this location, including distance from local services and lack of pedestrian accessibility to Lydd. Any development would have to improve pedestrian routes to local services, and therefore would recommend a joint plan for this with site 195.</p> <p>Positives include the fact that this is PDL, and therefore there is opportunity to improve design, biodiversity and aesthetics of the site. There is also, unlike a lot of Lydd, limited flood risk as it is mostly outside FZ2 and 3.</p> |
|-----------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No current leases |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Can be made available in 4-6 months |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Some scattered and incoherent residential development to the NE of site, and to the SW beyond the railway line. Local wildlife site to W. An integrated residential development here could provide coherence to the area, in particular if combined with site 195. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values compared with existing uses |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | This is not an attractive location, and so any site design must aim at beautification. |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Yes – clean-up from contamination; buildings on site. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Demolition of existing buildings on site. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Local wildlife site |
| | iv) infrastructure | Pedestrian permeability into Lydd across railway line must be improved. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | No particular constraints on type |
| | ii) Quantity | 26 dwellings proposed by submission. This is currently not a residential area, and there are capacity reductions as a result of the local nature reserve. Mixed use development could be appropriate here. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | 2 years estimated in submission |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site has an existing access point which could be suitable for a total of 14 units. The existing use of the site is likely to generate a fairly large amount of vehicle movements. There is however no footpath in a southerly direction towards Lydd and there is no way that a footpath could be installed due to the limited width of Station Road. Due to the lack of footpath the site would not encourage sustainable transport and would be heavily car dependent. There is also an inherent safety risk of pedestrians walking in Station Road, which is likely to happen due to the lack of footpath. We could therefore not support an allocation on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Site lies within an area of general archaeological potential, with multi-period remains found

to the north at Allen's Bank. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

This site is located in close proximity to a landfill site which could be considered an offsite source of contamination.

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No objection

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No objection

CONCLUSIONS

While this site is located a significant distance from local services and is beyond the settlement boundary, in other respects this site is suitable for development as previously developed land and with relatively few other constraints (and limited flood risk), with the proviso that pedestrian and other accesses and routeways to Lydd across the railway line **must** be improved. While there is a prospect of land contamination, redevelopment for housing should be encouraged to deal with and the site can go forward. Bear in mind the northern wedge designation as a local wildlife site. There are none of the flooding issues so prominent in the south of the district, and so housing type can be left open.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 319 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Shingle | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.4ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | <p>Yes – Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI.</p> <p>Adjacent to Lade Fort Scheduled Monument.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – SSSI and adjacent to scheduled monument. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | | |
| | <p>If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant</p> | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 4? | |
|-----------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This site is unsuitable for allocation given its location entirely within the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI, and its adjacency to the Lade Fort Scheduled Monument.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 378 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Mulberry Cottage Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Dwellinghouse | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 3.7.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | |
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None – adjacent to SSSI to NW |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Service centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway | Yes - the site is currently accessed |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | network be created? | from High Street along a gravel track flanked by mature hedgerow and semi-mature conifers, alongside an existing detached bungalow |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Majority, save south and east corners. Majority 'Nil' – north of site 'moderate' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | There is potential to impact the grade II listed building, but not the |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | townscape per se. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes - This site is adjacent to the SSSI. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | (Tree groups and hedgerows?) Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – site adjoins Mulberry Cottage which is a Grade II listed building. AAP on majority of site except access. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 60m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | 550m At Skinner Road |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 450m – High Street |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 500m Orchard House, Bleak Road |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | A buffer area may be appropriate on site on its frontage with the SSSI and/or the Listed Building. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Conservation Officer Comments Needed-LISTED BUILDING request sent 9.9.14</p> <p>Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions.</p> <p>There are important considerations in terms of the site's relationship with the adjacent listed building and SSSI.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | North – open farmland, designated SSSI East – detached and semi detached houses and bungalows South – detached bungalows West – detached and semi detached houses and bungalows, including a Grade II listed building Tourney Hall. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – semi-rural location located adjacent to an SSSI |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Detached or semi-detached at least two storey. |
| | ii) Quantity | Submission proposes 14, but this would be over-optimistic given the pattern of neighbouring development and on-site constraints. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency |
|---|

- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is proximate to Lydd's local services, but there are some constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. There are important considerations in terms of the site's relationship with the adjacent listed building and SSSI. In addition, access arrangements could prove challenging given the restricted access to High Street. However, the site is firmly within the settlement boundary.

Unlike many sites in the Walland and Denge Marsh ward, this has parts outside of Flood Zone 3, and is rated 'nil' risk in the SFRA to 2015.

In sum, this site is not available or deliverable fundamentally as a result of its poor access.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 0 / 662 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland and Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land north of Sycamore Close, Lydd | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | ~2.15ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | Yes – Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No - SSSI |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>xiii) Is it in flood zone 3?</p> <p>If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>'Significant' in its entirety</p> |
| | <p>xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)?</p> | |
| <p>C</p> | <p>Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following?</p> | |
| <p>i) Townscape</p> | | |
| <p>ii) Landscape</p> | | |
| <p>iii) AONB and its immediate setting</p> | | |
| <p>iv) Kent BAP sites</p> | | |
| <p>v) Tree Preservation Orders</p> | | |
| <p>vi) Heritage Assets</p> | | |
| <p>vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square</p> | | |
| <p>viii) Local Wildlife Site</p> | | |
| <p>ix) Protected Open Space</p> | | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Low (CIL band A) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency |
|---|

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This land is unsuitable for allocation given that it is entirely located within the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Dymchurch

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 604 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land east of Eastbridge Road, Dymchurch | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.36 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage | Yes |
|-------------------------|------------|

| | |
|----|----------------------|
| 2? | Integration concerns |
|----|----------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Potential access to Eastbridge Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Nearby |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Nearby |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Nearby |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Yes – electrical distribution from West to SE across southern corner of site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Damp ground conditions observed |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Tourist railway line along SE boundary. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage ditches on NW and NE boundaries. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority ‘significant’ with patches of ‘moderate’ in the centre and along the eastern edge |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield Two PRowS bisect the site; one across from W-E; one from SW-E. |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | i) Townscape | Development here would set a precedent for the expansion of the Dymchurch development beyond the confines of the railway line. |
| | ii) Landscape | Development on this site would consolidate the urbanisation of what at present is an area of rural ribbon development along Eastbridge Road. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 45m to Dymchurch station, next to which is situated a bus stop providing a regular service. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 175m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 320m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 220m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Tourist railway line to SE |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | There is a logic for the partial development of this site, in particular |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 3? | given its proximity to the services of Dymchurch. Spatially, too, development here would consolidate the built form of the town. However, there are substantial flood risk issues, and the presence of sizeable electricity distribution apparatus on site. The most pressing issue, however, is the need for improvements to Eastbridge Road to enable capacity for access for this site. |
|-----------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No – owned in full |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Subject to agricultural tenancy |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Unknown |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Need to explore length of tenancy |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | The site is subject to an agricultural tenancy, but details of the duration and the terms are unknown. Commitment of owner to sell and developer interest are also unknown. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Some residential, but surrounded in the main by agricultural uses |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would raise land values compared to agricultural yields |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | -- |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Need for very well designed SuDS scheme to address flood risk and ensure surface water managed effectively. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | There would be an express need to improve connectivity across the railway line to Dymchurch, and to make substantial improvements for accessibility along Eastbridge Road |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Must be over one-storey given high flood risk. |
| | ii) Quantity | Standard density on a site of this size in this location would be 30dph, giving circa 131dw on site. However, there are substantial constraints meaning that this number will have to be significantly reduced to fewer than half of these. Space would have to be given over in particular to SuDS features. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Potentially – circa 4 years |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health
- KCC Highways

Site cannot accommodate 87 dwellings as there is no footpath along Eastbridge Road. Site is remote from local services and the only way you can get there is by car. A suitable access into the site could also not be provided due to the lack of visibility splays. KCC would not support an allocation on this site.

- Highways Agency

No objection

- Environment Agency
- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB

No comment

- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE

No comment

- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

There is a logic for the partial development of this site, in particular given its proximity to the services of Dymchurch. Spatially, too, development here would consolidate the built form of the town. However, there are substantial flood risk issues, and the presence of sizeable electricity distribution apparatus on site. The most pressing issue, however, is the need for improvements to Eastbridge Road to enable capacity for access for this site.

Development here would set a precedent for the expansion of the Dymchurch development beyond the confines of the railway line, and would consolidate the urbanisation of what at present is an area of rural ribbon development along Eastbridge Road. Availability should be highlighted as somewhat of an issue, since the site is not immediately available. Given the significant flood risks on site, and the presence of electrical apparatus, combined with access issue on Eastbridge Road, capacity would be significantly restricted on this site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 347 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land W High Knocke Dymchurch | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 8.75 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|------|
| | | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Integration - UNSUIT |
|----------------------------|----------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Potentially, from The Fairway |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Nearby |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Nearby |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Nearby |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | None apparent |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Class 1 Radon Gas No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channels along North and East boundaries. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'Moderate'. South eastern part of site 'Significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | This would be a significant allocation and spread the settled area of St Mary's Bay northwards to the High Knocke Estate. This would be contrary to existing Core Strategy Policy SS1. |
| | ii) Landscape | Urbanisation of countryside |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Yes – Romney Marsh BOA |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPO off site to N |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP earthworks |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – bus 110m from site on Dymchurch Road. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – nearest is St Nicholas in New Romney |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – nearest is 1km St Mary's Bay Super Store. |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 920m Martello Health Centre, Dymchurch |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external | |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | environmental factors? | |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – would result in the conjoining of currently distinct settlements were the whole of this area to be built out, contrary to policy SS1 of the Core Strategy. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Resi to S and E; agricultural to W and N |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Resi would yield higher incomes than agricultural land |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – semi-rural and coastal |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | This is bordered by suburban-style development consisting mainly of semi-detached dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

This is a significant site adjacent to the built development of St Mary's Bay, but closer to the services of the rural centre of Dymchurch. It is, however, not sufficiently related to either. Development on this site would join the settlement of St Mary's Bay with the High Knocke estate, and encourage the conurbation of these settlements with Dymchurch, which is to be resisted.

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 349 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | land r/o Crimond Avenue 'Redoubt and Fleet Hythe' Dymchurch North | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural grassland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 11.11 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | <p>Majority of site contains areas at 'extreme' flood hazard for 2115. The eastern part of the site is classed as 'significant'.</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 2?</p> | <p>Integration – UNSUIT</p> <p>Majority of site 'extreme' flood hazard.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | [Rural centre] |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1. |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | | Receptor site CW-088 to north (area 3 watercourse, controlled water area) |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | The site is bounded almost entirely by marsh drainage channels |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Mid section 'Extreme' N-E and S-E sections, 'Significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

No comments

- **KCC Highways**

Not suitable for development as this is a red site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Outside of AONB, but within setting. Development here would represent an inappropriate extension of existing built development into greenfield land to the north. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comments

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

Development on this site would be inappropriate given that this estate is significantly separated from the main Dymchurch service centre, and is located on an area of extreme flood risk. It would not be possible to achieve sustainable development on this site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 350A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Pear Tree lane Land Dymchurch | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more | Yes |
|----------|--|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | dwelling(s)) | |
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Integration |
|----------------------------|-------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural Centre |
|----------|---|--------------|

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Access would need to be via Pear Tree Lane and then onto Hythe Road. Pear Tree Lane is currently an unadoptable gravel drive. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No evidence |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Yes | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Majority of site 'Nil'; SE outer band 'Significant' SE inner band 'Moderate' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | i) Townscape | This land sits in an area of low density semi-rural development associated with the Dymchurch settlement. |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Yes – Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes (No 4, 2008). At Pear Tree Lane interface |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- land adjoins a listed building curtilage. Situated in an AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 3m bus |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 1km |

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 890m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Proceed to Stage | Available Now |
|-------------------------|---------------|

| | |
|-----------|--|
| 4? | |
|-----------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While the previous use of the site, as a commercial pig farm, renders it Greenfield, it is suitably located amidst existing residential uses. While any development on this site would have to pay due attention to the TPO, the context of adjacent listed buildings, and on-site flood risk, there is a potential in particular for development that can incorporate local services on site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form –

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 350B | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Pear Tree lane Land Dymchurch | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Open space with mature and semi-mature trees | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.98 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | ‘Extreme’ flood hazard in NE quarter, on S corner, and a small portion of central area. The remainder has ‘significant’ flood hazard. |

| | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Integration |
|---------------------|-------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | There is potential to create access to Hythe Road, but highway improvements may be necessary. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – flat |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channel runs through centre of site along SW and SE, and forms the SE boundary of the site. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | Yes Majority of site ‘Significant’ Northern patch ‘Extreme’ | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | At present, there is a direct view from Hythe Road SE to the coastal dunes. Development on this site would therefore result in a loss of this sense of openness. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No, but there are several semi-mature and mature specimens on site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes railway station, <400m from a 7 day a week bus service. 5m from bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 950m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No – 1.2km |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 1000m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While spatially residential development on this site makes sense, the great challenge posed by flood risk, combined with the lack of locally-available services, means that this Greenfield site would not be suitable for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 351A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site</i> | Land N Hythe Road | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|
| Name/Address: | Dymchurch | | |
| Current Use: | Grassland | Area (ha): | 5.88 (for A & B) |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Two tiny blobs of 'extreme' flood hazard on the SE boundary, but the vast majority of the site 'significant' flood hazard. |

