APPENDIX I: REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

Annex I of the SEA Directive prescribes the information that must be contained in the SA Report; however, interpretation of Annex I is not straightforward. The figure below explains how we (AECOM) interpret Annex I requirements.

Annex 1

The report must include...

Interpretation of Annex I

The report must include ...

(a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;		An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	i.e. answer - What's the Plan seeking to achieve?	
 (b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan (c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected; 		Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance	i.e. answer- What's the	e SA?
(d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental	\times	The relevant environmental protection objectives, established at international or national level	'context'?	scope of th
importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;		The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan'		What's the s
(e) the environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;	$\langle \rangle \rangle$	The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular, those relating	What's the baseline'?	i.e. answer - What's the scope of the SA?
(f) the likely significant effects on the environment including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors;		to any areas of a particular environmental importance Key environmental problems / issues and objectives that should be a focus of appraisal	i.e. answer - What are the key issues & objectives?	
(g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan;		An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with (i.e. an explanation of the 'reasonableness of the approach)		
(h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information		The likely significant effects associated with alternatives, including on issues such as and an outline of the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives considered / a description of how environmental	i.e. answer - Wh has Plan-making SA involved up t this point?	g/
(i) a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring.		objectives and considerations are reflected in the draft plan.		
		The likely significant effects associated with the draft plan The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the draft plan	i.e. answer - Wh are the appraisa findings at this current stage?	
		A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring	i.e. answer - Wh happens next?	at

APPENDIX II: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL (HOUSING GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION)

Introduction

As described within Part 2 of this SA Report, an interim stage of plan-making / SA involved appraising the following alternative broad spatial approaches to housing growth:

H1) 19,600 - Urban focus and dispersed development and 3 broad locations

H2) 19,600 - Urban focus, dispersal, 3 broad locations and a new settlement

H3) 18,560 - Urban focus, dispersal and 3 broad locations

H4) 18,560 - Urban focus and new settlement with some dispersal

H5) 18,560 - Urban focus, dispersal and 2 broad locations in Maidstone urban area.

The appraisal findings are presented in full within this Appendix. The appraisal tables should be read alongside the corresponding section of Part 2, where an explanation can be found of the degree to which the Council took on-board SA findings when determining the preferred approach as set out in the draft Local Plan Consultation document.

Methodology

For each of the alternatives, the appraisal identifies and evaluates 'likely significant effects' on the baseline / projected future baseline, drawing on the sustainability issues identified through scoping (see Part 1 of this SA report) as a methodological framework.

Every effort is made to predict effects accurately; however, this is inherently challenging given the high level nature of the alternatives under consideration. The ability to predict effects accurately is also limited by understanding of the baseline and (in particular) the future baseline. In light of this, when likely significant effects are predicted this is done with an accompanying explanation of the assumptions made.⁸⁸

In many instances it is not possible to predict significant effects, but it is possible to comment on the merits of alternatives in more general terms. This is helpful, as it enables a distinction to be made between alternatives even where it is not possible to distinguish between them in terms of 'significant effects'.

It is important to note that effects are predicted taking into account the criteria presented within Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations.⁸⁹ So, for example, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are also considered. These effect 'characteristics' are described within the appraisal as appropriate.

Significant Positive effects are illustrated in the tables with **green shading** next to the relative alternatives. Significant negative effects are illustrated with **red shading**. Lighter shading represents effects with a lower magnitude. These ratings are to provide a better appreciation of the magnitude of effects, but it should be remembered that they do not reflect 'objective' measurements.

	Minor significant positive effects		Significant positive effects		Minor significant negative effects		Significant negative effects
--	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------

In some instances, there may not be any 'significant impacts' to discuss. Therefore, to assist in the comparison of alternatives, the appraisal findings also highlight the general merits/disadvantages of each approach using the following symbols.

Overall negative implications

① Overall positive implications

? - Uncertainty

⁸⁸ As stated by Government Guidance (The Plan Making Manual, see <u>http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageld=156210</u>): "Ultimately, the significance of an effect is a matter of judgment and should require no more than a clear and reasonable justification." ⁸⁹ Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

Appraisal findings: Alternatives for housing growth and distribution

Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternatives for housing quantum and distribution:

H1) 19,600 - Dispersed and three broad locations

H2) 19,600 - Dispersed, broad locations and a new settlement H3) 18,560 - Dispersed and three broad locations

H4) 18,560 - Dispersed and new settlement with no broad locations

H5) 18,560 - Dispersed development and two broad locations

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects								
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5			
Housing	Alternatives H1 and H2 exceed the objectively assessed need as identified in the SHMA (2014) and would therefore have a significant positive effect on the baseline position. However, given the problems identified with infrastructure delivery for a new settlement South East of the urban area, it is possible that development here might be delayed or fall through. This would have negative implications for alternatives H2 and H4. Having said this, there may be better opportunities to deliver ' <i>sustainable development</i> ' at strategic sites compared to smaller dispersed sites in the urban area. Alternatives H3, H4 and H5 all meet the objectively assessed need, and thus would also have significant positive effects . Alternatives H2 and H4 rely on a significant proportion of development being delivered through a new settlement, which might be difficult to deliver, and thus negative implications are recorded.		Û		Û				
	Though alternatives H3-H5 all seek to deliver the OAHN, the phasing and location of development would be different. H3 would rely on broad locations for growth in the longer term to deliver 3000 dwellings, whilst H5 would deliver only 1500 at broad locations, with 1500 dwellings being dispersed across the rural service centres. H5 would therefore be more likely to deliver housing in the short and medium term, which is perhaps preferable from a housing perspective and the contribution to a 5 year housing supply.								

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Flooding	In line with national policy, each of the alternatives would seek to deliver land that was not at significant risk of flooding. In the main, this would be achieved for each alternative. However, at higher rates of growth under alternatives H1 and H2 it might be necessary to release sites for housing that are not ideally situated (i.e. partially within or adjacent to flood zones 2 and 3). This could lead to negative impacts. A higher level of growth is also likely to have a greater impact in terms of modifying surface water run-off. However, well-designed development utilising SUDs can actually present an opportunity to achieve a net decrease in surface run-off. It should also be noted that each alternative involves an element of development in Yalding; which is an area at particular risk of flooding. This could have negative implications, the extent of which is dependent upon which sites are chosen, scheme design and proposed mitigation measures.	?	?	?	?	?
Health	Alternatives H1-H5 would deliver a significant amount of housing into the town centre and urban fringes. Alternatives H2 and H4 would deliver slightly less than alternatives H1, H3 and H5 as a significant amount would be delivered by a new settlement instead. Better access to services and facilities would be provided by delivering a higher proportion of development in the Maidstone urban area due to the concentration of existing facilities and could help to regenerate some of the more deprived urban areas within the town (<i>this is reflected by recording positive implications for each of these alternatives</i>). However, it could also lead to an increased number of residents living in areas suffering from poor air quality unless issues of accessibility, congestion and air quality are addressed through provision of appropriate transport infrastructure. Each of the alternatives is likely to help support rural service centres. However, the higher scale of growth in the rural service centres under alternatives H1 and H5 could lead to pressure on services in the rural centres if development is not supported by improvements to community infrastructure. In combination with the potential effects in the Maidstone urban area discussed above, alternative H1 and H5 have therefore been recorded as having negative effects. Alternatives 1 and 2 would provide an oversupply of housing in comparison to the number of jobs being planned for. This could have indirect negative implications on health if a proportion of the population are unable to access employment locally. However, there would also be increased choice and flexibility in housing (albeit the numbers involved are small).	ት ት ት	Û	Û	Û	₽₽

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Poverty	Each of the alternatives focuses a significant amount of housing development into the urban area of Maidstone. This correlates with the areas of greatest deprivation in the Borough and could therefore help to regenerate areas of need ⁹⁰ . It is therefore predicted all five alternatives would have a significant positive effect on the baseline as they would help to meet (or exceed) the Borough's identified housing need. Negative implications are recorded for each alternative, as development will put more people into areas that suffer from poor air quality and congestion. Alternatives H2 and H4 have the potential to have greater benefits than alternatives H1, H3 and H5 as a new settlement would be in close proximity to areas falling within the top 10% deprived areas. Development here could therefore bring benefits to the existing communities in this area. Enhancing infrastructure and facilities in and close to deprived areas may also help to prevent residents moving out of deprived areas when their conditions improve, which is a common failure of area-based regeneration schemes where the conditions of an area are not improved ⁹¹ . It is hould be noted that there are concerns over the delivery of infrastructure at a new settlement in this location, which could mean that development actually exacerbates existing issues of congestion and poor air quality. Negative effects have therefore been predicted for H2 and H4.		Û	¢	Û	¢
Education	It is difficult to determine whether any of the options would have an effect in terms of increasing educational attainment or accessing skills training for higher quality employment. New development would need to take account of the impact in school places, so capacity issues are unlikely to be an issue. However, increased development in rural service centres could put pressure on schools that are unable to physically expand. In this respect, alternatives H1 and H5 could have negative implications. Uncertain effects have been recorded at this stage. Alternatives H1 and H2 could provide an oversupply of housing / undersupply of local jobs, which could have knock-on effects in terms of being able to provide an adequate number of apprenticeships / 'on-the-job' training opportunities. These effects are not predicted to be significant.	?⊅	Ŷ	-	-	?

 ⁹⁰ Department for Communities and Local Government (2010) Valuing the benefits of regeneration. Economics Paper 7: Volume 1 – Final Report. [online] available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/valuing-the-benefits-of-regeneration
 ⁹¹ Bennett J et al (2006) Would you live here? Making the Growth areas communities of choice London: IPPR

Sustainability Objective	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)					
		H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Crime	Access to a decent home is a key factor in reducing (re)offending rates ⁹² . Therefore, delivery of the identified housing need will help to support access to an affordable home. Higher levels of growth are also likely to have a positive effect in terms of providing job opportunities in construction. Provision of homes on brownfield sites in areas of need could also help to regenerate derelict areas, helping to reduce the 'broken windows' effect ⁹³ . Although these factors are not expected to have a significant effect on the baseline position for any of the alternatives, 'positive implications' (1) have been recorded for each alternative to highlight the general merits. Alternatives H1 and H2 could provide a slight mismatch in jobs and housing (given that they exceed objectively assessed housing needs), however, the effects are not predicted to be significant.	Û	Û	Û	Û	Û
Vibrant Community	It is difficult to determine whether any of the alternatives would have an effect in terms of increasing involvement in decision making and consultation. Each of the alternatives involves a degree of growth in the rural service centres, which could help to support community facilities in these areas. The significance of effects would depend upon the capacity and usage of existing facilities, which is unknown at this stage. This would be determined at project level. Having said this, it is reasonable to assume that higher levels of growth in the rural settlements could contribute to the enhancement of community facilities (though increased development contributions). In this respect, alternatives H1 and H5 would be slightly more beneficial than H2, H3 and H4.	Û	-	-	-	Û

 ⁹² Ministry of Justice (2013) Transforming Rehabilitation: a summary of evidence on reducing reoffending. [online] available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/243718/evidence-reduce-reoffending.pdf
 ⁹³ Cisneros, H,G. (1995) Defensible Space: Deterring Crime and Building Community - US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Accessibility	 Each of the alternatives seeks to concentrate the majority of housing development into the Maidstone urban area. On one hand, this will help to ensure that residents are well located in relation to services and jobs. This would have significant positive effects for some communities under each alternative. However, it could put additional pressure on an already constrained transport network, making it difficult to travel into the town centre. This would have negative implications for some communities. Alternatives H2 and H4 consist of a new settlement, and would locate a significant proportion of development on the urban fringe which could put further pressure on the road network. However, a new settlement would also present an opportunity to enhance access to services in this area. Provision of new road infrastructure would be necessary to support a new settlement. If this was not implemented there would be major negative effects. Indeed, the development might not be able to go ahead. Consequently, a minor significant negative effect is recorded for these alternatives. Alternatives H1 and H5 would lead to a greater amount of development around rural service centres, which could put pressure on existing services unless supporting infrastructure and facilities were secured in these areas. Whilst a number of development management policies would seek to mitigate impacts on accessibility, the cumulative impact of development might require strategic improvements to be made. These issues would need to be explored further. 	Û		Û		Û
Culture	It is considered that there would be no significant effects on the baseline, nor is it possible to determine the relative merits of the alternatives.	-	-	-	-	-
Land Use	 Each of the alternatives would lead to the loss of a significant amount of agricultural land classified as Grade 3, both in the rural service centres and the Maidstone urban area. Alternatives H1, H3 and H5 would also lead to the loss of over 50 hectares of Grade 2 agricultural land to the South East of the Urban Area. Alternative H1 and H5 would require additional land to be released around rural service centres compared to alternatives H2, H3 and H4. Much of the land that would be developed under this scenario is Grade 3Agricultural Land. It is likely that over 40 hectares of additional agricultural land would need to be released in total at these locations. Through the development of a new settlement, alternatives H2 and H4 would lead to the significant negative effect on the baseline. Although there is a focus on the urban areas of Maidstone, each of the alternatives still allocate a significant amount of Greenfield land. However, alternatives H1, H2, H3 and H5 would achieve regeneration on strategic brownfield sites at Maidstone Barracks and the Town Centre. On balance, the effects would not be significant, but there would be positive implications (1). These brownfield sites would not be promoted for alternative H4; whilst H5 would disperse 1500 additional homes rather than development in Lenham. 	Û	Û	Û		Û

Sustainability	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)					
Objective		H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Congestion	Each alternative focuses a significant amount of development into and surrounding the Maidstone urban area. As a result, there is likely to be increased pressure on areas identified as being very congested; such as the town centre section of the A229 and its connecting roads. The proposed sites in the north west of Maidstone could also exacerbate existing congestion on the crossing point of the River Medway where routes A229, A20 and A26 meet, identified in the ITS as a principal constraint on the borough's road network. Consequently, each alternative (particularly H2 and H4) would depend on substantial infrastructural improvements to mitigate congestion. It is unclear whether this infrastructure could be secured due to viability concerns. Furthermore, if infrastructure could be secured to support a new settlement, this may still not address the issues with congestion in the Maidstone Town Centre. Alternatives P4 and H4 therefore have the potential to have a significant megative effect on the baseline.		?		?	

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Climate Change	In the main, each of the alternatives would avoid areas at risk of flooding. However, development in Yalding would need to be carefully sited and designed. The impacts are unclear at this stage and would need to be addressed at the project level. Carbon emissions from transport would be expected to remain in-line with the projected baseline for each of the alternatives; although a focus on urban areas could support greater use of public transport and other modes of travel such as walking and cycling. Overall, higher levels of growth could be expected to increase demands for energy. However, it may also present an opportunity to enhance the efficiency of building stock. On balance the impacts on the projected baseline are not anticipated to be significant. In terms of the development of decentralised energy schemes, there are opportunities identified South East and North West of Maidstone urban areas. However, it is unclear whether schemes would come forward at this stage.	?	?	?	?	?
Biodiversity	The scale of growth at a new settlement and / or strategic development to the South East of the urban area may have negative implications for the Spot Lane Quarry SSSI and other local wildlife sites in this part of the Borough. However, in the main, each of the alternatives avoids the most sensitive parts of the Borough in terms of biodiversity value. There could be some effects on sites of local importance for biodiversity at development sites across the Borough; but Local Plan policies should ensure that suitable mitigation and / or enhancement occurs. Having said this, to meet the increased housing targets in Headcorn under alternative H1 (and H5), there would be a likely requirement to release land for development in close proximity to the River Beult SSSI and other local wildlife sites. This <u>could</u> have a significant negative effect in this locality. In terms of the overall scale of growth, the higher targets under H1 and H2 are more likely to result in a fragmentation of habitats, particularly in the urban areas. However, policies for Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure in the Local Plan seek to ensure that these impacts are avoided. In terms of recreational pressure; visitor survey data obtained during 2012 identifies that visitor numbers to the nearest part of the North Downs Woodlands SAC (Boxley Warren) are fairly low; 59 visitors were recorded during 6 days of survey. However, there is the potential for development focused in the urban area to make a significant contribution to recreational activity within the SAC. Each alternative would have the potential to contribute towards a negative effect. Therefore, alternatives H1 and H2 could have a significant negative effect .	?	?	?	?	?