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Integ |
|---------------------|-------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Applicant claims there is, however this appears to be via an unadopted lane that currently crosses through a light industrial area. Other accesses may be tricky given the watercourse and treed verges. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 Receptor site HH-010 (Dymchurch County Primary School) |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Bounded fully along NW boundary by railway line. Light industrial area to immediate NE of site as the only development NW of the watercourse. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Pond on site. Site bounded along its whole SE boundary by water course separating it and the main |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | Dymchurch settlement |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'Significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development on this site could serve to extend the built footprint of Dymchurch along an existing main distributor road to match the other site. |
| | ii) Landscape | Development here will undoubtedly impact the landscape, and in particular views from the tourist railway adjacent to the site. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Yes – vast majority of site, except NE wedge, SH37 Pasture, Ditches and Pond. |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 100m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 180m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 580m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 320m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? | |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | UNSUITABLE |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While this site benefits from proximity to Dymchurch services, there are a variety of constraints that render it unsuitable for allocation. There are areas of extreme flood risk on the site, while the majority of it suffers from significant flood risk, while there are notable patches of water on site. The land is Greenfield, and is almost entirely designated as a local wildlife site. Current access is insufficient, and via a builders yard, while any access from the public highway would not be straightforward given the requirement to cross Hoorne's Sewer. Any residents may be disturbed by the presence of the tourist railway along the NW boundary of the site. In sum, therefore, development on this site would be contrary to the

NPPF principles of sustainable development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 351B | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | RM |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land N Hythe Road Dymchurch | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grassland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.4ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI | Tiny areas of 'extreme' flood risk at NE and SE of site. Vast majority of the remainder of the site shows significant flood hazard. |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes, but with large constraints |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Rural centre |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Applicant claims there is, however this appears to be via an unadopted lane that currently crosses through a light industrial area. Other accesses may be tricky given the watercourse and treed verges. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No evidence from streetview |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Bounded to NW by tourist rail line. Area of light industrial use to S. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – flat grassland |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Bounded to NE and SE by drainage watercourse |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority 'Significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | There could be potential for a continuation of the self-contained cul-de-sac pattern of development evident in plots to the NE of the site which have developed in similar ways to those proposed here. |
| | ii) Landscape | Spread of settlement into open countryside. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 10m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 400m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 800m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes – 550m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? | Yes – buffer area may be required around builders' yard (traffic movements; industrial activity) |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | UNSUITABLE |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Yes, issue over access |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Resi to N, E and S. Agri to W. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive, semi-rural location in a small service centre. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | Need to investigate access options, as current access not acceptable. |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site benefits from proximity to Dymchurch services, and there are fewer constraints on this site than for site A. Having said that, the site still suffers from areas of significant flood risk. Current access is insufficient, and via a builders yard, while any access from the public highway would not be straightforward given the need to cross Hoorne's Sewer. Any residents may be disturbed by the presence of the tourist railway along the NW boundary of the site, and by potential ongoing activity at the builders yard. On balance, however, this site would not be suitable for development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Greatstone

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1013 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | New Romney |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Car Park, Coast Drive, Greatstone | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Public car park | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.02 gross; 0.47 for allocation |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None, but adjoins Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI to N & E. |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Strategic towns (Littlestone) |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes, from Coast Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Within highway |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Within highway |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Within highway |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Hardstanding with shingle beyond |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No – coastal |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Low across most of site; moderate midway along eastern boundary |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Storm beach gravel Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | This would move the built area of the settlement further towards the coast creating an irregular line of development, but could improve on current hardstanding. |
| | ii) Landscape | Could result in a landscape improvement, but could also reduce sense of openness of this part of the coastal area. Adjoins Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI to N & E. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP on southern half of site |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 25m to bus stop on Grand Parade |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.2km to Greatstone Primary |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 250m to Spar; 600m to Londis |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 2.3km to GP in New Romney |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This is PDL, and development on this site would not be especially damaging. While it would establish a line of development to the east of existing Coast Drive dwellings, continuation and proliferation is limited by constraints to the north and south of this site (including the SSSI) which do not affect this site at all. There is a certain flood risk on this site, and Greatstone does not benefit from many local services – site design should take account of this. However, this is an established residential area. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | SDC and Crown Estates |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Public open space to the north; beach/sea directly to the east; existing two-storey residential directly to the west. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would potentially yield significantly more than car park. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Very attractive coastal location with access to open space to the north. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Site clearance of car park |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Surface water management strategy |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses, all 4-bed semi-detached |
| | ii) Quantity | 16 dw – this is on the upper end of acceptability based on location (~30dph) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – 2-3 years proposed |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

This site is an existing car park and it would need to be demonstrated that the proposals would not have an impact on car parking on local roads in the vicinity of the site. The site has an existing access point which could cater for 16 dwellings. There are footpaths on both sides of Coast Drive and it is relatively close to the local facilities in Greatstone.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 4. Located adjacent to open stretch of shingle beach. Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

Right behind inadequate defences (1in20 year) and have been affected by overtopping in 2013. So we object to these.

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This sliver of land is among the very few areas in the locality with a lower number of constraints, most importantly being outside of the SSSI. Therefore, there is little chance of a proliferation of development in the locality. While it is in the flood zones, the SFRA estimates only a low probability of future flooding issues, but capacity may have to take account of this risk with the production of a surface water management strategy. While the range of services able to be accessed from this location is limited, it is adjacent to an existing residential area on previously developed land (car park) and should be brought forward to the next stage.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Brenzett

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 612 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adjacent Moore Close Brenzett | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grassland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.07 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary Village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No evidence of presence |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channels nearby |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Would alter the major built pattern of the area from linear along road to cluster. |
| | ii) Landscape | Significant extension into flat Greenfield area. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – site includes land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus stop – 120m at A2070/B2080 roundabout Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | Yes - 300m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 520m Shell Petrol Station |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – 2km in Brookland |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No – sufficient distance from main road. |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions.</p> <p>The site is at risk of flooding and includes land of archaeological potential.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A – already acquired |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes – owned by development company |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | SW – existing residential development. Other boundaries level grassland enclosed in part by ditches. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase values compared with current uses. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Rural settlement – could enable improvements of appeal of Moore Close |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs | Potential need for road upgrade at Moore Close. |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Should be individual dwellings more than one-storey due to location in FZ2 and 3. Flats not appropriate. |
| | ii) Quantity | Up to 60dw at 30dph; but offers less allowing for structural landscaping and open space. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways**

How many dwellings are proposed? A suitable access point could be provided from Moore Close. The site is capable of accommodating another 20 dwellings. There are limited facilities in Brenzett.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 3. Proposed allocation site is located in an area of general archaeological potential on edge of Brenzett. The ditches that bound the site on its north-eastern north-western and south-western boundaries are depicted on the Brenzett Tithe Map. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

The size of this site would result in a proportionately major extension to the built area of this small settlement, and intrusion into the countryside. There are some constraints on site, including AAP, and its situation in flood zone 3, but rated 'nil' in the SFRA. Brenzett does not benefit from access to a great number of services. However, development in this location could meet local need, general critical mass for greater service provision, and provide a design improvement to the locality.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Brookland

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 407a | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site</i> | Land N Pod Corner, | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Name/Address: | Brookland | | |
| Current Use: | Open grazing land | Area (ha): | 0.72 |
| | | Site Visit: | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | CW-143 Controlled Water Area Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Sewer drain on NE boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – adjacent to main settlement as logical extension between in the gap between the two areas of Brookland. |
| | ii) Landscape | No – landscape at this point impacted by distributor road |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Area of Archaeological Potential |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 170m A259 |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 260m Brookland school |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – Brookland Branch surgery closed. Nearest is Appledore, 5km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Brookland does not benefit from an extensive number of services. If there is a need for development on Brookland, this site would be among those most preferred given its access to infrastructure and adjacency to substantial more recent development, and its more limited constraints. Like all of Brookland, it is in FZ2 and 3, and so single-storey dwellings or flats would not be appropriate. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | -- |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Given advice by agents Smiths Gore. |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | -- |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|---------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | West is an existing cul-de-sac development. South is bounded by bypass. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Reasonably attractive rural settlement |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable Housing |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | This should be individual dwellinghouses of at least 2-storeys, |
| | ii) Quantity | 10-15dw |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – currently Greenfield and ready for development. |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways**

A suitable means of access could be provided for this site for a total of 15 units. The 30mph zone would need to be extended towards the roundabout. There are footpath links to Brookland village and the Church and primary school.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score: 3. Brookland lies in an area of general background archaeological potential, with a number of chance archaeological finds having been made in the surrounding fields. The site is bounded to the north-east by a drainage ditch which is shown on the Brookland Tithe Map. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

This site has been previously assessed as appropriate and deliverable for new development, with relatively few constraints as opposed to others in the settlement. While this site is in flood zone 3, the SFRA suggests no additional flood hazard. It should be noted, however, that the settlement of Brookland does not offer a full range of services, but benefits from a primary school and bus links. At the current time development on this site would result in limited encroachment into the countryside. However, if there is additional OAN in Brookland for large-scale housing, this would be the Council's preferred site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|------------|-----|-----------|----------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 431 | SDC Ward: | Waland & Denge Marsh |
|------------|-----|-----------|----------------------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | The Old Slaughterhouse 'Rosemary Corner', Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | PDL, scrub and arable (grade 1) | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.27 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
|----------|---|-----------------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No, but significant telegraph infrastructure across entrance. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No, but need to remove remnants of derelict building. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No – development would serve a logical and proportionate continuation of built area. |
| | ii) Landscape | No – the site is reasonably well bounded so as not to provoke encroachment into the field to the north. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | None on site, but on neighbouring site to SE |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Adjacent to Conservation Area on SE boundary. AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 40m High Street |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 50m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – Appledore. Brookland Surgery closed |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – Brookland suffers from a lack of access to a full range of services, but this site is the preferred site for residential development in the settlement. It is a proportionate, bounded-site coterminous with the pattern of built development. It is reasonably free of constraints, and constitutes previously developed land. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | |
|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? |
|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|----------------|
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | SW and NE adjoining land is residential – semi-detached bungalows with landscaped frontages. NW is flat open agricultural land. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural settlement |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | None |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | None |
| | iii) planning policy | -- |
| | iv) infrastructure | None |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Should be individual dwellings of at least 2-storey given location in flood zones. |
| | ii) Quantity | 5-8dw proposed. Previous SHLAA estimate 5dw would be appropriate given the size of the site and location. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The site could accommodate a vehicle access for 5 dwellings and there is a footpath along the eastern side of Straight Lane. The site is close to the primary school, pub and church.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score 2. Site lies close to the Grade I Listed Church of St Augustine, which features a rare Grade I Listed detached belfry. The site lies in a prominent position on the approaches to the village and is located close to a number of Listed Buildings. The site also lies immediately adjacent to the Brookland Conservation Area. Brookland lies in an area of general background archaeological potential, with a number of chance archaeological finds having been made in the surrounding fields. Development of all or part of the site may not be appropriate. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions. Further assessment of impact of development on the setting of Conservation Area and nearby Listed Building(s) is required prior to determination.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site comprises a former slaughterhouse in an advanced state of dereliction adjacent to existing residential dwellings. The land was regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. Although the site is in flood zone 3, the SFRA attributes it a 'nil' rating. However, any development must take account of neighbouring conservation area and the TPOs on neighbouring sites. Negotiation with utility provider necessary to move pole and wires from access. The settlement itself is not well equipped with services; however this is the preferred site for residential development in Brookland.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 329 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Pepperland Nurseries, Boarmans Lane, Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant – 5 yrs | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.72 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 24.2.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | <p>Permission for Hotel and motel units 95/928/SH – not implemented</p> <p>Permission for CoU from agriculture to Light Industry 93/834/SH, not implemented, and renewed under 99/0970/SH.</p> <p>Confirmation of Prior Approval under application Y15/0015/BGPD for the change of use/conversion from agricultural of two residential units.</p> <p>Y15/0089/SH – Permission granted for the change of use and conversion of existing building to 6 holiday apartments (C1)</p> |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes – HU-101 (Nursery, Straight Line) |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Brookland Sewer drain on SE of site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including | Airfield | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – While the land abuts the conservation area on its SW boundary, that conservation area comprises significant areas of undeveloped land. Therefore, the proposed construction of 9 homes would significantly detract from the conservation area’s setting, and result in a spread of the built area of the village. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes - The proposed density would undermine the rural setting of this area. |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – the site contains land that is of archaeological potential and adjoins a Conservation Area. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus – 50m Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – 350m Brookland school |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m - Appledore |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------------|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Fast-flowing road to NE |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. Like a lot of the Marsh the site is at risk of flooding and includes land of archaeological potential. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | This land is contiguous with the Brookland conservation area which contains 2000m² of glasshouses and pump house. Other neighbouring residential uses have substantial cartilages. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase land values in comparison with a commercial nursery |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Yes – rural location |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Investigation for contamination |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Site clearance |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing Conservation area – adjacent/impact |
| | iv) infrastructure | Improvement of access road – Boarman’s Lane |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Individual dwellinghouses |
| | ii) Quantity | 9 dw proposed |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**

The access is onto Straight Lane, which is the ownership of Highways England so they would need to be consulted. The site is remote from local services and there are no footpath links along Straight Lane and therefore this site should not be allocated.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site is Greenfield and has a long unsuccessful planning history. There is potential for adverse impacts on the conservation area, and the site is remote in terms of access to services. Previous housing schemes on the site have been refused. The site is situated in flood zone 3, and there may well be sequentially better sites.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 609 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adjacent Framlea, Rye Rd, Pod Corner Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural grazing | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.63 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No Views in Y14/0091/SH and Y15/0499/SH. Appeal 15/0003 was dismissed in Dec 15 for 8 dwellings. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: | None |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary Village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | CW-143 Controlled water area Radon Gas Class 1 |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – urbanisation of area |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – incursion of building into open countryside |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – the site includes land of archaeological potential. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 50m Brookland Bypass and Boarmans Lane. |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 200m Brookland school |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – Brookland surgery closed. Appledore is closest 5km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|---------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No - sub |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | <p>Available</p> <p>Like the majority of the Marsh the site is at risk of flooding and includes land of archaeological potential.</p> |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | <p>W – Rye Road, and beyond resi.</p> <p>E – A259 bypass</p> <p>One dwelling to SW.</p> |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural settlement |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No – attention to controlled water area requirements |
| | iii) planning policy | CSD3 |
| | iv) infrastructure | No [though attention to road improvements cited as of concern to PC] |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Should be at least 2-storey individual dwellings. |
| | ii) Quantity | 8-16dw proposed. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – at appeal. |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

Suitable access points could be provided as we have previously raised no objection to a planning application on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **KCC Heritage**

Score: 3. Brookland lies in an area of general background archaeological potential, with a number of chance archaeological finds having been made in the surrounding fields. Historic Ordnance Survey maps show a farmstead within the site in question (now demolished). Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

No comment

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comment

CONCLUSIONS

The Council has recently won an appeal on this site, based on the loss of rural character and development into open countryside and outside of the settlement boundary. However, it is noted that the element of tidal flooding can be/has been overcome for despite the site's location in flood zone 3a, it has been shown to be at 'nil' risk in the SFRA.

This site, like others in Brookland, has access only to limited services, but has relatively few constraints compared to other sites.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 631 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland & Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at West Place, Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Amenity greenspace | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.119ha |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | No |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| | permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | No – does not meet size threshold |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary Village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage | |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|----|--|
| 3? | |
|----|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|---|------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|---|------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is a divided site, and neither the constituent parts nor the whole meet the area threshold for allocation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1016 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Waland and Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land North of Boarmans Lane Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.51 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> | Refused Y14/0091/SH for 8 detached dw. |

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – entrance from Boarman’s Lane. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | CW-143 Controlled Water Area |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channel near NW boundary |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site 'Nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Increased urbanisation of rural settlement |
| | ii) Landscape | Loss of green space between two parts of village |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 50m A259 |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – Brooklands C of E. |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – only a mobile surgery on Tuesday lunchtimes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? | |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Discussions ongoing with developers |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | No – currently bounded by open fields, but engineered bypass borders site to NW, and beyond is another submitted site |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase values |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural settlement |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Individuals dwellings at least 2-storeys given flood zone. |
| | ii) Quantity | 6-8 dw – this site could take the maximum number of dwellings. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | Spatially, this would be more appropriate to come forward in the |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | later part of the plan. |
|--|--|-------------------------|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site would not be suitable for development in the first part of the plan period given its lack of adjacency to current residential development. However, the site has few raw constraints other than its location in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development here would result in countryside encroachment and the conjoining of two distinct parts of the settlement.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1017 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Walland and Denge Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land South of Boarmans Lane Brookland | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 9.2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning | |

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Telegraph wires running SW-NE |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 CW-039 Controlled Water Area |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channels along all boundaries of site, and channel running from midway up NW boundary NW almost to SE |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes While site – 'Nil' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes – potential impact on Conservation Area and Listed Buildings to NW, and urbanisation of an area removed from current built area |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – new block of building separated from existing settlement and in open countryside. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA. |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPO at mid point on NW boundary |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP Grade II listed lodge at NW boundary Small part of site, along NW boundary, forms part of Conservation Area. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 170m High Street |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – Brooklands C of E. |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – only a mobile surgery on Tuesday lunchtimes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No, vacant |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Discussions held with developers |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | N/A |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | No – to the north is the Brookland conservation area, mainly constituted of individual dwellings in enormous gardens. The site is well outside the settlement boundary. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase land values exponentially as residential land. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive open countryside |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | No |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | SS3 |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Given its flood zone location, only individual dwellings 2-storeys or above. |

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| | ii) Quantity | 10 to 15 dw |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | No - isolated |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While site 329 has planning history, both that and this site stand remote from the main settlement and therefore cannot be integrated into the built confines of the settlement. This site has relatively many constraints, including the presence of wiring on site, TPOs, watercourses on site, flood zone 2 and 3 situation, controlled water area, and relationship to listed buildings and a conservation area. It does not benefit from access to services within the settlement, and therefore it is not among the select sites for Brookland. Allocation here would constitute unacceptable encroachment into the countryside.

Completed by

Signed

Date

St Mary's Bay

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 004 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site</i> | Former Sands Motel, St | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Name/Address:</i> | Mary's Bay | | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant motel & CP | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4 (1.6ha proposed for housing) |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 24.2.16 23.3.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes – identified in previous assessments. (SHLAA Consolidated Document (2010), SHLAA Update (2011), Housing... Technical Note (2012) Planning permission Y07/1566/SH approved in March 2016 |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None – adjacent to SSSI on Southern boundary |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary Village |
|----------|--|------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Could be connected |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Could be connected |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Could be connected |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Class 1 Radon Gas. No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No – slopes upward 2.3m N-S. |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Sea wall has now been improved Significant and moderate in greater part of site. Low on north-western wedge of site. Nil at very west of site. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes – storm beach gravel Airfield safeguarding (90m) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Yes – Romney Marshes BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 20m from site at junction of Jefferstone Lane and Dymchurch Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – primary schools in New Romney and Dymchurch |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – Jefferstone Lane |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – nearest is Martello Health Centre in Dymchurch |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Yes – Outfall for the new sewer (part of the land drainage network) Proposed development needs to be outside the required byelaw zone. (5m either side of the pipes) |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site constitutes PDL within the defined settlement boundary of St Mary's Bay. The settlement does not offer a full range of local services, and the site itself has challenges due to flood risk. It has, however, recently been given planning permission for its redevelopment for residential occupation, with an approved strategy for the constraints posed by this site. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Promoted by developer |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available now and likely to be developed given developer interest. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Not particularly - Resi flatted accommodation to W; Located on the southern section of the site is an outfall of the new sewer which forms part of the land drainage network. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would raise values compared with existing, and former tourist uses. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Coastal location |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Issues of clearing remaining built structures, and with land levels. |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | May be issues relating to the sewer outfall. Flood mitigation strategy |
| | iii) planning policy | Affordable housing SSSI adjacency |
| | iv) infrastructure | -- |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Mix of housing and flats proposed. Would be better indiv dwellings above 1 storey. |
| | ii) Quantity | 85 dwellings proposed on this site – 59 houses; 26 apartments. |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – planning permission and promoted by developer |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways <p>This site has a resolution to grant planning permission and KCC Highways are satisfied that the access arrangements are acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Heritage <p>Score 3. Located on the site of the former Sands Motel (and previously Sands Hotel) adjacent to New Sewer sluices outfall. WW2 defences clustered around New Sewer outfall. No 2 Gun Emplacement and Battery Observation Post for a WW2 Emergency Coastal Battery (St Mary's Bay Battery aka Dymchurch Battery) was located on the site and may survive as below ground remains close to sea wall. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) <p>No comments</p> |
|---|

CONCLUSIONS

This site has been considered suitable for development previously. Given that this is previously developed land (brownfield) under the terms of the NPPF, and it related to the Primary Village of St Mary's Bay with access to local services, redevelopment of this site is considered sustainable development.

Attention should be paid to the site's relationship to the SSSI, and any development should work to improve the setting of the SSSI from the present state. This should also be combined with the buffer required for the New Sewer drainage output to the sea.

This site constitutes PDL within the defined settlement boundary of St Mary's Bay. The

settlement does not offer a full range of local services, and the site itself has challenges due to flood risk. It has, however, recently been given planning permission for its redevelopment for residential occupation, with an approved strategy for the constraints posed by this site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 352 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land NE Nesbit Road 'Jesson Farmland' St Mary's Bay | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant 30 yrs | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.9 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: • SAC | None |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | No – access is proposed by the applicant over the railway line, or across third party land. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Adjacent to railway line on NW boundary |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channels on E and SE boundary. SE boundary constitutes anti-tank ditch |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Central part 'Nil' NW 'Low' S and SE 'Moderate' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – 140m at Jefferstone Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – nearest schools are in Dymchurch and New Romney |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 275m (Beachside Stores) |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – nearest surgeries are in Dymchurch and New Romney |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Proximity to railway line |

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Access - is there any? UNSUITABLE |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | Access issue; otherwise no |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Existing residential to S and E, and permitted residential scheme to N. Railway to W and agriculture beyond. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with | Housing will increase land values |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Reasonably attractive semi-rural location. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | Access infrastructure provision |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | No – no reasonable accesses |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While this site is adjacent to existing residential development and related to the primary village of St Mary's Bay, residential amenity cannot be assured given the shape of the site

and its relationship to the railway line. More importantly, access to the site is doubtful, and the adjacent plot's layout means that vehicular access cannot come from the north, meaning that it is not a deliverable site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 380 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Romney Marsh |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land off Jenners Way St Mary's Bay | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Arable Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.3 (A & B) |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No – smaller site submitted for assessment in 2008 call |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: | None |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Primary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – the only conceivable point of access could be via Jenner’s Way, which currently serves a small courtyard of late C20th almshouse-style buildings. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Available |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Available |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Available |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 Receptor site CW-110 (Area C) |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | Watercourses, controlled watercourses) on westerly sliver. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Railway line on western boundary. Substantial drainage channel on northern boundary. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'Moderate' Part of eastern edge 'Significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | All existing surrounding construction is late C20th single-storey rural terraced housing uninspired in its aspiration and design. |
| | ii) Landscape | If the whole site is developed, this could negatively impact the wider countryside. However, infill development could come forward on the northern part of the site. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes (250m from a bus stop) |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – nearest schools in Dymchurch and New Romney |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 615m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – nearest surgeries in Dymchurch and New Romney |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | <p>No</p> |
|--|--|------------------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 3?</p> | <p>NA</p> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| <p>A</p> | <p>Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site?</p> | |
| | <p>i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip</p> | <p>No</p> |
| | <p>ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement</p> | |
| | <p>iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell</p> | |
| | <p>iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop</p> | |
| | <p>v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease</p> | <p>No, but currently under agricultural use</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 4?</p> | <p>Available</p> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Residential to N, beyond a water course. Resi to NE. Tourist railway to W; open land to S & SE. |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Residential uses would increase land values significantly. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location, with countryside views. |
| | iv) Demand | Medium (CIL band B) |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Would need to be two-storey single dwellings given flood zone. |
| | ii) Quantity | Up to 30 dw proposed |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

This is a marginal site in all ways. While there is potential to improve the built environment of the immediate locality, it would be inappropriate to allocate the whole of this site given that this would result in intrusion of development into the countryside and create pressure for infill on neighbouring parcels. It is noted that flood hazard is greatest on the part of the site adjacent to Jenner’s Way and closest to the settlement. Therefore this site is unsuitable for development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Burmarsh

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 391 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | RM |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | The Old Rectory Burmarsh | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Residential Garden | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|--|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>Proceed to Stage 2?</p> | <p>Check integration ok</p> <p>While this plot is broadly contiguous with built development in Burmarsh, its neighbouring plots between it and the main settlement are particularly substantial. As such, in terms of built form, it would be unlikely this site is suitable for particularly dense development. Extrapolating, this looks to be suitable for only 2-3 dw.</p> |
|-----------------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Secondary village. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway | Any access would potentially have to cross third party land. It would |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | network be created? | definitely necessitate hardstanding on adjacent land plots currently open fields/gardens. Submission states existing access is hardsurfaced, but no evidence on maps. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes – adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes – adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes - adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | None evident |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | CW-007, CW-097 and CW-102 Controlled water areas Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No. Pond on site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Yes |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes - Whole SW quarter of site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus 120m – The Green/Thorndike Road Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m - Dymchurch |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >1km - Dymchurch |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Unsuitable |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health <p>No comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KCC Highways <p>Not suitable for development as this is a red site. The access proposed would only be suitable for 1-2 properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency <p>No objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency |
|--|

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Outside of AONB but within setting. Development here would represent inappropriate extension of village northwards. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

It is considered that this site is unsuitable for allocation. First and foremost there is the fact that a quarter of the site is subject to TPO, and has a body of water, meaning that the area nearest to the settlement could not be developed, leading to an encroachment into the countryside.