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
	All the alternatives focus a significant amount of housing into the Maidstone urban area, which contains a concentration of historic buildings. Policies in the Local Plan would help to reduce any adverse effects of development and could actually serve to enhance the built environment. This has therefore been recorded as having potentially positive implications (1), but it is not anticipated that the effects would be 'significant' in terms of the baseline position.					
Countryside and Heritage	In terms of effects on the 'countryside', alternative H1 is predicted to have a significant negative effect on the landscape character to the south of the urban area. In particular, an increased amount of land would need to be released around the service centres of Staplehurst and Headcorn. This could alter the character of these settlements and their relationship to the countryside. Due to flood risk constraints, the sites released for development in these areas to meet the higher targets would be likely to fall within areas with low capacity for landscape change. Conversely, alternatives H2 and H4 are likely to have fewer effects in the rural service centres (compared to alternative H1), but could have a significant negative effect on the character of the urban fringe to the south east of Maidstone. The new settlement would fall between the southern anti-coalescence belt and open countryside to the North.		Û	Û		Û
	Alternative H3 is likely to have a significant negative effect on the baseline position. Although this alternative would involve lower levels of growth at most rural service centres, the broad location at Lenham could have significant negative effects upon the setting of the AONB.					
	Alternative H5 is likely to have similar effects to alternative H3, although there would be less development at Lenham and a greater scale of growth at the other rural service centres of Marden, Staplehurst, Headcorn and Harrietsham. This could necessitate the release of further housing sites that fall within areas that are sensitive to landscape change (for example at Headcorn and Harrietsham). Consequently a significant negative effect is predicted.					
	A higher level of growth is likely to increase the overall amount of household waste generated. Therefore, alternatives H1 and H2 could have some negative implications in this respect.					
Waste	However, in terms of waste collections, a strategy that places most of the development into accessible urban areas is more attractive as it helps to reduce the distance travelled to collect waste from new properties. In this respect, each of the alternatives promotes a distribution of development that makes the best use of existing infrastructure.	Û	û	-	-	Û
	Although existing settlements in more rural areas already receive waste collection services, the increased number of homes in these areas (<i>associated with alternative H1 and H5 in particular</i>) could mean that more/longer trips are required to collect and dispose of this waste.					

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects					
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Water resources	The Maidstone Water Cycle Study (2010) states that development in and around the Maidstone urban area could be constrained by sewerage infrastructure. This could be overcome with investment, but the implications in terms of cost and timing need to be established. There could therefore be potential negative impacts associated with each of the options. At this stage it is unclear whether the effects would be significant and has been recorded as such (?). A significantly higher level of development at some rural service centres (particularly Headcorn) could lead to problems with environmental capacity as there is limited headroom at Waste water treatment works in these areas. This constitutes a significant negative effect associated with Alternative H1 and H5. In terms of water demand, the South East Water Resources Management Plan suggests that there will be a shortfall in water supply in the longer term in the region. Although, a number of solutions are being proposed to tackle these issues, some are complex with long lead-in times. As a result, there is a risk of supply issues in the longer term, especially if climate change impacts are more extreme than envisaged. With this in mind, planning for a higher level of growth could add a greater amount of stress on water supply - with subsequent knock-on implications for water quality. At this stage, the impacts are not clear and so an uncertain effect has been recorded for each alternative.	?	?	?	?	?
Energy	Due to economies of scale, a new settlement is more likely to provide the opportunity to secure higher levels of sustainability in new development. Therefore, alternatives H2 and H4 could have a positive effect in this respect. However, the need to secure substantial road and sewerage infrastructure to support new development in these areas will result in significant energy expenditure. For this reason, the overall effects in terms of energy usage are not considered to be significant. Overall, higher levels of growth would be expected to increase the demand for energy, but the properties that were delivered would be of a higher standard than the existing building stock so there are mixed effects anticipated (<i>as reflected by both negative and positive implications for each alternative</i>). Each of the alternatives also directs much of the development into urban areas that are already well serviced by infrastructure, reducing in part the need for construction of new infrastructure (and thus energy expenditure).	₽₽	₽₽	₽₽	₽₽	₽₽

Sustainability Objective	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)					
		H1	H2	H3	H4	H5
Economy	Under each of the alternatives, the majority of housing development would be located in and around the Maidstone urban area. Given that a significant number of employment opportunities will be located in the Town Centre and at Newnham Park; this will help to ensure good access to job opportunities, which constitutes a significant positive effect for each alternative. However, it could also result in additional traffic into the centre of Maidstone, which could have negative implications through a reduction in business efficiency. It is unclear whether the employment land opportunities would provide enough jobs for everyone at higher levels of growth. Therefore, under higher growth scenarios such as alternatives H1 and H2, there could be a requirement for additional space if economic growth is to keep up with local population growth. If there is a mismatch between the level of jobs provided and the number of residents seeking work, it would mean that a greater proportion of the economically active would need to commute out of Maidstone to find employment or could find themselves without a job. In this respect, negative effects could occur (4), but the effects are not predicted to be significant given the relatively small increase in housing that would be provided under H1 and H2 compared to the OAHN that would be met under H3-H5. Conversely, higher levels of housing development would be expected to support more jobs in the construction industry, and could attract additional investment into the local economy. Therefore, mixed effects are predicted for alternatives H1 and H2.	Q	Ţ			

	Housing	Flooding	Health	Poverty	Education	Crime	Community	Accessibility	Culture	Land use	Congestion	Climate Change	Biodiversity	Countryside and heritage	Waste	Water	Energy	Economy
Alternative 1		?	₽	Û	5 û	Û	Û	Û	-	Û		?	?	①	Û	?	₽₽	Û
Alternative 2	Û	?	Û	Û	Û	Û	-		-	仓	?	?	?	①	Û	?	₽	Û
Alternative 3		?	Û	Û	-	Û	-	Û	-	Û		?	?	<u></u> ٢	-	?	₽	
Alternative 4	Û	?	Û	¢	-	Û	-		-		?	?	?	Û	-	?	₽	
Alternative 5		?	₽	Û	?	Û	Û	Û	-	Û		?	?	Û	Û	?	₽₽	

Summary

There are likely to be significant positive effects on housing associated with each alternative; as development seeks to meet the identified housing need in the SHMA. Alternative H1 would be most likely to achieve the OAHN given that the target is higher; which provides slightly greater choice and flexibility.

Each of the alternatives seeks to focus the majority of housing development into the Maidstone Urban Area. This could help to tackle deprivation in the most deprived areas of need; with positive implications for health and wellbeing and access to services. However, the significant increase in development within the Maidstone Urban Area could lead to a significant increase in congestion; particularly for alternatives H1 and H2. This would have negative implications for business efficiency, air quality, and health.

Each of the alternatives would provide a boost to the local economy by supporting the construction industry and helping to ensure that there is suitable accommodation for the labour force. However, alternatives H1 and H2 could provide a slight oversupply of housing compared to the level of jobs provided, which could have negative implications.

There are negative effects on land use across all of the alternatives; with a significant loss in greenfield and agricultural land. Alternatives H1, H2,H3 and H5 however do contain a greater element of previously developed land at two 'broad locations'; which would help to secure regeneration in these areas.

Accessibility to services, jobs and facilities is likely to improve for each alternative, as much of the housing would be located in central urban areas. Strategic development would also present opportunities to enhance local services.

There is likely to be a significant negative effect from each of the alternatives on the character of the landscape and countryside. For alternative H1 and H5 this involves significant development on the urban fringe and around numerous settlements across the Borough. For alternatives H2 and H4, this is largely attributed to the implications of a large new settlement on coalescence, whilst H3 would lead to substantial growth in Lenham within the setting of an AONB. Although development has the potential to have effects on the setting of historic buildings, it is anticipated that Local Plan policies would ensure that appropriate mitigation measures were secured at the project level.

There are positive implications for health across all alternatives as they will increase the provision of services available, however air quality could suffer in alternative H1 where congestion increases.

Whilst alternatives H1 and H2 would have a more pronounced positive impact on housing and economic factors, adverse effects through increased levels of congestion would be more likely. There could also be a slight oversupply of housing compared to the level of jobs planned for. In combination, these factors could have negative implications for the wider local economy, health and wellbeing.

Alternatives H3-H5 meet identified housing needs, but would also be likely to have a less severe effect in terms of congestion, and other environmental constraints. These alternatives are also likely to be more suitably matched to the number of projected jobs. However, due to the constraints and uncertainties associated with the delivery of a new settlement, it is considered that alternatives H3 and H5 are more favourable than alternative H4

There are many similarities between H3 and H5, with the only difference being increased dispersal for H5 and the inclusion of a broad location for housing at Lenham under H3. The differences in effects are limited to the following factors.

- H5 is predicted to have more negative effects on landscape across the borough, whilst H3 would have more profound effects in Lenham.
- H5 is predicted to have potential negative effects on education provision.
- H5 is more likely to secure enhancements to community facilities across a wider range of rural service centres (through potentially increased contributions to community facility enhancements).