The proposed number of dwellings would lead to a pattern of development incongruous with the immediate surroundings. This, combined with the dispreferred access arrangements, and other constraints including flood risk and setting of listed buildings means that this is to be a dispreferred option.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 600 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | RM |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land West of Burmarsh Burmarsh | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.01 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar | None |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | UNSUIT loc |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Secondary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Not apparent on streetview |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | CW-008 off site to south (Controlled water area) Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No - flat |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channels along north, west and south boundaries of site |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Whole site is 'significant' |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Airfield |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Significant expansion of built area |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – open countryside |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | Adjacent to recreation ground |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus stop 230m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m - Dymchurch |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >1km - Dymchurch |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? | |
| | Is a buffer area required? | |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – Unsuitable location |
|---------------------|--------------------------|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

No comments

- **KCC Highways**

Not suitable for development as this is a red site. There does not appear to be anywhere that the site could be accessed from Church Road due to a ditch. A footpath would also be required along the site frontage to link into the facilities in the village.

- **Highways Agency**

No objection

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

Outside of AONB but within setting. Development here would appear unrelated to existing settlement. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

No comment

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

This site is considered unsuitable given that development would notably extend the built area of the village into open countryside and would necessitate the upgrading of the main road through the village. This settlement is at the bottom of the settlement hierarchy, therefore significant development would not be sustainable given the significant distances required to access services. Added to this, there is the challenge of significant flood risk.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Newchurch

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 611 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | RM |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Former piggery, Brooker Farm Newchurch | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agricultural | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|------|
| | | |
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | None |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | TBC Regen or not? – NPPF definition would suggest not. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Secondary village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Seems to be far to south of site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas Class 1 No other contamination |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage channel along NE boundary and along western third of Southern boundary. |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | Yes |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes Majority of site 'moderate' with a band of 'low' across the middle of the site. |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | Could be an improvement to disused agricultural buildings |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | Romney Marsh BOA |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes – the site includes land of archaeological potential. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus >400m Train >800m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | >800m – Nearest are Hamstreet or Dymchurch, 5km |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m – Nearest are Hamstreet or Dymchurch, 5km |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors?</p> <p>Is a buffer area required?</p> | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | <p>Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions.</p> <p>The site is at risk of flooding and includes land of archeological potential.</p> <p>It is situated some 300m from the built confines of Newchurch, with open fields separating it and the main small settlement.</p> |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB**

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is significantly divorced from the main, minor settlement. While it has been previously developed, its development has been exclusively agricultural in nature as per the NPPF definition, and therefore cannot count as brownfield under the terms of that document.

Therefore, given that this is a Greenfield site in the wider countryside only marginally related to a secondary village without services, this site cannot be allocated for development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Hawkinge

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 244 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Former Officers Mess, Aerodrome Road Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant WWII Officers Mess | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.75 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes The land was regarded as deliverable and developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but AONB and part of the site is designated CO24 (Strategic Landscape Buffer) |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located in the service centre of Hawkinge, within the settlement boundary. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – part of the site contains land classified as CO24 – important to retain, extent of area approx 20% of total area. |
| | iii) AONB | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Hedgerows and tree groups |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | ix) Protected Open Space | Not protected but is a recognised open space |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus- Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes- however the site capacity may be affected by its AONB setting and the Strategic Landscape Buffer (CO24) which covers some of the site. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Demolition of buildings |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB and CO24- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Houses |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states between 50-99, however because of the constraint of the CO24 buffer area I feel 70 is most appropriate. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- Land at Aerodrome Road, Hawkinge – This site is currently subject to a planning application, of which KCC Highways are satisfied with the access arrangements. |
|--|

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Partially brownfield site, well contained by landscape features. Any development would need to be of exceptional quality and care required with layout, design and scale and existing trees within/around perimeter of site should be retained.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site was previously allocated for education purposes however KCC education no longer requires reservation of this site to meet educational needs. Therefore residential development on the site would seem an appropriate use here as long as the Landscape Buffer is preserved and the sites impact on the AONB is given specific consideration.

In conclusion there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 404 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adj Kent Battle of Britain Museum, Aerodrome Road Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | WW11 Airfield | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 5.5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site lies within the settlement boundary for Hawkinge a service centre |
| B | <p>Physical or Infrastructure Constraints:</p> <p>i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created?</p> <p>ii) Is there adequate highway capacity?</p> <p>iii) Is there water supply?</p> <p>iv) Is there sewerage?</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>?</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Some possible contamination from former airfield uses |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | In an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Old WW2 airfield so potential archaeology, contamination, asbestos, pipe mines, German bombs etc |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | See above |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 175 to 250, which seems high for its AONB setting, 100 would be more appropriate. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- The access would have to be from Aerodrome Road as Elvington Lane is not suitable for accommodating extra vehicular traffic. There is an existing tree on the opposite side of Aerodrome Road that obstructs visibility out of any site access and this would need to be cut down. The tree is not a highway tree and so it would need to be investigated who owns this tree. There is a footpath on this side of Aerodrome Road which allows easy access to Hawkinge and the local facilities that are available. • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England |
|---|

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB and on a partially brownfield site. Site is contained by existing built development. Any development of the site should be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping and should not extend into the south western part of the site (retain an undeveloped buffer adjacent to Gibraltar Lane).
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The sites impact on the AONB and CO24 designation requires specific consideration however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 261 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Limuru | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | House and garden | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.9 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| | assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but it is AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The majority of the site adjoins the settlement boundary for Hawkinge, a small part of the site lies within. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes- possible residual contamination from present and previous uses |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------|
| | | |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes- to front of site |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes- bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | Medium- £50 |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Contamination |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 2-5, but it would need to be 6 to qualify as a SHLAA site due to the demolition of the existing dwelling. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Limuru, Cowgate Lane, Hawkinge – This site is remote from Hawkinge centre, is served off a narrow lane, which has no footpaths or street-lighting. KCC Highways could therefore not support an allocation on this site currently.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Although the site is at the edge of a service centre it is very rural in nature and far removed from services. In addition the site is in the AONB and the impact on this requires specific consideration.

However it is hard not to conclude that there appears scope within the land parcel to accommodate five dwellings (or more) plus landscaping although this would require further investigation.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 316 (Revised) | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | East Hawkinge Lands Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Open fields | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 11.075 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year | No- but it is in the AONB |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>2115)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary for Hawkinge a service centre in the district. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes- The Queens College own two plots of garden land to create two site entrances to the west of the site. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Yes |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | Yes |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Yes |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | Yes |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Brickearth (other Areas) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes large Greenfield site |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | CO24- strategic landscape buffer |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes- but the sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | The land is let on an agricultural tenancy which has provisions allowing it to taken back for development. |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** The only location for an access would be from Mitchell Avenue. KCC Highways could support an allocation of up to 50 dwellings as only point of access can be provided. It should be noted that this site is likely to be unpopular with local residents where any access point could be provided. There are good footpath links to Hawkinge village, which has local facilities.
-
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB and a greenfield site. Would represent a major development, contrary to NPPF para 116 and would challenge the conservation of the AONB. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site has been revised and reduced in size however it still remains a large (over 10ha) greenfield expansion in to the AONB. The Core Strategy resolved to consolidate Hawkinge (CS para 5.147) and rejected a major expansion. In addition this site is not well contained and the boundary to the east would be extremely vulnerable to further growth in the future especially as the applicant has expressed an interest in doing this.

On the plus side Hawkinge as a service centre has good facilities and transport links and the site is relatively close/walkable to the centre of Hawkinge.

The sites impact on the AONB would require specific consideration, especially as it is such a large site.

For this site to progress further it would need to be reduced in size and consist of a smaller area within the western corner of the site. The density would need to be 20dph to reflect its rural setting in the AONB and the site capacity should be no more than 50 dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 334 | SDC Ward: | NDW |
| Site Name/Address: | Mill Lane r/o Mill Farm Hawkinge | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 1.1 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- The Land was regarded as deliverable developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) | No- But it is in the AONB |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located within the settlement of Hawkinge a service centre. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes- Access from Mill Lane in the ownership, see title plan. Secondary farm access to the street not owned. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No, but available to bungalow adjacent |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No, but available to bungalow adjacent |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No, but available to bungalow adjacent |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes- site acts as a rural pocket within the town |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Adjoins a large blanket TPO area |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | An area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | |
|----------|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? |
|----------|---|

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| | | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 13. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways-** An outline planning application has been submitted which KCC Highways have eventually withdrawn our objection to for 14 units. We are therefore happy with the access proposals into the site.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Well related to existing settlement and enclosed by natural screening. Any development would need to be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout, with appropriate landscaping.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping. Outline application in Y15/0741/SH

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 388 | SDC Ward: | NDE |
| Site Name/Address: | Land west of Canterbury Road Hawkinge | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 1 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes - Land regarded as deliverable or developable in the SHLAA previously. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No (AONB) |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Adjoins settlement boundary for Hawkinge, a service centre. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Site adjoins an area with a blanket TPO. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage | Yes |
|-------------------------|-----|

| | |
|----|--|
| 4? | |
|----|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 10-20 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- There are gradient issues with providing an access from Canterbury Road as the land rises steeply. The Oaks is a private road and therefore you cannot get access more than a couple of properties as otherwise the road would have to be adopted. The Oaks does not meet an adoptable standard due to its narrow width and lack of turning space for larger vehicles. |
|--|

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Concerned development here would extend built development onto North Downs scarp and beyond existing village confines. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration and there are access problems, therefore it seems unlikely that the site could accommodate five dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 399 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | adj 252 Canterbury Road Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.83 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- AONB |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located between the settlements of Hawkinge and Densole on the A260. It lies closest to Hawkinge a service centre. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | No |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes important open gap between settlements? |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary | 700m |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------|
| | school | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | 670m Tesco Express |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 650m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No |
|---------------------|----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- Not suitable for development as this is a red site. • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Within AONB. Inappropriate extension of Hawkinge to north, unrelated to existing settlement pattern. Not supported. • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS
 This site is in open countryside not adjoining an existing settlement, the site would in effect be a free standing estate in the AONB, albeit with the facilities in Hawkinge relatively close by and accessible. In addition this is an important gap between the existing settlements of Hawkinge and Densole.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 616 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land north east of Hawkinge Cemetery Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Grazing land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 5.072 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 20.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve | No- but AONB |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site does not immediately adjoin the settlement boundary for Hawkinge and is in the open countryside of the AONB. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No, this site is not well integrated with Hawkinge and lies in the AONB in open countryside. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. The site does not represent a natural extension to the village and would challenge the purposes of AONB designation. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is a significant land polygon near the northern part of the A260 Hawkinge bypass. It

does not immediately adjoin the settlement boundary (CO1) and is in the open countryside of the AONB. It is very hard to see how any development could integrate satisfactorily whilst maintaining the settlement's compact form and without unacceptable impacts. The site is bound on all sides by agricultural land, apart from a limited shared boundary with the Cemetery. There are no obviously less sensitive small areas within the site that could be considered/ developed individually on a more favourable basis. In addition Spitfire Way and Aerodrome Road provide strong physical barriers to the existing settlement.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1002 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Spitfire Way Hawkinge | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant open countryside | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year | No- but AONB |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | 2115) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is within the settlement boundary of Hawkinge, a service centre. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | Need to double check this |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes- however the site is on allocated employment land so it would need to be assessed to ascertain whether this is still required. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | |
|----------|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? |
|----------|---|

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| | | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Medium |
| | iv) Demand | £50- Medium |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 60 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Site has recently been granted planning permission for a total of 46 units, of which KCC Highways were happy with the access arrangements.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Any development should be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping. Critical that a strong landscape buffer is provided along southern boundary.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is within the settlement boundary of a service centre, close to facilities and good transport links. If the site is not required for employment land then residential development would seem logical here as long as the sites impact on the AONB is specifically consideration. However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 1001 | SDC Ward: | NDE |
| Site Name/Address: | Land at Canterbury Road Hawkinge | Source: | Sub |
| Current Use: | Agricultural land | Area (ha): | 4.5 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary in Hawkinge, a service centre. However it is separated from the build up area by CO24 a strategic landscape buffer. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Confirm with visit |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- open countryside on the edge of the settlement |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes- a large section to the south of the site has a blanket TPO cover, however the applicant is proposing to retain this area. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No |
|---------------------|----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB- Within AONB. Inappropriate extension of Hawkinge to north unrelated to existing settlement pattern. Not supported.**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is in open countryside not adjoining an existing settlement, the site would in effect be a free standing estate in the AONB, albeit with the facilities in Hawkinge relatively close by and accessible.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Sellindge

Site Form

| | | | |
|------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 623 | SDC Ward: | NDW |
|------------|-----|-----------|-----|