SA of the Maidstone Local Plan

APPENDIX III: ALTERNATIVES APPRAISAL: EMPLOYMENT LAND DISTRIBUTION

Introduction

As described within Part 2 of the main SA Report document, an interim stage of plan-making / SA involved appraising three spatial approaches to employment land distribution.

- 1) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and dispersed development at rural service centres
- 2) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and M20 Junction 8
- 3) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and a hybrid of 1 and 2 (i.e. dispersed development at rural service centres, plus development at M20 Junction 8).

The interim appraisal findings are presented in full within this Appendix. The appraisal table should be read alongside the corresponding section of Part 2, where an explanation can be found of the degree to which the Council took on-board SA findings when determining the preferred approach as set out in the Local Plan.

Methodology

See discussion within Appendix II

Appraisal findings: Alternatives for Employment Distribution for Maidstone Local Plan

Table presenting	Table presenting an appraisal of the following alternatives for employment land distribution:									
2) Town centre, M)) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and M20 Junction 8 2) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and dispersed approach 3) Town centre, M20 Junction 7 and hybrid of option 1 and 2 (dispersed and smaller scale development at M20 Junction 8)									
Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects									
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3						
	All three alternatives would support the housing market by providing opportunities for economic growth. This would help to retain a healthy local labour market. All three options also focus an element of the employment land provision into the town centre and a strategic site at Junction 7 of the M20. This should help to provide good links between housing development in the urban area and employment, retail and leisure.									
Housing	Alternatives 1 and 3 would also seek to increase job provision in Headcorn, Marden and Yalding. This could help to support the housing market in these areas, and compliment any housing and retail development planned for these settlements.	仓	Û	Û						
	Alternative 3 has the greatest potential for economic growth, which involves a strategic site on the M20 J8 as well as expansion in rural service centres. This would be most likely to lead to a demand for higher housing provision, but would also lead to a better balance between the planned housing target and the amount of jobs created.									
Flooding	Alternatives 1 and 3 include development north of Headcorn (ED-1) which includes some areas of Flood Zone 3. The former Syngenta Works (ED2-17) also includes areas of land within Flood Zone 3 which could result in a significant negative effect if developed upon. Mitigation would be required here to avoid negative impacts. Alternative 2 includes negligible areas within flood zones 2 or 3 and would therefore have a negligible impact on the baseline. The cumulative effect of employment allocations under each of the alternatives is not considered likely to have a significant effect on rates of surface water runoff, as plan policies would seek to ensure a neutral or positive effect.									

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Health	All three alternatives would involve the development of a Medical Campus at Newnham Park. This campus would provide specialist treatment facilities, and research and development capabilities in an accessible location alongside the Kent Institute of Medicine and Surgery Hospital. These facilities would provide access to high quality NHS and private services, which should help to reduce rates of sickness and death in the longer term.			
	The development of this site would also create approximately 4,200 jobs, which would help to increase the health and wellbeing of local communities able to take advantage of these opportunities. Significant positive effects are anticipated under all three alternatives.			
	However, concentrated development in and around the town centre, could lead to increased congestion and poorer air quality along routes into this area, which could affect the health and wellbeing of residents living in the Maidstone Urban Area. Alternatives 2 and 3 in particular could have further impacts in this respect, as it would also involve the development of another strategic site at Junction 8 of the M20 and thus result in increased traffic movements in accessing the site. A proportion of trips to and from the site would be expected to be via the Motorway, so these issues should not be significant.		Û	û
	Allowing for the expansion of existing employment sites across the Borough (alternative 1 and 3) helps to support the local communities in other settlements; whilst having a lesser impact on congestion and air quality in the Maidstone urban area (for Alternative 1 only).			
	Each alternative could have a significant positive effect by helping to secure job opportunities in the Maidstone urban area and at the strategic location at Newnham Park. This is where the most deprived communities are concentrated. This will depend however, on the match between the skills and aspirations of those seeking employment and the jobs that are available.			
Poverty	Alternatives 2 and 3 may have the potential to provide greater benefits than alternative 1 as strategic development at junction 8 of the M20 is closer to the deprived areas in the urban area (when compared to the dispersed approach of alternative 1). Development in the rural service centres (alternatives 1 and 3) is less likely to support regeneration in areas of need, but it may still be possible for some residents in deprived areas to access jobs in these areas. Alternative 1 is least likely to deliver the type of employment land required to support aspirational jobs growth, and therefore could have negative implications in terms of access to higher skilled jobs. Conversely, alternative 3 would deliver strategic development at Junction 8 as well as catering for the needs of rural areas. This alternative is therefore more likely to have significant positive effects.	û		

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Education	Each alternative would have positive implications in terms of increasing job opportunities - with knock-on effects for skills and education. Each alternative also includes the allocation of a mixed-use development at Newnham park that would involve creation of a medical campus, research and development facilities. This could help to support higher skilled jobs and associated training programmes and is considered to be a significant positive impact. Alternatives 2 and 3 would help to attract higher quality employment (and jobs) at the strategic site close to Junction 8 of the M20. Alternative 1 does not provide the type of sites that would be likely to attract high end occupiers.			
Crime	Access to a job is a key factor in reducing (re)offending rates. Therefore, delivery of strategic employment opportunities in and around the Maidstone urban areas would have positive implications under each alternative. This will depend however, on the match between the skills and aspirations of those seeking employment and the jobs that are available.	仓	Û	Û
Vibrant Community	It is difficult to determine whether any of the options would have an impact in terms of increasing involvement in decision making and consultation.	-	-	-
	Each of the alternatives would deliver an office development in Maidstone town centre, along with the expansion of Newnham Park. These sites are accessible by public transport and could therefore have a significant positive impact on the baseline by creating more job opportunities in accessible locations. However, an increase in jobs in this area could exacerbate congestion issues on the road network into Maidstone Town Centre. Alternatives 2 and 3 would be the least desirable in this respect as they would deliver further development along the M20 at Junction 8.			
Accessibility	Alternatives 1 and 3 should also support greater access to jobs for communities around the Rural Service Centres of Marden and Headcorn and Larger Village of Yalding. This would have positive implications for residents in these areas, but may lead to longer commutes depending on where employees reside.	Û	û	û
	In contrast to the dispersed approach of Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would provide a larger and more concentrated area of development closer to the Maidstone urban area at Junction 8 of the M20. Whilst this would be accessible to communities in the north of the Borough and those with good motorway access, it would be less accessible for residents living to the south of the Borough. Alternative 3 would involve both dispersed and strategic develop at Junction 8 of the M20; therefore accessibility to jobs ought to be improved across the borough, which would constitute a more pronounced positive effect compared to alternatives A and B.			

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Culture	It is predicted that there would be no significant effects on the baseline; nor is it possible to determine the relative merits of the alternatives.	-	-	-
Land Use	All three alternatives include one site which is wholly previously developed land, which is in the urban area (MX-15) and partially developed land at Boxley as part of the Newnham park development. This is an effective use/reuse of land. However, all three alternatives also involve the loss of greenfield/agricultural land. Each alternative would lead to the loss of over 50 hectares of best and most versatile agricultural land. Although the majority of this would be Grade 3 (a mix of 3a and 3b), a significant negative effect has been recorded for each alternative. The development site at Newnham Park contains over 30 hectares of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. For Alternatives 1 and 3, there is some reuse of land in Yalding (ED2-17) and Marden (ED-11), but the majority is greenfield. Alternatives 2 and 3 also involve a large greenfield site at Junction 8 of the M20 (Hollingbourne), which is Grade 3 agricultural land. Alternative 3 would have the most pronounced negative effects simply due to the greater amount of land that would be released for employment use.	-	-	_
Congestion	Each alternative promotes a town centre office site and the expansion/redevelopment of Newnham Park. This could have mixed effects. On one hand, in provides job opportunities in the Maidstone urban area, which is accessible by public transport. However, it could exacerbate congestion issues in this area. Alternatives 2 and 3 would also focus further development beyond the edge of the urban area at Junction 8 of the M20, which would contribute to further congestion and air quality issues through commuting. Although the Junction 8 site has good links to the M20 motorway, the size of development could have a significant negative effect on air quality and congestion in combination with the Newnham park and other Town Centre developments through the traffic movements of employees accessing the site (although this can be offset to some extent by provision/improvement of park and ride facilities). Alternatives 1 and 3 could result in shorter commutes for some local workers in rural service centres. As sites are located on existing road networks and close to existing developments, these alternatives would also help direct some traffic away from the inner urban area. Alternative 1 would be the least negative approach as it promotes the lowest amount of growth overall, as well as avoiding strategic development along the M20.			