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------|
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | South of Ashford Rd Taylor Wimpey lands Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 10.81 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | Yes- broad location in Core Strategy and has outline planning permission. |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the central settlement boundary in Sellindge a Rural Centre identified in the Core Strategy settlement hierarchy. The site is further identified as a broad location for residential led mixed use development |
|----------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | by Policy CSD9 of the Core Strategy and has been granted outline planning permission. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | There is domestic BT pole mounted cables crossing the site to existing offsite dwellings and domestic lv/mv electrical cables also crossing the site to domestic dwellings. Both can be undergrounded and simply diverted in to any new internal site layout. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No but there is a pond |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | vi) Heritage Assets | YES – SOMERFIELD COURT AND SOMERFIELD BARN COURT IMMEDIATELY TO THE SOUTH. RHODES HOUSE AND LITTLE RHODES TO THE NORTH OF THE A20 |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes- 400m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes- 20m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes- 20m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes- 10m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes, this site is a broad location identified in the Core Strategy and has outline Planning Permission, therefore any issues as highlighted above have already been resolved. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 250 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways**

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS
 Yes, this site is a broad location identified in the Core Strategy and has outline Planning Permission, therefore any issues highlighted above have already been resolved.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 627 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site</i> | Land rear of Brook Lane | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|--------------------|-------|
| <i>Name/Address:</i> | Cottages, Brook Lane Sellindge | | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Garages, parking area and shrub land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.454 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge, a rural centre identified in the Core Strategy. However this site is a long way from the central area identified as a broad location and the existing community |
|----------|--|---|

| | | |
|--|---|-------------|
| | | facilities. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Not aware |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Not aware |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Not aware |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Silica Sand/Construction Sand-Sandstone: Folkestone Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| | | |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes see above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 10 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways-** Land rear of Brook Lane Cottages, Brook Lane, Sellindge – This site cannot be accessed as the access road is extremely narrow and already serves the parking area for the rear of the properties on Brook Lane. KCC cannot support an allocation on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but close to boundary and within setting. Development here would be seen within context of existing built form to south. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **KCC Heritage-** Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Access could be a problem and needs to be further investigated; however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 618 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land west of Jubilee Cottage, Swan Lane Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.9 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge a rural centre |
|----------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | identified in the Core Strategy |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Greenfield site so loss of open space |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site adjoins a listed building Grade II Holly Cottage. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes (as the crow flies) |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes (as the crow flies) |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes (as the crow flies) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes, although protecting the setting of the Listed Building may have an effect of the site capacity. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Yes an agricultural lease exists which would require negotiation to cease. |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | Setting of listed building |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 10-15 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways-** Land west of Jubilee Cottage, Swan Lane, Sellindge - A suitable access point could be provided onto Swan Lane for a total of 15 dwellings. There is a footpath along the western side of Swan Lane which provides access to Sellindge village. There is a bus service that calls along Swan Lane and so the site is in a reasonably sustainable location.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but close to the boundary and within setting. Development here would be seen within context of existing built form of village. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB. It is essential that existing trees around the boundary of site are retained.

- **KCC Heritage-** Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions. Further assessment of impact on setting of nearby Listed Building(s) is required prior to determination.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site adjoins a grade II listed building, this could result in significant capacity reductions. The site is also far removed from the central area identified for development in the Core Strategy (CSD9). However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 402 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | The Piggery, Main Road Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Vacant since early 1980s. Land and buildings formerly used as a piggery | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.3 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary of part of a small island of defined settlement between the designated parts of Sellindge i.e. the central village and Stone Hill. Sellindge is defined as a rural centre in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus Stop 400m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | 600m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | 550m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Available |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very good |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 5 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highway- This site is only suitable for 5 dwellings as the access is too narrow to be an adopted road. It would have to be a private drive. There is a footpath along |
|---|

this side of the road and it is close to local facilities such as Potten Farm and the Dukes Head public house.

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**- Outside of AONB, but within setting. Brownfield site. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping, with particular attention to northern edge, to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site has been submitted with a tight focus on the existing piggery buildings and its immediate cartilage. It wraps tightly around the back of 'Springfield' and extends parallel to land associated with 'Orchards End'. Its therefore well integrated to these properties which are part of a small 'island' of defined settlement between the designated parts of Sellindge i.e. the central village and Stone Hill. Its location on the eastern side of this means it is more walkable then most other locations outside the central Sellindge area to the village facilities, most immediately the Pub.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 328 | SDC Ward: | NDW |
| Site Name/Address: | Sellindge East | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Farmland/ Agriculture | Area (ha): | 19ha |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Potential impacts of the development on Gibbins Brook SSSI , which is 200 m from the site. |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is situated on the south eastern side of Sellindge. It adjoins Sellindge's village boundary, a rural centre. |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No- Ashford Rd |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No- Ashford Rd |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No- Ashford Rd |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Overhead wiring and pylons cross the southern part of the site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No. Significant surface water flood risk in south and south eastern part of the site. The site is also in a surface water Nitrate vulnerable zone. |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | A high voltage underground powerline runs parallel with the M20 and national grid transmission lines diagonally across the southern section of the site. |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Drainage ditches and a small stream |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation. Drinking water protected areas safeguard zones – this site is in surface water safeguarding zone. | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- There is a lack of existing landscape features or physical constraints that would contain development or provide a defensible boundary to village growth. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – small stretch along boundary with properties on Lourdes Manor Close |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Two listed buildings along Main Road |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | Motorway, power lines? |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes although there are several factors which might result in a reduction in site capacity. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | Yes |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Yes |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Power lines? |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 200, however 50 seems more appropriate. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Only one point of access could be provided from Ashford Road due to the limited site frontage and the requirement for a right hand turn lane. An emergency access onto Ashford Road would also be required to accommodate this number of dwellings. Site is in a reasonably sustainable location, close to local facilities in Sellindge and has a footpath along the eastern side of Ashford Road.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Concerned that development of all of site would result in a large scale extension of the village eastwards that could be prominent in views from the North Downs scarp. Would wish to see LVIA to assess impact on AONB. Development of south eastern part of site likely to be more appropriate in terms of impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is a large greenfield expansion into the countryside, with a site boundary vulnerable to further growth in the future to the North East of the site. The site is also constrained by the electricity pylons running across the southern section of the site and its proximity to the motorway.

However it cannot be argued that the site could not accommodate five (or more) houses with significant landscaping in a smaller development on part of the site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 428A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Northern) Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.68 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Check integration - |
|----------------------------|---------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge, which is a rural centre within the settlement hierarchy. However this site does not adjoin the main central settlement boundary in Sellindge but a peripheral area called Barrowhill separated physically from the core which is the area identified as a broad location in the Core Strategy (2013). |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Radon Gas- Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Yes |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | Yes but only a small part of the site next to the river. | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes- Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone) | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Moves the focus away from the core and the centrally located facilities. |
| | ii) Landscape | Extends development into open |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | | countryside. No natural boundary to the site so development could end up sprawling further out in the future. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes bus stop |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes 550m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes (double check) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- backland development, encroachment, site is divided by a river this part of the site is subsequently within flood zone 3 and also appears to contain groups of trees along the river bank. The site includes land of archaeological potential and is grade 2 agriculture land. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | |
|----------|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? |
|----------|---|

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| | | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|-----------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Not suitable for development as this is a red site. The site also has no connection point with the public highway and therefore cannot accommodate any development.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

No- It would appear highly improbable given the form of the land - ‘a strip’ rear of properties (backland development) on the main road - that the site can be associated with a compact form of Sellindge development. The site would go against the current urban form in the area and be encroachment into the open countryside. Furthermore this Barrowhill part of the parish has the physical and perceived divide from the main village where the services are related; significant residential development is unlikely to be sustainable.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 619 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land west of Trust Cottages, Moorstock Lane Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.7 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This field is very much located in the countryside (policy CO1), albeit within the undefined 'hamlet' of Moorstock and not far from the facilities in Sellindge. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes Sandstone- Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Site is in open countryside, so there would be a detrimental impact |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes (might need to double check) |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- this site is outside the confines of the settlement boundary, development here would be an encroachment in to the open countryside. Although some facilities may not be great distance to travel to, they are not easily walkable as Moorstock is linked to Sellindge by a country lane without a footpath. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | Land is let on a short lease |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is outside the confines of the settlement boundary, development here would be an encroachment in to the open countryside. Although some facilities may not be great distance to travel to, they are not easily walkable as Moorstock is linked to Sellindge by a country lane without a footpath. It cannot be concluded this is a sustainable location for five or more units as the site does not relate to a compact or walkable defined settlement and would increase the urbanising of a small rural hamlet.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1005 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site</i> | Land at Barrow Hill | <i>Source:</i> | Sub 2015 |

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| Name/Address: | Sellindge | | |
| Current Use: | Agriculture | Area (ha): | 0.69 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site is separated from the settlement boundary in Barrowhill (Sellindge) by the A20 road. Sellindge is a rural centre identified in the Core Strategy. Barrowhill is separated from the core Sellindge settlement by a fly over bridge carrying the M20. The settlement boundary runs along the |
|----------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | road frontage in a linear fashion. This site is located to the south of Barrowhill. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adjoining site |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adjoining site |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Adjoining site |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes just |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage | Yes |
|-------------------------|-----|

| | |
|----|--|
| 4? | |
|----|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 10 to 15 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways-** An access could be provided for this site, it would require visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 120 metres as Barrow Hill is subject to a 40mph speed limit. Barrow Hill has a footpath along both sides and there are bus stops on both sides.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **KCC Heritage-** Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Although the site is situated a fair distance from the central Sellindge facilities, they are walkable as there is direct pavement access. This site is also well contained therefore there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|-------------------|--------------|------------------|----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1007 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site</i> | Silver Spray | <i>Source:</i> | SUB 2015 |

| | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|
| Name/Address: | Sellindge | | |
| Current Use: | Garden | Area (ha): | 0.45000000000000001 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site is centrally located within the settlement boundary for Sellindge, a rural centre identified in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| | network be created? | |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | No |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 4 to 5 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- A suitable access point could be provided for 5 dwellings. The site is located close to the local facilities in Sellindge and is close to the two proposed bus stops as part of the Sellindge masterplan. • KCC Heritage- Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be |
|--|

accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB. Brownfield site. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is very well located within Sellindge and there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1008 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Great Priory Woods | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 9 in total with 1.9h developable |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | The wider site contains ancient woodland, however the 1.9h the applicant has labelled as developable adjoins the ancient woodland with the addition of a woodland buffer |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge a rural centre identified in the Core Strategy |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Unknown |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation & Sub- Alluvial River Terrace Deposits |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Open countryside and ancient woodland plus setting of the ancient woodland could be a concern |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | This site does not perform well in terms of the sustainability criteria as it is far from central Sellindge, right on the edge of the village and would be encroaching into open countryside. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------|
| | | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 30-40 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Outside of AONB, but close to boundary and within setting. Development here would appear unrelated to existing settlement and involve loss of ancient woodland. Not supported. |
|---|

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

No- This site is on the very edge of the village of Sellindge (a rural centre). In terms of the sustainability criteria it does not score well and is far removed from the central area identified as a broad location for development in the Core Strategy (CSD9) where all the facilities and transport links are based.
 Development here would be encroachment into the countryside and there are more favourable sites within Sellindge for development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 628 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Rhodes House, Main Road Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | House and Garden | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but site contains a grade II listed building |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Site adjoins the main central settlement boundary of Sellindge a rural centre in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | It is not clear how this would be achieved. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | The character of this site is open and rural to respect the setting of the listed building |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes Rhodes House is a grade II listed building. This site would have a large impact on its setting |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- although the site is well located in Sellindge it would be heavily contained because of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building. The land to the front of Rhodes House along the A20 would need to be preserved but it might be possible to get 2 or 3 dwellings on the north of the site. However it is not clear how access would be provided to the highway. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB • Kent Wildlife Trust |
|---|

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

Although the site is well located in Sellindge it would be heavily constrained because of the need to preserve the setting of the listed building. The land to the front of Rhodes House along the A20 would need to be preserved but it might be possible to get 2 or 3 dwellings on the north of the site. However it is not clear how access would be provided to the highway for these dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 428B | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Somerfield Court Farm, Barrowhill (Southern) Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Agriculture | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | <p>This site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge, which is a rural centre within the settlement hierarchy. However this site does not adjoin the main central settlement boundary in Sellindge but a peripheral area called Barrowhill separated physically from the core which is the area identified as a broad location in the Core Strategy (2013).</p> |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | From Submission form: 'Existing access to Barrow Hill is limited. A new access point will be created through the purchase and demolition of an existing residential dwelling.' Therefore the likelihood of this site gaining highway access in the future is uncertain. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes- Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Moves the focus away from the core and the centrally located facilities. |
| | ii) Landscape | Extends development into open countryside. No natural boundary to the site so development could end up sprawling further out in the future. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Limestone Hythe Formation |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes- bus stop |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | no |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes (double check) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- Backland development, encroachment and they do not control an access point to the site, therefore there is too much uncertain with the site coming forward for it to progress. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|---------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways-** Not suitable for development as this is a red site. The site also has no connection point with the public highway and therefore cannot accommodate any development.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

No- It would appear highly improbable given the form of the land - 'a strip' rear of properties (backland development) on the main road – that it can be associated with a compact form of Sellindge development, which is an aim of the Core Strategy. The site would go against the current urban form in the area and be encroachment into the open countryside.

The Barrowhill part of the parish has the physical and perceived divide from the main village where the services are related; and the southern end is not served by any walkable facilities. It is a linear form of development, and indeed there are further properties to the south on the road that are already outside the current boundaries, and there does not appear scope for close integration of 5 or more new dwellings within the site.

In addition the owner does not control an access point to the site, therefore there is too much uncertain with the site coming forward for it to progress.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 606 | SDC Ward: | NDW |
| Site Name/Address: | The Mount, Barrow Hill Sellindge | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Single residential dwelling | Area (ha): | 5ha (this appears incorrect- 2.359ha) |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | <p>The site contains a likely Bronze Age burial mound (TR13 NW9) this constraint could potentially result in a site capacity reduction. KCC Archaeological section should be contacted for further advice.</p> |
|----------|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes (More info required regarding archaeological value of site. Speak with KCC Archaeological section) |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary of Sellindge, which is a rural centre within the settlement hierarchy. However this site does not adjoin the main central settlement boundary in Sellindge but a peripheral area called Barrowhill separated physically from the core which is the area identified as a broad location in the Core Strategy (2013). |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No- but wiring going across one corner of the site |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No- just the burial mound? |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Moves the focus away from the core and the centrally located facilities. |
| | ii) Landscape | Extends development into open countryside. No natural boundary to the site so development could end up sprawling further out in to the countryside in the future. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes (Bus Stop) |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes but some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Ancient burial ground? |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | The applicant states 50 to 60 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- An access could be provided for this site, it would require visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 120 metres as Barrow Hill is subject to a 40mph speed limit. Barrow Hill has a footpath along both sides and there are bus stops on both sides. • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping |
|---|

to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**
- **KCC (Heritage)**- Probable upstanding Bronze Age burial mound recorded on site. Not designated, but would appear to be demonstrably of equivalent significance and therefore paragraph 139 of NPPF would apply. Site also contains The Mount farmhouse. Allocation for development would not be appropriate. Significant archaeological remains are understood to be present that whilst not designated, are thought to be demonstrably of equivalent significance and as such development here should be avoided.

CONCLUSIONS

Advice has been sort from KCC Archaeological section regarding the burial mound; they have confirmed that there is an upstanding Bronze Age burial mound recorded on site. Therefore allocation for development would not be appropriate.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 610 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Grove House land, Main Road Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Short term lease to local farmer: Currently grazed by sheep. | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.4 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|-----|

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is in the parish of Sellindge a rural centre, although not within or adjacent to the settlement boundary. However it does adjoin the broad location identified in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adjacent property Grove House is. Connection in Main Road (A20) |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adjacent property Grove House is. Connection in Main Road (A20) |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Adjacent property Grove House is. Connection in Main Road (A20) |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes-This part of the village does have a rural open feel and until the broad location is built out this site does not integrate well with the existing settlement. In addition the site completely wraps around a large characterful detached country house. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes but tree groups and tpo's mostly on the boundary, |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------------|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes (bus stop)- 400m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes- 250m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes- 600m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes-300m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes however there are some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No- there are multiple owners but all within one family and all want to see the land developed. |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 25-30 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | Yes |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Grove House land, Main Road, Sellindge – The site could provide a suitable access point together with required visibility splays. There is a footpath along this side of the road that links up to the public house, school, village hall and Co-Op. There is also a bus stop close by.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is very rural and open in character and until the broad location is built out this site does not integrate well with the existing settlement. In addition the site completely wraps around a large characterful detached country house. There are also concerns regarding further sporadic development along the A20.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 1006 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Otterpool Quarry Sellindge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB 2015 |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Disused Mineral Processing Site | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| B | <p>Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site?</p> | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Adjoins the Otterpool Quarry SSSI |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site is not located in or close to any settlement. Closest settlement boundary would be Barrowhill, which does not have any facilities. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Possible but a remediation strategy has been agreed with the EA. |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | See above |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | In an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See answer above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Unknown |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | <p>Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required?</p> | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No, this site is poorly located in open countryside. In addition the site adjoins a SSSI, developing this site might have an adverse effect. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| | | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 50 to 90 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Outside of AONB, but within setting. Development here would |
|--|

be unrelated to any existing settlement and apparent in views from the AONB. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

No, this site is poorly located in open countryside. In addition the site adjoins a SSSI, developing this site might have an adverse effect.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Lyminge

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 605 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land south of Canterbury Road Lyminge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Golf Course | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| | positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No (AONB) |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary for Lyminge a rural centre that provides shops and services to residents as well as to other villages in the North Downs. The site is on one of the main routes through the village. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | On Canterbury Road |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | On Canterbury Road |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | On Canterbury Road |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | It would extend the natural end point of the village into the open countryside |
| | ii) Landscape | " |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Some of the site is in an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes- 500m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes- 350m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes -50m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |
|--|---|----|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes however the sites setting in the AONB could result in some potential constraints which could result in site capacity reductions. The site visit concluded that the boundary trees need to be properly appraised and considered in relation to the possible development of this site – it is important that they should be retained. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No- although the Golf course would need to be reconfigured |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Reconfiguring golf course? |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------|
| | | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 30 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways-** Access would have to be provided from Canterbury Road, which is subject to a 60mph speed limit. Visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 215 metres would be required, which cannot be provided. KCC would not support an allocation on this site.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Development here would represent an inappropriate extension of village southwards that would fail to conserve the AONB. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

- **KCC (Heritage)** - Site lies immediately south of known Anglo-Saxon cemetery on the edge of historic settlement of Lyminge. Development of all or part of the site may not be appropriate. Pre-determination archaeological evaluation is required to determine what development can be achieved (if any).

CONCLUSIONS

The site would go against the current urban form in the area and potentially be encroachment into the open countryside. In addition the sites impact on the AONB, potential archaeology and access difficulties require specific consideration and investigate.

However Lyminge is a rural centre and has good facilities and transport links, this site adjoins the settlement boundary and is in easy walking distance to all the facilities. Subsequently further investigations needs to be carried out to explore if there are any options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----|
| SHLAA Ref: | 691 | SDC Ward: | NDW |
| Site Name/Address: | Land adj Lyndon Hall Lyminge | Source: | |
| Current Use: | Glazing | Area (ha): | 2 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- AONB |
|----------|---|----------|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary for Lyminge a rural centre identified in the Core Strategy. The site comprises 2 hectares of land, at the rear of and adjacent to the developed area of Lyminge, surrounds the gardens of Lyndon Hall (Grade II Listed Building) and wraps around the rear of the Lyminge Telephone Exchange. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Yes- Overhead power lines cross the site from west to east and there is a pole transformer in the heart of the land. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No- It is relatively flat but rises gently from south to north |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes the site is in the AONB |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes- the site is within the Kent Downs AONB |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes- there is a blanket TPO on the whole of the site. |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | The site surrounds Lyndon Hall a Grade II listed building as the site is the former garden. The site is in an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | yes |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No the site has a number of potential constraints such as location in the AONB, effect on setting of a listed building and the blanket TPO. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| | | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 30 to 40 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Development here would represent an inappropriate extension of village, unrelated to existing settlement pattern. Not supported
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**
- **KCC (Heritage)**- Site lies to the south of known Anglo-Saxon cemetery and close to the historic core of Lyminge. The site also lies immediately adjacent to the Grade II* Listed Lindon Hall and development may be detrimental to its setting. Development of all or part of the site may not be appropriate. Pre-determination archaeological evaluation and assessment of impact on the setting of nearby Listed Building(s) is required to determine what development can be achieved (if any).

CONCLUSIONS

No- the site acts as a soft boundary between the urban area and open countryside/ AONB, it marks the beginning of the Elham valley from the north of Elham. In addition the site has a number of additional constraints such as the negative effect on the setting of a listed building and the blanket TPO covering the whole site.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|----------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 633 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Hilltop Farm, Woodland Road Lyminge | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Barns and office building | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.67 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 25.06.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|-------------|
| | assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No but AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | There is no relationship to the settlement hierarchy |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| x) Is there difficult topography? | No | |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | No |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- This is a highly rural site in the centre of the AONB. It is, from all perspectives, countryside. Although the site is claimed to be rundown and brownfield the location is simply not sustainable for five or more private dwellings. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Within AONB. Unrelated to any existing settlement. Not supported. • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS
 No- This is a highly rural site in the centre of the AONB. It is, from all perspectives, countryside.
 Although the site is claimed to be rundown and brownfield the location is simply not sustainable for five or more private dwellings.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Elham

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 686 | SDC Ward: | ESM |
| Site Name/Address: | Land at Duck Street Elham | Source: | Submission |
| Current Use: | Unused agricultural land | Area (ha): | 0.3 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: • SAC | No but it is in the AONB |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary for Elham, a rural centre as identified in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Confirm with site visit |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | Within 60m |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sub- Alluvial |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes it could have as this is open countryside on the edge of the village |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Duplicate question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB so landscaping? |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 5 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** A suitable access point could not be provided as the required visibility splays would go over 3rd party land. KCC therefore cannot support any development on this site.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Any development should be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping and retain existing planting along south and east boundaries. Mitigating for views from higher ground to the east particularly important.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is on the edge of a rural centre and is relatively close/ walkable to what may be regarded as the centre of Elham, and good bus links; the village would remain relatively compact. However this would require further testing given its location in the AONB and there is the possibility that the development would act as a standalone housing estate and not integrate well with the village.

There appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five

dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Lympne

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 209 | SDC Ward: | Hythe Rural |
| Site Name/Address: | Former Lympne Airfield, Lympne | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Agricultural land | Area (ha): | 28.5 |
| | | Site Visit: | 19.6.14 6.4.16 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No Outline planning application for 250 homes refused (Y13/0360/SH) |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Location consideration – adjacent to AONB Yes |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Adjacent to Primary Village |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – on to Aldington Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – adjoining |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – adjoining |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No - adjoining |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | Yes HU-021 Lympne Airfield Radon Gas Class 1 |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | Contamination |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Limestone Hythe Formation (Kentish Ragstone) on Western part Airfield | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | This has potential to impact negatively the setting of the AONB. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Adjacent to AONB on southern boundary beyond Aldington Road. |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | Yes – collective TPO at various points along the site’s boundary with Aldington Road |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | AAP Lympne WW2 airfield Adjacent to Listed Building to E |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes – bus stop adjacent on Aldington Road |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | Yes – Lympne C of E |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes – 170m Lympne Village Store |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – nearest is Sellindge |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes – this site could provide a logical extension to the village of Lympne. Capacity reductions may be preferable to diminish impact on the adjacent AONB, but development could address contamination on site. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Compatible with current built form on eastern side as an extension to Lympne village |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Would increase values significantly based on existing use. |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive rural village opposite the AONB. |
| | iv) Demand | High – CIL band C |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | Must address contamination |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | Southern Water – foul water should be addressed by condition. Planning contribution to KCC required for Lympne Primary School. |
| | iii) planning policy | LR9/LR10; CSD1 |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Should match current grain of development in Lympne, consisting of individual dwellings. This is to avoid the urbanisation of this village. |
| | ii) Quantity | Circa 250dw proposed Significant reduction would be encouraged given the size of the existing settlement and its ability to incorporate such growth. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site ‘deliverable’ (1 - 5 years)? | Yes – within 4 years |
| | Is the site ‘developable’ (6 – 15 years)? | -- |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health No comments • KCC Highways KCC Highways previously raised no objection to an application for 250 residential units on this site. The principle of 150 units is therefore accepted with one access point onto Aldington Road and an emergency access. This proposal will require improvements to the Newingreen junction. • Highways Agency No objection • KCC Heritage Score 2. The site is located on the former Lympne airfield. Within the proposed allocation site there are a number of features and structures surviving that relate to the airfield's wartime use. These include hanger bases, part of the machine gun testing range, air-raid |
|---|

shelters and other features. The site also lies in an area of general archaeological potential, with remains of Bronze Age date having been found to the north and early medieval and medieval to the west. Further assessment of non-designated heritage assets needed prior to determination of any planning application.

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**

Outside of AONB, but within setting. AONB boundary on opposite side of road. This land provides a welcome green gap between existing residential development at Lympne and the Lympne Industrial Estate, helping maintain a rural environment. The gap in development allows fine views of the North Downs scarp. Not supported.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

No comments

CONCLUSIONS

While this location scores well on sustainability indicators, an appeal inspector for a recent previously refused application noted that development of this size and location “would have serious and harmful consequences, especially in terms of the environmental dimension of sustainability”. She states that 250dw is more appropriate for a higher order settlement, but that “Villages such as Lympne clearly have to play their part to accommodate growth”. This site should come forward for development as an extension of Lympne, but with significant capacity reductions and the allocation of a significant area for local amenity space.