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Climate Change	Although increased economic growth is typically associated with increased demand for energy, the efficiency of new buildings is likely to be improved under all alternatives. For example, the outline Planning Application for the Medical Campus at Newnham park indicates that BREEAM 'Very Good' could be achieved for this development. This would have positive implications in terms of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from new development. Emissions associated with transport are likely to remain in-line with current trends, as each alternative locates employment in areas that are already accessed by private transport. However, there would be some off-setting improvements to the public transport network associated with all the options through facilitating infrastructure (such as park and ride). Alternative 2 largely avoids areas of flood risk, so it would be unlikely that disruptions to key employment sites would arise as a result of future climate changes. However, alternatives 1 and 2 locate some development at the former Syngenta works in Yalding, which contains areas at significant risk of flooding. Although some employment uses can be more compatible with areas at risk of flooding, there is greater potential for disruption to economic activity in this area (especially if critical infrastructure and road networks are affected). Indeed, Yalding was particularly affected by the Autumn 2000 floods, with some 50 properties affected and road access closed. Although the Leigh Barrier helps to manage flood risk in Yalding; incidents still occur, such as on Christmas day in 2013. A significant negative effect has been recorded to reflect these issues, although further mitigation measures delivered through any development could help to manage the risks.	Û	Û	Û
Biodiversity	 Each alternative includes the development of a town centre site for office-based employment, and the Newnham Park development. The development land at Newnham Park is adjacent to ancient woodland, which presents a potential impact on important habitat and species. This can (and will) be addressed through mitigation measures such as buffer zones Alternatives 1 and 3 also include a significant strategic development site at Hollingbourne (ED-12) which is close to the Kent Downs AONB and is dissected by a watercourse. Although it is not in proximity to a designated wildlife habitat, there is still potential for disturbance to wildlife habitats and species at this location. For alternatives 1 and 3, the site in Yalding (ED2-17) is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site, which could also result in impacts on local habitats and species. On balance, each alternative could have some negative implications, but it is not considered that there would be a significant effect on the baseline as development is largely located away from sensitive designated habitats and mitigation measures could be implemented at the project level. 	Û	Û	Û

Sustainability	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u>			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Countryside and Heritage	Each alternative includes development at Newnham Park, which is likely to change the character of this area. However, as it is currently undergoing piecemeal development, the allocation could help to deliver a more coherent landscape strategy for area, having positive implications. Each alternative also includes development in the Maidstone urban area (MX-15), which could affect the Romney Place Listed Building. However, it is expected that appropriate mitigation would be secured before planning consent would be granted. For alternatives 2 and 3, development at Junction 8 of the M20 is likely to have a significant impact on the setting of the Landscape to the south of the Kent Downs AONB. This would constitute a significant negative impact on the baseline. Alternatives 1 and 3 would also involve a dispersed pattern of development to the south of the Borough. This could have an effect on the character of landscapes surrounding Marden, Headcorn and Yalding; but the effects are not anticipated to be significant. However, development in Yalding (ED2-17) would be in close proximity to the Twyford Bridge Scheduled Monument. This presents the potential for a significant negative impact, although it is expected that appropriate mitigation would be secured before planning consent was granted.	Û	Û	Û
Waste	Whilst economic growth is traditionally associated with increased generation of waste, no significant effects are anticipated for any of the alternatives compared to the baseline projection.	-	-	-
Water resources	Economic growth will lead to an increase in water use. However, much of the growth will be in non-industrial sectors, where the level of water usage is much lower in comparison. The impact of development on water quality is also likely to be insignificant as a result. Surface water run-off is unlikely to be significantly altered, although in combination with housing development there could be localised effects if mitigation measures are not secured. Policies in the Local Plan should help to ensure that net surface water run-off remains the same or potentially improves with the use of sustainable urban drainage systems.	-	-	-
Energy	The 'Sustainable Construction in Maidstone Study (March, 2011) does not identify any specific opportunities for decentralised energy schemes at any of the proposed employment sites. A significant proportion of the employment allocations would also be office and warehousing, which will have a greater demand for electricity rather than for heating. Although increased economic growth is typically associated with increased demand for energy, the efficiency of new buildings is likely to be improved under each of the alternatives. For example, the outline Planning Application for the Medical Campus at Newnham park indicates that BREEAM 'Very Good' could be achieved at this development. This would have positive implications for each alternative. Nevertheless, it would be beneficial to seek high standards of design (e.g. BREEAM 'Excellent' or 'Outstanding') at each of the proposed employment sites. This will help to reduce energy use and carbon emissions as well as providing attractive accommodation for businesses.	Û	Û	Û

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects			
Objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3
Economy	Each alternative presents equal opportunities for economic growth in the Maidstone urban area through the development of Newnham Park and a Town Centre site for offices (site references ED15 and MX15). The Newnham Park development contains the existing Newnham Court Shopping Village, which would expand to provide a boost in local employment. Newnham Park would also involve the creation of a medical campus alongside the Kent Institute of Medicine and Surgery Hospital. This could attract a highly skilled workforce, support training opportunities and provide higher quality jobs for local residents. Alternatives 2 and 3 also propose a strategic development site by junction 8 of the M20, which would be a major location for economic growth. The nature of this site means that it is more likely to attract high profile employers, which could further boost the economy and the offer of skilled employment. This constitutes a significant positive impact. However the site could potentially exacerbate congestion issues around the Maidstone urban area, which could have negative implications for the wider local economy. Alternatives 1 and 3 distribute employment land across the south of the district at sites in Headcorn, Marden, and Yalding. As most of these sites are proposed extensions to existing small industrial estates, they would not provide for the high-profile investment opportunities that the Junction 8 site could bring. These locations are also less well connected to the Motorway network. However, a dispersed approach would be less likely to add to peak-time congestion issues in the Maidstone Urban Area and would better support the local employment site requirements of these settlements. Alternative 1 would be least likely to meet identified gaps in the types of employment land required to support high quality jobs. Therefore, it may be less likely that the target of 14,400 jobs would be achieved and so the magnitude of the positive effects would be lower than for alternatives 2 and 3.		Û	Q

	Housing	Flooding	Health	Poverty	Education	Crime	Community	Accessibility	Culture	Land use	Congestion	Climate Change	Biodiversity	Countryside and heritage	Waste	Water	Energy	Economy
Alternative 1	Û			Û		Û	-	Û	-			Û	û	Û	-	-	Û	
Alternative 2	Û		Û			Û	-	Û	-			Û	û	Û	-	-	Û	Û
Alternative 3	仓		Û			仓	-	Û	-			Û	û	Û	-	-	仓	Û

Summary

Each alternative would have a significant positive effect by increasing the quantity and quality of employment opportunities. There would also be benefits in terms of increased opportunities to develop skills and employment in the health sector in particular. Each alternative would help to tackle deprivation by providing jobs in close proximity to areas of need. This is particularly the case for alternatives 2 and 3. However, there is a danger that increased movements into the Maidstone urban area could exacerbate existing congestion and air quality issues; having an effect on the wider local economy, business efficiency and health for alternatives 2 and 3. These effects would be less pronounced for alternative 1, which would disperse employment to a number of settlements to the south of the urban area. This dispersal strategy would also support the local economies in a number of service centres, but would not provide the types of sites that would attract high-profile development. Whilst alternative 3 also involves development at a number of locations to the South of the urban area, it also includes development at the M20 Junction 8 site.

Alternatives 2 and 3 are predicted to have significant negative effects on landscape character due to the location of the Junction 8 site in relation to the Kent Downs AONB. Although alternatives 1 and 3 could still lead to localised impacts on character around a number of settlements, these effects are considered less significant. Each of the alternatives makes some use of previously developed land but would also lead to a significant loss of grade 2 and 3 agricultural land. The effects would be most pronounced for Alternative 3, which includes the Junction 8 site as well as dispersed development.

Mixed use development in Yalding is within areas at significant risk of flooding, which has also been recorded as a negative effect for alternatives 1 and 3.

Overall, each of the three alternatives score fairly similarly against the range of sustainability criteria. This is due to the fact that each contains common elements. However, whilst alternative 1 would be least likely to have negative effects upon congestion, landscape and soils, the positive effects upon the economy, accessibility and deprivation would be less pronounced compared to alternative 2 and (particularly) alternative 3.

APPENDIX IV: OPTIONS APPRAISAL (SITE ALLOCATIONS)

Introduction

As described within Part 2 of the main SA Report document, an interim stage of plan-making / SA involved appraising a range of site options for housing, mixed uses, employment and Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The appraisal findings are summarised in this Appendix, with detailed proformas for each site presented in separate technical appendices.

Site options appraisal methodology

Site options were subjected to SA utilising a strict 'appraisal question' based methodology. Site appraisal questions were developed to reflect the sustainability issues identified through SA scoping as far as possible – see Table 1; however, given data availability⁹⁴ the questions that it has been possible to pose are limited in scope.

Sustainability topic	Appraisal criteria used	Comments / limitations
Housing	N/A	It is not appropriate to simply examine the size of sites as a proxy for the number of homes/affordable homes that could be delivered (taking into account the assumption that larger developments can deliver a higher proportion of affordable housing). This is on the basis that sites will often eventually be brought forward in combination.
Flooding	 Is allocation of the site within a flood zone? Is the proposed use of the site appropriate in terms of guidance set out in the 'Technical Guidance to the NPPF' relating to flood risk? See table 3 (page 8) of the technical guidance. 	Criteria do not establish the extent to which a site lays within flood zones or whether this portion could be avoided.
Health	 Are there potential noise problems with the site – either for future occupiers or for adjacent/nearby occupiers arising from allocation of the site? How far is the site from the nearest children's play space? How far is site from the nearest area of publicly accessible greenspace (>2ha in size)? 	Criteria do not account for the quality of parks and play spaces. Nor do they account for the usage of facilities and potential over-capacity.
Poverty	• Will allocation of the site result in employment- generating development in or close to (<2400m) deprived areas?	It is assumed that development can bring with it investment that will in turn help to facilitate an increase in prosperity locally / reduce spatial inequalities in terms of relative deprivation.
Education	 How far is the site from the nearest secondary school? How far is the site from the nearest primary school? 	It may have been possible to assess the potential for new development to impact on school capacity. However, in practice, developments will be required to provide enhanced school place provision to account for population growth in an area.
Crime	N/A	It is difficult to make a meaningful assessment of impacts on levels of crime at this scale.
Vibrant Community	N/A	It is not possible to determine how sites could affect involvement in community activities.

Table 1: Scope of the site appraisal methodology

⁹⁴ Given the imperative of achieving consistency and transparency it is only possible to draw on data-sets for which data is available for each and every site option.

Sustainability topic	Appraisal criteria used	Comments / limitations
Accessibility	 How far is the site from the Maidstone Urban Area or a Rural Service Centre? How far is the site from the nearest medical hub or GP service? How far is the site from the nearest post office? How far is the site from the nearest outdoor sports facilities (i.e. playing pitch, tennis courts)? How far is the site from the nearest children's play space? How far is site from the nearest area of publicly accessible greenspace (>2ha in size)? 	A major limitation relates to the fact that larger sites could have differing levels of accessibility. It is also important to note that all distances are "as the crow flies" as it was not possible to take account of routes / pathways (e.g. the distance of the route that would be taken in practice when walking or travelling by car to reach a local centre). Criteria do not account for the quality of parks and leisure facilities. Nor do they account for the usage of facilities and potential over-capacity.
Culture	N/A	It is not possible to determine how sites could affect cultural activities.
Land Use	 Will allocation of the site lead to loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land? Will allocation of the site make use of previously developed land? 	Agricultural land classification uses historical data. The criteria does not differentiate between Grade 1, 2 and 3a/3b agricultural land. However, a description of each 'score' is provided to explain the site characteristics in further detail.
Congestion	How far is the site from the nearest bus stop?How far is the site from the nearest train station?Is the site within or near to an AQMA?	Different parts of a larger site may not be as accessible as others. Measuring 'as the crow flies' is not wholly representative of actual routes and distances.
Climate Change	N/A	The ability of development to adopt building integrated low carbon technologies is not affected by location. Suitability for district energy schemes has not been established for each site
Biodiversity	 Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon an Ancient Woodland (AW) or Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW)? Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)? Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR)? 	Distance to wildlife sites is not the only indicator of a potential impact. For example, scale of development is not accounted for. A smaller allocation could be closer to a site and have fewer impacts than a much larger scale location that is further away. Distance is measures from site boundaries.
Countryside and Heritage	 Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)? Listed Building? Conservation Area? Does the site lie within an area with significant archaeological features/finds or where potential exists for archaeological features to be discovered in the future? Is the site located within or in proximity to and/or likely to impact on the Kent Downs AONB? Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, is the allocation of the site likely to cause harm to the objectives of the Green Belt designation? Would development of the site lead to any potential adverse impacts on local landscape character for which mitigation measures appropriate to the scale and nature of the impacts is unlikely to be achieved? 	Ideally, it would be desirable to establish the extent and sensitivity of different character areas and to make an assessment of how each site option could impact upon local character. This information is available for some sites (as taken from detailed Landscape Character Assessments 2014). However, for some sites, this information has been inferred using broader level landscape characterisations and officer views. Where a detailed site assessment has been undertaken as part of the 2014 landscape study, this replaces the assessment made at previous stages of appraisal using broad character areas in the 2012 landscape assessment. Proximity to heritage features is measured from site boundaries.

Sustainability topic	Appraisal criteria used	Comments / limitations
Waste	N/A	
Water Management	N/A	Ideally, the potential impact of sites on water quality would be established. However, it is difficult to quantify impacts based purely on distance.
Energy	N/A	
Economy	 How accessible is the site to local employment provision (i.e. employment sites or the nearest local service centre?) Will allocation of the site result in loss of employment land/space? 	NB: Employment land is often somewhat substitutable, i.e. can be possible to develop other sites for the same or similar employment use.

Tables 2 and 3 present a concise list of the appraisal questions posed, along with the 'decision rules' used to categorise performance. A red categorisation equates to the prediction of a 'significant constraint', an amber categorisation equates to the prediction of a 'potentially significant constraint', and a green categorisation equates to the prediction of 'no constraint'.

The decision rules are quantitative. This allows for the analysis of the sites to be undertaken using Geographical Information System (GIS) software. No qualitative information / professional judgement has been drawn on when categorising sites as red, green or amber. Where subjective judgement has been used, this is highlighted.

Most of the rules are distance related. It is important to note that all distances are 'as the crow flies' as it was not possible to take account of routes / pathways (e.g. the distance of the route that would be taken in practice when walking or travelling by private vehicle to reach a local centre). Most distance rules have been developed internally by the plan-making / SA team, following a review of thresholds applied as part of Site Allocation / SA processes elsewhere in England. A number of thresholds reflect the assumption that 400m is a distance that is easily walked by those with young children and the elderly.

Updates to site appraisal findings

Given that the Local Plan has been prepared over a period of years, the accuracy of data used to appraise initial site options has deteriorated over time for some factors. Where such changes have been identified, the site options have been reappraised accordingly. This ensures that all site options have been appraised using the same criteria and information regardless of when they were appraised and presented for consultation.

Changes have been made to reflect the following updates to data,

Air quality – The extent of the AQMA differed on the GIS layers used to appraise initial site options (I.e. those that were presented in the interim SA Report in March 2014) compared to further site options that were appraised (*i.e. those presented in the October 2015 focused REG18 consultation*).

New schools, health facilities and post offices – The appraisal of initial site options has been refreshed to ensure that access to services reflects the closure and opening of facilities since 2013.