The developers have stated that only a 7 hectare site will be put forward for development despite the submission of a larger site. However, as part of any policy we would seek to include the whole area of land as to take into consideration open space within this development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Stanford/ Westenhanger

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 613 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land rear Barnstormers, Stone Street Stanford | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Residential house and garden | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.5 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but within a Special Landscape Area |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary for Stanford a Primary Village identified in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Says yes on submission but may need confirmation looks like it would require demolition of Barnstormers? |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Silica Sand/ Construction Sand-Sandstone Folkestone Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- the site contains land of archaeological potential and the site adjoins a listed building. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus >400m Train 750m |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes- although backland development, the access needs to be checked and there are potential constraints such as an area of archaeological potential, possible agricultural grade 2 or 3 and adjoins Stanford Windmill a grade II listed building so could effect the setting. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|--------------------|
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 6 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Not suitable for development as this is a red site. It is unclear how an access would be formed; the existing property would have to be demolished. There is no footpath along Stone Street and there is no local facilities and the site is therefore not sustainable.
- **KCC Heritage-** Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions. Further assessment of impact on setting of nearby Listed Building(s) is required prior to determination.

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development of the site should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is backland development located behind houses fronting Stone Street and Kennett Lane, so bounded by gardens on two sides and open countryside. Although centrally located in Stanford it would act as a freestanding estate.

The access is not clear and there are other potential constraints on site such as the site is in an area of archaeological potential, possible agricultural grade 2 or 3 and adjoins Stanford Windmill a grade II listed building. To be further investigated.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 204A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Folkestone Racecourse (parts) | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------|------|
| | Westenhanger | | |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 0.75 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Ancient monument close by (Westenhanger Castle). |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Stanford/ Westenhanger is identified as a Primary Village in the settlement hierarchy, this site is within Westenhanger although Westenhanger does not have a settlement boundary. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Silica Sand/ Construction Sand-Sandstone: Folkestone Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No, |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site includes land of archaeological value. |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------|
| | | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Duplicate Question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus >400m Train 200m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | >800m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 10 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- This site is remote from local services and has no footpath along this part of Stone Street. Stone Street is also narrow and suffers from significant on-street car parking due to Westenhanger Station. KCC Highways could therefore not support an allocation on this site currently. • KCC Heritage- The site is located immediately to the east of the Scheduled Monument of Westenhanger Castle, which includes the Grade I Listed Westenhanger Manor. Westenhanger Castle which would have been set in extensive historic estate. Landscape elements of this estate survive (including as buried archaeological remains), and now form part of the Castle's setting, though this land is not of itself designated as part of the monument. The line of the Roman road between Lympne and Canterbury approxiametly |
|---|

follows the line of modern Stone Street, which forms the site's eastern boundary. Not all of the identified site may be suitable for allocation. Detailed pre-determination assessment of the impact of development on the setting of nearby Scheduled and Grade I Listed Westenhanger Castle is required to determine what development can be

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Any development should be of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This site is located on the Roman Stone Street which is the basis of all Westenhanger properties. This means the focus is inherently linear. Frontage development (although the land could accommodate development to the rear) would be consistent with this. It is located on the station and Stanford side of Westenhanger properties i.e. towards services and is proportionate relative to the settlement. This avoids extending out away from the historic village cores in the area.

In addition the sites capacity will be constrained by its proximity to Westenhanger Castle (an ancient Monument).

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|-------------|------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 204B | SDC Ward: | NDW |
| Site Name/Address: | Folkestone Racecourse (parts) Westenhanger | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | | Area (ha): | 5.75 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | no |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | no |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site is in Newingreen an area of sporadic development along a historic main route and not identified in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy. |
|----------|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adjoining |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adjoining |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Overhead |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone- Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | In an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- The area is rural and would not appear to relate well to Newingreen in size or form and would operate as a freestanding estate. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- 204 – Folkestone Racecourse (Site B) – Not suitable for development as |
|--|

this is a red site. It is remote from services and would operate as a free-standing estate.

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Development, either in isolation or in combination with sites 326, 632 and 614, would constitute a major development in the countryside outside of any existing settlement, that would be highly visible in views from the AONB. **Not supported.**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

Folkestone Racecourse has closed and on this occasion two of its land parcels have been submitted. The area is rural, although the two main historic routes (Roman Stone Street and Ashford Road the coaching route to London) have seen sporadic properties along them over their long history, and with some additional early/mid 20th Century dwellings. Most notably this has resulted in small ribbons/ clusters of houses known as 'Newingreen' and 'Westenhanger'

This land is the larger of the two and is extends back from the road at Newingreen to create a triangular shape. It is bound by the current racetrack, effectively a corner of the Racecourse. It would not appear to relate well to Newingreen in size or form and would operate as a freestanding estate. Moreover, there are no facilities at Newingreen and it is no longer a recognised settlement (Core Strategy hierarchy). It is regarded as countryside, although it is not the most remote rural location in the district.

This site is less well related than the other at the Racecourse to the railway station and the core of Stanford village, the edge of Lympe is closer but it is not well related to that village either.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 614 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land at Newingreen Estate, Stone Street Stanford | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Industrial/ residential/ agricultural land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 4.409 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site is located in Newingreen a rural area with no facilities the site is in effect in the countryside. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | <p>If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant</p> | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Silica Sand/ Construction Sand |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | TPO's on the boundary |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Yes- site includes land of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- poor location development here would be a housing estate isolated from any recognisable village in the countryside. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency |
|---|

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Outside of AONB, but within setting. Development of this site, either in isolation or in combination with 326, 632 and 204b, would constitute a major development into the countryside outside of any existing settlement. Not supported

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is situated on Stone Street just north of the Newingreen junction. The area is rural, although the two main historic routes (Roman Stone Street and Ashford Road the coaching route to London) have seen sporadic properties along them over their long history, and with some additional early/mid 20th Century dwellings. There are small ribbons/ clusters of houses, but no local facilities. Newingreen is no longer a recognised settlement: not in the Core Strategy hierarchy. The Newingreen junction area is not readily walkable from any recognised Core Strategy village; Westenhanger station is under 1km but not very close by.

The bulk of this relatively significant site is Greenfield. The industrial element adjoins the offices to the south, not the established built form northwards (Westenhanger). This does not help any argument for subdivision of the site for a smaller development, prospects for integration without a sizeable impact are poor.

The site does not score well for residential development of 5 or more units in overall sustainability terms, due to its location. It does not appear there is a case for an exception, and there is the prospect that any such development would be a housing estate isolated from any recognisable village.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Etchinghill

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 418 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Etchinghill Nursery Etchinghill | <i>Source:</i> | Sub |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Horticultural purposes | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.6 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Etchinghill is a secondary village, this site adjoins the settlement boundary. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | This site is located at the entrance to the village, however the site on the opposite side of the road has already been developed. |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes the site is in the AONB |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | To be confirmed |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | Area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | To check |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Some potential constraints on site which could result in site capacity reductions ie located in the AONB. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | Some horticultural activity of a very minor nature takes place on the site but this would not be a barrier to redevelopment. |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 30 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways-** A suitable access into the site could be provided from Canterbury Road. A new footpath would be required along Canterbury Road to link in with the existing footpath. It is likely that Canterbury Road would be required to be widened along the site frontage to 5.5 metres in width. A new crossing point would be required across Canterbury Road to link in with the footpath on the opposite side of

the road.

- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Development along Beachborough road frontage would be an inappropriate extension of the village southwards, but consider some scope exists for high quality development on brownfield part of site.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is relatively close/walkable to what may be regarded as the centre of Etchinghill, and good bus links; the village could remain relatively compact. The sites impact on the AONB require specific consideration, however there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 419 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adjacent the Golf Course Etchinghill | <i>Source:</i> | Submission |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 0.74 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Etchinghill is a secondary village, this site adjoins the settlement boundary. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- see below |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes- in addition the protection of the trees is an issue that requires further consideration |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | To be confirmed |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No but mature trees on site |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | Yes in Lyminge (if direct measurement used, by road it would be over 1km) |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes, although it's rural setting and impact on the AONB could result in significant capacity reductions on the site. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | |
|----------|-------------------------|
| A | Market Interests |
|----------|-------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------------|
| | | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 10 (suggested by the applicant). |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** There is an existing access serving the golf course which could accommodate 10 dwellings. There is a footpath along this side of Canterbury Road which links to local facilities in the village.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Any development should be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping and retain existing trees and hedgerows.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**
- **KCC (Heritage)-** Lies on northern edge of historic settlement of Etchinghill and close to Etchinghill Conservation Area. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

CONCLUSIONS

The site is bound by dwellings on more than one side, the other boundaries being shared with the golf club (clubhouse area) and railway cutting. It relates satisfactorily to the settlement, although its impact on the AONB requires specific consideration. There appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 423A | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land east of former railway, Teddars Leas Rd Etchinghill | <i>Source:</i> | Submission |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Golf course and vacant grassland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more | Yes |
|----------|--|-----|

| | | |
|----------|---|-------------|
| | dwellings) | |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Within AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Etchinghill is a secondary village, this site adjoin the settlement boundary and the old railway line. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adj |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adj |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Adj |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | The site is within the AONB. Boundary vegetation needs to be preserved where appropriate |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | In an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | ? |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 800m of a primary school | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No. This site is 'the wrong side' of the former railway and development here would be encroachment into the countryside/AONB as there is no development to the NE of Etchinghill. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 60 across the 2 sites |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- Not suitable for development as this is a red site. There is also no footpath down Teddars Leas Road, it has no street-lighting and is subject to a 60mph speed limit. • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Within AONB. Development here would result in inappropriate extension of village eastwards. Not supported. • Kent Wildlife Trust • HSE • Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother) |
|--|

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS
 No. This site is 'the wrong side' of the former railway and development here would be encroachment into the countryside/ AONB as there is no development to the NE of Etchinghill.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 423B | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land east of former railway, Teddars Leas Rd Etchinghill | <i>Source:</i> | Submission |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Golf course and vacant grassland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.9 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|------------------------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve | Adjoins SSSI and Ancient Woodland. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes- although the site may be constrained by its close proximity to a SSSI and Ancient Woodland |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Etchinghill is a secondary village, this site adjoin the settlement boundary and the old railway line. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Adj |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Adj |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Adj |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including | ? |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | minerals)? | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | The site is within the AONB. Boundary vegetation needs to be preserved where appropriate |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No but site adjoins ancient woodland |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | In an area of archaeological potential |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | Site adjoins a SSSI |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | ? |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | YES |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 15 (amended from 30) |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** Not suitable for development. There is no footpath down Teddars Leas Road, it has no street-lighting and is subject to a 60mph speed limit.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Fairly well contained on all sides by woodland and residential development, however not a natural extension to the village settlement pattern. Further assessment required as to impact on AONB.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

No- This site is 'the wrong side' of the former railway development, in close proximity to a SSSI and Ancient Woodland and within the AONB. There is a danger the site may not relate well to Etchinghill as the houses would be tucked away behind the main frontage and the site would operate as a freestanding, backland estate.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 327 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDW |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land off Teddars Leas Road Etchinghill | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1.125 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SAC• SSSI• National Nature Reserve• Ramsar• SPA• Ancient Woodland• an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115)• Scheduled Monument• Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | Site adjoins the settlement in Etchinghill a Secondary Village in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------|
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | >800m |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- encroachment into the countryside/ AONB |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |

| | | |
|--|---|----|
| | | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | No |
|----------------------------|----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 16-20 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health |
|--|

- **KCC Highways-** Land off Teddars Leas Road, Etchinghill - Not suitable for development as this is a red site. There is also no footpath down Teddars Leas Road and it has no street-lighting.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Development would result in inappropriate extension of village eastwards that would challenge character of the AONB. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**
- **KCC (Heritage)-** Located in an area of general archaeological potential on the edge of the village of Etchinghill. Archaeological mitigation measures will be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

CONCLUSIONS

No. This site is 'the wrong side' of the former railway and development here would be encroachment into the countryside/ AONB as there is no development to the NE of Etchinghill.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Densole

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|-------------|-------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 1003 | SDC Ward: | NDE |
| Site Name/Address: | Land adjoining 385 Canterbury Road Densole | Source: | SUB |
| Current Use: | Open land | Area (ha): | 3.232 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but it is AONB |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site adjoins the settlement boundary of Densole a secondary village. |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|---|---------|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Unknown |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Unknown |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Unknown |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| | | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|------------------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 30-40 looking at adjoining pattern |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways- Land adjoining 385 Canterbury Road, Densole - The site is in a reasonably sustainable location on Canterbury Road. A footpath would need to be provided along the site frontage together with a suitable crossing point across Canterbury Road. A footpath extension would also need to be provided to link into the existing Canterbury bound bus stop. It is likely that a suitable access point onto Canterbury Road could be provided. • Highways Agency |
|--|

- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. The site does not represent a natural extension to the village and constitutes a greenfield. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is in the centre of Densole with access to good bus links. To ensure the village remains compact this site should have frontage development only; this will help it fit in with the surrounding pattern of development.