Table 2: Site appraisal questions and decision rules

rapie 2. Site appraisal questions and decisio	
Criteria	Scoring
Accessibility	
How far is the site from the Maidstone Urban Area or a Rural Service Centre? Not applicable for employment site options	 R = Not adjacent to the Maidstone Urban Area, or a rural service centre and would not be more accessible to services even if other sites were allocated A = Adjacent to the Maidstone Urban Area or a rural service centre,
	or could be more accessible to services if other sites allocated as well G = Within the Maidstone Urban Area or a rural service centre
How far is the site from the nearest medical hub or GP service?	R = >800m A = 400m - 800m
Not applicable for employment site options	G = <400m
How far is the site from the nearest secondary school?	R = >3900m
	A = 1600-3900m G = <1600m;
Not applicable for employment site options	
How far is the site from the nearest primary school?	R = >1200m
	A = 800-1200m G = <800m;
Not applicable for employment site options	G = <00011,
How far is the site from the nearest post office?	R = >800m A = 400m - 800m
Not applicable for employment site options	G = <400m
How far is the site from the nearest outdoor sports facilities (i.e. playing pitch, tennis courts)?	A = >1.2km G = <1.2km
Not applicable for employment site options	
How far is the site from the nearest children's play space?	A = >300m from 'neighbourhood' children's play space G = <300m
Not applicable for employment site options	
How far is site from the nearest area of publicly accessible greenspace (>2ha in size)?	A = >300m (ANGST) G = <300m
Not applicable for employment site options	
Economy	
How accessible is the site to local employment	R= >2400m
provision (i.e. employment sites or the nearest local service centre?)	A = 1600-2400m
	G = <1600m
Will allocation of the site result in loss of employment land/space?	 R = Allocation will lead to significant loss of employment land/space A = Allocation will lead to some loss of employment land/space G = Allocation will not lead to the loss of employment land/space
Will allocation of the site result in employment- generating development in or close to (<2400m) deprived areas?	A = Not within or close to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within the country, according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation, 2010.
Only applicable for employment site options and mixed use site options	G = Within or close to the 40% most deprived Super Output Areas within the country.

Criteria	Scoring
Transport and accessibility	
How far is the site from the nearest bus stop?	R = >800m A = 400 - 800m G = <400m
How far is the site from the nearest train station?	R = >800m A = 400 - 800m G = <400m
How far is the site from the nearest cycle route?	R = >800m A = 400 - 800m G = <400m
Landscape, townscape and the his	toric environment
Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)?	 A = On a SAM OR Allocation will lead to development adjacent to a SAM with the potential for negative impacts G = Not on or adjacent to a SAM and is unlikely to have an adverse impact on a nearby SAM.
Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a listed building?	 A = Contains or is adjacent to a listed building and there is the potential for negative impacts. G = Not on or adjacent to a listed building and is unlikely to have an impact on a nearby listed building.
Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon a Conservation Area?	 A = Within or adjacent to a Conservation Area and there is the potential for negative impacts. G = Not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area and is unlikely to have an impact on a nearby listed building.
Does the site lie within an area with significant archaeological features/finds or where potential exists for archaeological features to be discovered in the future?	 A = Within an area where significant archaeological features are present, or it is predicted that such features could be found in the future. G = Not within an area where significant archaeological features have been found, or are likely to be found in the future. N = No information available at this stage
Is the site located within or in proximity to and/or likely to impact on the Kent Downs AONB?	 A = In close proximity to the Kent Downs AONB and/or there is the potential for negative impacts. G = Not in close proximity to the Kent Downs AONB and/or negative impacts on the AONB are unlikely.
Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, is the allocation of the site likely to cause harm to the objectives of the Green Belt designation?	 A = Within or adjacent to the Green Belt and development could potentially cause harm to the purposes of the Green Belt designation and/or its openness G = Not within or adjacent to the Green Belt
Would development of the site lead to any potential adverse impacts on local landscape character for which mitigation measures appropriate to the scale and nature of the impacts is unlikely to be achieved? *Determined through 2012 Landscape Character Assessment	R = Likely adverse impact (taking into account scale, condition and sensitivity issues), which is unlikely to be appropriately mitigated A = Likely adverse impact (taking into account scale, condition and sensitivity issues), which is likely to be appropriately mitigated G = Opportunity to enhance landscape character or there is unlikely to be an adverse impact
Landscape Sensitivity *Determined through Maidstone Landscape Capacity Study (2014)	 R = Low capacity to accommodate change A = Moderate capacity to accommodate change G = High capacity to accommodate change

Criteria	Scoring
Air quality and causes of climate c	hange
Are there potential noise problems with the site – either for future occupiers or for adjacent/nearby occupiers arising from allocation of the site?	 A = Potential adverse impact G = Unlikely adverse impact N = No information available at this stage
Is the site within or near to an AQMA?	 R = Within or adjacent to an AQMA A = <1km of an AQMA G = >1km of an AQMA
Land use	
Will allocation of the site lead to loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	 A = Includes Grade 1, 2 or 3 agricultural land G = Does not include 1, 2 or 3 agricultural land
Will allocation of the site make use of previously developed land?	 R = Does not include previously developed land A = Partially within previously developed land G = Entirely within previously developed land
Flood Risk	
Is allocation of the site within a flood zone?	R = Flood risk zone 3b A = Flood risk zone 2 or 3a G = Flood risk zone 1
Is the proposed use of the site appropriate in terms of guidance set out in the 'Technical Guidance to the NPPF' relating to flood risk? See table 3 (page 8) of the technical guidance.	 R = Development should not be permitted A = Exception test is required G = Development is appropriate
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructu	Ire
Is the allocation of the site likely to impact upon an Ancient Woodland (AW) or Ancient Semi- Natural Woodland (ASNW)?	R = Includes AW/ASNW A = <400m from an AW/ASNW G = >400m
Could allocation of the site have a potential adverse impact on a SSSI?	 A = Potential impacts identified by County Ecologist G = No likely impacts identified at this stage.
Could allocation of the site have a potential adverse impact on a designated Local Wildlife Site or Local Nature Reserve?	 A = Potential impacts identified by County Ecologist G = No likely impacts identified at this stage.

Appraisal findings

The following tables summarise the SA findings for all site options. The tables are grouped by the type and source of site options as follows:

Housing site options

- **Table 3:** Sites appraised and presented alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan.
- **Table 4**: Sites submitted for consideration following the Call for Sites undertaken at the same time as the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan.
- **Table 5**: Housing site options submitted following focused consultation in 2015

Employment and commercial site options

- **Table 6**: Employment site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan.
- **Table 7**: Mixed use and commercial site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan

Gypsy and Traveller site options

- **Table 8:** Site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan
- **Table 9:** Sites previously considered as candidates for the potential public Gypsy and Traveller site
- Table 10: Sites submitted as potential Gypsy and Traveller Locations (Call for Sites 2014)
- **Table 11:** Rejected housing, employment and mixed use sites from 2013 and 2014 SHLAA/SEDLAA)
- **Table 12:** Existing permanent Gypsy and Traveller Sites with possible potential for additional pitches

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Provimity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Ancient woodland	ISSS	Local Wildlife sites
HO1	Land at Horseshoes Lane, Langley																										
HO2	Bicknor Farm, Sutton Road, Langley													?													
HO3	Land off Marigold Way, Barming																										
HO4	Land rear of 3 Cripple Street, Loose																										
HO5	Roseacre Farm, Bell Lane, Bearsted																										
HO6	Land at Kent Cottage, Grigg Lane, Headcorn																										
HO7	Land between Ulcombe Road and Millbank, Headcorn																										
HO8	Plot 2, Stede Hill, Harrietsham																										
HO9	Puddledock, Caring Lane, Bearsted																										
HO10	Land off Oakapple Lane, Barming																										
HO11	The Old Goods Yard, Headcorn Road, Lenham																										
HO12	Land as Westfield Sole Road, Boxley																										
HO13	Land adjacent to Woodside, Firs Lane, Hollingbourne																										
HO14	Land at Millfield House, Headcorn Road, Staplehurst																										
HO15	Land off Headcorn Road, Staplehurst																										
HO16	Land opposite Green Lane Cottages, Green Lane, Langley																										
HO17	Land at Ashford Drive, Kingswood																										
HO18	Land at junction of Caring Lane and A20, Bearsted																										
HO19	Hoppersfield, Tonbridge Road, Barming																										

Table 3: All housing site options appraised prior to the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan.