The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration. However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 617 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Black Horse Caravan Site, 385 Canterbury Road Densole | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Caravan Park | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3.663 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | March 2016 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
|----------|---|-----|

| | | |
|----------|--|---------------|
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No- but AONB. |

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary for Densole a secondary village. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | conditions? | |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes – Site extends into the open countryside |
| | iii) AONB | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Bus <400m Train >800m |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No>800m |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |

| | | |
|----------|---|----------|
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No >800m |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscape |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | Applicant states 20- 30 which seems a little low. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency • Natural England • Kent Downs AONB- Within AONB. While acknowledging the existing use of the site as a caravan park, concerned that a residential development could have more impact on the AONB as a result of increased permanent built development. Any development should be of exceptional quality and be an appropriate scale, design and layout and incorporate adequate landscaping to mitigate impact on AONB and retain existing trees. • Kent Wildlife Trust |
|--|

- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

This is AONB land immediately adjoining the settlement boundary. The brownfield site is well located to the services that exist at Densole, and would perform well in terms of compactness and walkability within the village.

However the potential loss of a tourism use in this location, plus the impact on the AONB are both serious issues that require further investigation but given its size and form, it cannot be concluded at present that five (or more) dwellings is necessarily unacceptable.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|-----|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 303A (Revised) | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land south of Little Densole Farm Densole | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Farmland | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2.2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | Wider site adjoins Ancient woodland and the whole site is AONB. |
|----------|---|---|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | The site adjoins the settlement boundary of Densole a secondary village in the Core Strategy. |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes - Property 12A Densole Way is owned by the developer and would need to be demolished to enable the potential development site to tie in with the existing network. |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | Yes |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Occasional telegraph pole and G3 mast. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Brickearth (other areas) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- this is open countryside in the AONB. |
| | iii) AONB | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Duplicate Question |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes- Bus |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | Yes |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | Yes- but the sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | iii) planning policy | AONB- Landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | 50- Applicant states 100, I think this seems high and 50 would be more appropriate. |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways-** KCC Highways could not support an allocation on this site as Densole Way is subject to inappropriate parking on both sides of the access road. This parking only allows one way working at the access of Densole Way with Canterbury Road therefore, Densole Way could not accommodate the proposed 100 houses. Given the nature of Densole Way not all properties have driveways which adds to the on-street parking problem.
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB and a greenfield site. Development in this location would not represent a natural extension to the village and would challenge character of village and AONB. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

CONCLUSIONS

The site has been revised and reduced in size however it still remains a large greenfield expansion in to the AONB. The sites impact on the AONB requires specific consideration and there are access issues with the site. However there appears scope within the land parcel to explore options to accommodate five (or more) dwellings plus significant landscaping, however for this site to progress further it would need to be reduced in size and consist of a smaller area.

The site is relatively close/ walkable to the centre of Densole and good bus links; the village could remain relatively compact. However there may be other sites in Densole that would be better contained, integrated and more defensible, while not operating as free standing estates as this one could.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Stelling Minnis

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 635 | SDC Ward: | NDE |
| Site Name/Address: | Camping and Caravan Site, Minnis Lane | Source: | Submission |
| Current Use: | Camping/ Caravan site | Area (ha): | 0.47 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: | No but AONB |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|---------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This site is located in the secondary village of Stelling Minnis as identified in the Core Strategy |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate | |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Brickearth (other areas) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes? |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No? |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No? |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |
| Proceed to Stage 3? | | Yes |

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | No |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | No |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | No |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | No |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|------------|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|----------------------------|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Yes |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | High |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Good |
| | iv) Demand | £125- Very High |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | AONB so landscaping |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| | ii) Quantity | 10 |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Yes |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**

- **KCC Highways-** The access would have to be taken through the existing car park and this would have to be widened and replacement car parking provided. The site is right next to the Rose and Crown public house and close to the village shop. There is however no footpaths on Minnis Lane and a lack of other facilities available in close proximity to the site.

- **Highways Agency**

- **Environment Agency**

- **Natural England**

- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Any development should be of exceptional quality and of an appropriate scale, design and layout (low density to reflect existing settlement pattern of Stelling Minnis) and incorporate adequate landscaping and retain existing landscape features around perimeter of site.

- **Kent Wildlife Trust**

- **HSE**
- **KCC Heritage-** Archaeological mitigation measures may be required and can be accommodated through planning conditions.

- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

The site is located in the AONB so needs further investigation, it could potentially be land of very good or excellent agricultural value and these are all constraints which could result in site capacity reduction.

However the site is well located in the village (next to the pub), it would appear it could integrate well and accommodate five or more sensitively designed houses with gardens.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Newingreen

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 326 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe Rural |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Land adj The Willows, Ashford Road Newingreen | <i>Source:</i> | |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 3 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as | No |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|--|--|

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | UNSUIT loc |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | None |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | No – in road |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No – in road |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | No – in road |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Poles across boundary to Ashford Road |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone – Sandgate Formation | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | ii) Landscape | Development would constitute encroachment into the countryside and would have a negative effect on the locality |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | None |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 200m bus; 1km Westenhanger station |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.05km Lympne |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – circa 3km Sellindge |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – encroachment into the countryside and lack of access to local services. Not sustainable. |
|---------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While this site offers few constraints, and development here would be contiguous with the ribbon development along Ashford Road, it would also constitute intensification of development and urbanisation of the countryside. Newingreen is not a recognised settlement in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, and offers no services. It is situated well outside a recognised settlement boundary. The distances to the closest services mean that development in this location would not constitute sustainable development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| SHLAA Ref: | 632 | SDC Ward: | Hythe Rural |
| Site Name/Address: | Elms Farm, Ashford Road Newingreen | Source: | |
| Current Use: | Residential farm | Area (ha): | 1.178 |
| | | Site Visit: | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | UNSUIT loc |
|---------------------|------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | None |
|---|---|------|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – on to the A20 |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Appears to be telegraph infrastructure on site. |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No | |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |
| xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone – Sandgate Formation Airfield on eastern half of site. | |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | Development could continue the pattern of ribbon development fronting the A20 |
| | ii) Landscape | Development would constitute incursion into the countryside. |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 150m bus; 1km Westenhanger train |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.05km Lympne |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – circa 3km Sellindge |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – no access to services, and urbanisation of the countryside. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health • KCC Highways • Highways Agency • Environment Agency |
|---|

- Natural England
- Kent Downs AONB
- Kent Wildlife Trust
- HSE
- Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)

CONCLUSIONS

While this site offers few constraints, and development here would be contiguous with the ribbon development along Ashford Road, it would also constitute intensification of development and urbanisation of the countryside. Newingreen is not a recognised settlement in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, and offers no services. It is situated well outside a recognised settlement boundary. The distances to the closest services mean that development in this location would not constitute sustainable development.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 690 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | Hythe Rural |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Red House Farm Newingreen | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | Dwellings and agricultural land | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 2 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|-----|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| | <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | |
| C | <p>Is the site within or does it contain any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes, but unsuitable location. |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | None |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes – onto Ashford Road |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | Yes |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | Poles across boundary to Ashford Road |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | No |
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Sandstone – Sandgate Formation |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | No |
| | ii) Landscape | Would constitute an isolated development in the countryside, and negatively impact the countryside |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | No |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | No |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | See above |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | 800m bus; 1km Westenhanger station |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No – 1.05km Lympne |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No – circa 3km Sellindge |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No – Isolated development in the countryside. Unsustainable. |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|----------------|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | N/A |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | N/A |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | N/A |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | Unknown |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | Adjoining land is currently open countryside to the west, and the development site for “Martello Lakes” to the immediate east/ |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | Increase |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | Attractive semi-rural location |
| | iv) Demand | High [CIL band C] |
| B | Cost | |

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| | i) site preparation | Potential contamination Need for archaeological watching brief |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | No |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | No |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | Circa 38 based on 20dph with some capacity reductions |
| | ii) Quantity | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | Dependent upon development of adjacent site – better for later period |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB**
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

While this site offers few constraints, it would constitute isolated development in the countryside. The closest hamlet, approximately 800m from the site, is Newingreen which is not a recognised settlement in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy, and offers no services. The distances to the closest services mean that development in this location would not constitute sustainable development, and any residents would struggle to make trips on foot to and from the site due to the dearth of local infrastructure.

Completed by

Signed

Date

Swingfield

Site Form

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
| <i>SHLAA Ref:</i> | 634 | <i>SDC Ward:</i> | NDE |
| <i>Site Name/Address:</i> | Mill House, Oak Hill, Swingfield Swingfield | <i>Source:</i> | SUB |
| <i>Current Use:</i> | | <i>Area (ha):</i> | 1 |
| | | <i>Site Visit:</i> | 19.6.14 |

Stage 1: Initial Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|---|---------------------|
| A | Is the size of the site 0.17ha or over (to enable the development of five or more dwellings) | Yes |
| B | Has the site been allocated for housing; <u>or</u> been identified as suitable in previous assessments; <u>or</u> has had planning permission; <u>or</u> there has been a positive change in circumstances; <u>or</u> is a new site? | No |
| C | Is the site within or does it contain any of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SSSI • National Nature Reserve | No- But AONB |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ramsar • SPA • Ancient Woodland • an Extreme Flood Hazard (as defined in the SFRA for the year 2115) • Scheduled Monument • Registered Parks and Gardens | |
|--|---|--|

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Proceed to Stage 2? | Yes |
|----------------------------|-----|

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment on suitability

| | | |
|----------|--|---|
| A | Relationship to the settlement hierarchy? | This is a rural site well within the AONB. It adjoins extensive agricultural land but is on the edge of a small cluster of residences |
| B | Physical or Infrastructure Constraints: | |
| | i) Can a suitable access to the highway network be created? | Yes |
| | ii) Is there adequate highway capacity? | ? |
| | iii) Is there water supply? | Yes |
| | iv) Is there sewerage? | No |
| | v) Is there electricity supply? | Yes |
| | vi) Are there electricity pylons on site? | No |
| | vii) Is there contamination? | No |
| | viii) Are there adverse ground conditions? | No |
| | ix) Is there any hazardous risk? | No |
| | x) Is there difficult topography? | No |
| | xi) Is there a river near or on the site? | No |
| | xii) Is it in flood zone 2? | No |
| | xiii) Is it in flood zone 3? | No |
| | If yes hazard rating 2115 with climate change - Nil/Low/Moderate/Significant | |

| | | |
|----------|---|--------------------------|
| | xiv) Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | Brickearth (other areas) |
| C | Could the development potentially have a detrimental impact on any of the following? | |
| | i) Townscape | |
| | ii) Landscape | Yes- open countryside |
| | iii) AONB and its immediate setting | Yes |
| | iv) Kent BAP sites | ? |
| | v) Tree Preservation Orders | No |
| | vi) Heritage Assets | No |
| | vii) Historic Park/Garden or Square | No |
| | viii) Local Wildlife Site | No |
| | ix) Protected Open Space | No |
| D | Has the site been identified to be retained in the Employment Land Review? | No |
| E | Is the site safeguarded (including minerals)? | No |
| F | Sustainable Location. How does the site perform against the following criteria? | |
| | • Within 800m of a bus stop or railway station | Yes |
| | • Within 800m of a primary school | No |
| | • Within 800m of a convenience store | No |
| | • Within 1km of a GP surgery | No |
| G | External Environmental Factors | |
| | Would the amenity of residents be adversely affected by any external environmental factors? Is a buffer area required? | No |

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Proceed to Stage 3? | No- site is in open countryside in the middle of the AONB, in a non sustainable location. |
|----------------------------|---|

Stage 3: Deliverability

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| A | Do any of the following factors affect the availability of the site? | |
| | i) Multiple Ownership/Ransom Strip | |
| | ii) Existing Tenancy/Lease Agreement | |
| | iii) Willingness of the Owner(s) to Sell | |
| | iv) Willingness of the Developer to Develop | |
| | v) Occupied by Use unlikely to Cease | |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Proceed to Stage 4? | |
|----------------------------|--|

Stage 4: Achievability

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| A | Market Interests | |
| | i) Compatible with Adjacent Uses | |
| | ii) Land Values compared with Existing and Alternative Uses | |
| | iii) Attractiveness of Locality | |
| | iv) Demand | |
| B | Cost | |
| | i) site preparation | |
| | ii) abnormal costs; | |
| | iii) planning policy | |
| | iv) infrastructure | |
| C | i) Type of dwelling | |
| | ii) Quantity | |

| | | |
|----------|--|--|
| | | |
| D | Delivery and Phasing | |
| | Is the site 'deliverable' (1 - 5 years)? | |
| | Is the site 'developable' (6 – 15 years)? | |

Stage 5: Comments from other organisations

- **SDC Internal – Property/Housing/Environmental Health**
- **KCC Highways**
- **Highways Agency**
- **Environment Agency**
- **Natural England**
- **Kent Downs AONB-** Within AONB. Unrelated to any existing settlement. Not supported.
- **Kent Wildlife Trust**
- **HSE**
- **Local Authorities (Ashford, Dover, Canterbury, Rother)**

CONCLUSIONS

This is a rural site well within the AONB. It adjoins extensive agricultural land but is on the edge of a small cluster of residences, which has no relevant facilities. This site would increase ribbon and sporadic development in a rural location.

A small residential site has been developed nearby as a 'rural exception' (affordable housing) on a plot tightly bound by roads/ properties.

It is in close proximity to the A260 and its bus routes, but no facilities are walkable.

This is not a sustainable location to take forward through the SHLAA, and the impact of development would be unlikely to be found acceptable.

Completed by

Signed

Date