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Proximity to train station	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildlife sites
HO20	Hoppersfield, Tonbridge Road, Barming																									
HO21	Land north of Teasaucer Hill, Loose																									
HO22	Land north of Cripple Street, Loose																									
HO23	Gore Court, Church Road, Otham																									
HO24	Land at Maidstone Road, Headcorn																									
HO25	6 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone																									
HO26	Rochester Meadow, Old Chatham Road, Sandling																									
HO27	Land north of Howland Road, Marden																									
HO28	Land west of Wentways, Warmlake Road, Chart Sutton																									
HO29	Mayfield Nursery, Ashford Road, Harrietsham																									
HO30	Land to the rear of Elizabeth House, Grigg Lane, Headcorn																									
HO31	Land south of Sutton Road, Langley																									
HO32	Louverne, Stede Hill, Harrietsham																									
HO33	Land north of Sutton Road, Langley																									
HO34	Land north of Pleasant Valley Lane, Dean Street, East Farleigh																									
HO35	Land at Dairy Lane, Chainhurst, Marden																									
HO36	Twelve Acre Farm, Grigg Lane, Headcorn																									
HO37	Highwoods Farm Packing Shed, Holly Farm, Holly Farm Road, Otham																									
HO38	Holly Farm, Holly Farm Road, Otham																									
HO39	Land at Iden Park, Cranbrook Road, Staplehurst																									

																1						-					
Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	Local Wildlife sites
HO40	Monchelsea Farm, Cock Street, Boughton Monchelsea																										
HO41	Land west of Hermitage Lane, Barming																										
HO42	The Walled Gardens, Barham Court, Tonbridge Road, Teston																										
HO43	Land at Heathfield, Heath Road, Coxheath																										
HO44	Land at Vicarage Field, Linton Hill, Linton																										
HO45	Land at Marden Cricket and Hockey Club, Stanley Road, Marden																										
HO46	Land at Ham Lane, Lenham																										
HO47	The MAP Depot, Goudhurst Road, Marden																										
HO48	Land at Glebe Gardens, Lenham																										
HO49	466-470 Loose Road, Maidstone																										
HO50	The Mote Cricket Club, Willow Way, Maidstone																										
HO51	Hockers Farm, Phase 1, Orchard View, Detling																										
HO52	Hockers Farm, Phase 2, Orchard View, Detling																										
HO53	Hockers Farm, Phase 3, Orchard View, Detling																										
HO54	Land to the north of Heath Road, Coxheath																										
HO55	Land adjacent to Cross Keys/Roundwell, Bearsted																										
HO56	Herts Farm, Old Loose Hill, Loose																										
HO57	The Old Quarry, Well Street, Loose																										
HO58	Land south of Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne																										
HO59	The Parsonage, land south of Marden																										

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Proximity to train station	Cvcle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildlife sites
HO60	Land at Oakapple Lane, Barming																										
HO61	Land adjoining Fishers Oast, Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst																										
HO62	Land at Forstal Lane, Coxheath																										
HO63	Land at Hubbards Lane/Haste Hill Road, Boughton Monchelsea																										
HO64	Land at South Lane, Sutton Valence																										
HO65	Land north west of Maidstone Road, Headcorn																										
HO66	Land East of Hermitage Lane, Barming																										
HO67	Land west of Burial Ground Lane, Tovil																										
HO68	Land at Postley Road, Maidstone																										
HO69	Land at Penenden Heath, west of Eclipse Business Park, Boxley																										
HO70	Land at Kings Road, Headcorn																										
HO71	Land north of Marden Road, Staplehurst																										
HO72	Land at Church Road, Harrietsham																										
HO73	Land at Stanley Farm, Marden																										
HO74	Land at Fant Farm, Maidstone																										
HO75	Land at Teiseside Nurseries, Lees Road, Laddingford																										
HO76	Land to rear of Kent Police HQ, Sutton Road, Maidstone																										
H077	Land at Kent Police Training School, Sutton Road, Maidstone																										
HO78	Land at West Street, Harrietsham																										
HO79	Land at Bell Farm, East Street, Harrietsham																										

SA of the Maidstone Local Plan

		-		1	1	1									_							-	-			-	
Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildlife sites
HO80	Land rear of 12 Caring Lane, Bearsted																										
HO81	Land at Sweetlands Lane, Staplehurst																										
HO82	Land at New Line Learning Academy, Heath Road, Loose																										
HO83	Gatland House, Gatland Lane, Maidstone																										
HO84	Land at Prospect House, Hunton Road, Marden																										
HO85	Moons Farm, Gallants Lane, East Farleigh																										
HO86	Grove Lodge, New Cut Road, Boxley																										
HO87	Land between Forge Lane and Chapel Lane, Bredhurst																										
HO88	Hazeldene Nursery, Dean Street, East Farleigh																										
HO89	Millfield Reclamation Yard, Holm Mill Lane / Greenway Lane, Harrietsham																										
HO90	Land south of M20 and west of Hockers Lane, Detling																										
HO91	Hockers Lane Operational Depot, Hockers Lane, Detling																										
HO92	Land to the north of Redic House, Warmlake Road, Sutton Valence																										
HO93	Site at Cuxton Road, Parkwood																										
HO94	Warmlake Business Park, Maidstone Road, Sutton Valence																										
HO95	Land at Farleigh Lane and Gatland Lane, Maidstone																										
HO96	Land adjacent to Godfrey House, Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne																										
HO97	Land at the corner of Dean Street and Lower Road, East Farleigh																										
HO98	Land at Vicarage Road, Yalding																										
HO99	Land at Boughton Mount, Boughton Lane, Loose																										

SA of the Maidstone Local Plan

													-				- 1				-	-	1				
Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area Archaeolocy	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	Local Wildlife sites
HO100	Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst																										
HO101	Land at Barty Farm, Roundwell, Bearsted																										
HO102	Land at Bletchingley Farm, Pristling Lane, Staplehurst																										
HO103	Laguna Motorcycles, Hart Street, Maidstone																										
HO104	Land at Valdene Industrial Estate, Sutton Valence																										
HO105	Land at Moat Farm, Moat Road, Headcorn																										
HO106	Rectory Fields, Frittenden Road, Staplehurst																										
HO107	Bridge Nurseries, London Road, Allington																										
HO108	Land east of Stede Hill and south of Pilgrims Way, Harrietsham																										
HO109	Land at New Line Learning Academy, Boughton Lane, Loose																										
HO110	Chapel Field, Plain Road, Marden																										
HO111	Redwall Farmhouse, Redwall Lane, Linton																										
HO112	Land at Boughton Lane, Loose																										
HO113	Land to the west of North Street, Barming																										
HO114	Land to the south of Oliver Road, Staplehurst																										
HO115	Copper Lane Pasture, Copper Lane, Marden																										
HO116	Land at Detling (south)																										
HO117	Land at Detling (north)																										
HO118	Land north of Horish Wood, Detling																										
HO119	Land at Linden Farm, Stockett Lane, Coxheath																										

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Provimity to train station	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodiand SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO120	Land at Hubbards Lane, Boughton Monchelsea																									
HO121	19-59 John Street, Maidstone																									
HO122	Land south of Marden Road, Staplehurst																									
HO123	Land north of Sutton Road and east of Church Lane, Otham																									
HO124	Land off Bow Hill, Wateringbury																									
HO125	Land east of Hockers Lane, Detling																									
HO126	Land at Fishers Farm, Fishers Road, Staplehurst																									
HO127	8-28 Boughton Lane, Loose																									
HO128	Land at Longsole Church, Long Rede Lane, Barming																									
HO129	Church Cross House, Church Lane, Barming																									
HO130	Land at 4 Malthouse Cottages, Dean Street, East Farleigh																									
HO131	Land adjacent to Lenham Road (next to tennis and cricket club), Headcorn																									
HO132	Land adjacent to Lenham Road, Headcorn																									
HO133	Land A, rear of Knaves Acre, Headcorn																									
HO134	Land B, rear of Knaves Acre, Headcorn																									
HO135	Land between Grigg Lane and Lenham Road, Headcorn																									
HO136	Land off Blind Lane and Dunn Street Road, Bredhurst																									
HO137	Land off Blind Lane and Dunn Street Road, Bredhurst																									
HO138	Land off Musket Lane, Hollingbourne																									
HO139	41 and 56 Valley Drive, Loose																									

r					1												1										-	
Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone Elond risk	Frood risk Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO140	Land rear of 127-141 Tonbridge Road, Maidstone																											
HO141	Land adjacent to Hollingbourne Station, Eyhorne Street, Hollingbourne																											
HO142	Land at 1B Whitmore Street, Maidstone																											
HO143	Land adjacent to Dean Street, East Farleigh																											
HO144	Old School Nursery, Station Road, Headcorn																											
HO145	Cleaveland, Chart Road, Chart Sutton																											
HO146	Lordswood urban extension, west of Sindals Lane and north of Westfield Sole Road, Boxley																											
HO147	Land rear of The Bell Inn, High Street, Staplehurst																											
HO148	The Acre, Eastwood Road, Ulcombe																											
HO149	Land east of South Road, Marden																					Т						
HO150	Land to the north of Vicarage Road, Yalding																											
HO151	Church Farm, Maidstone Road, Marden																											
HO152	Greengates, Lenham Road, Headcorn																											
HO153	Land at Great Love Farm, Love Lane, Headcorn																											
HO154	Broomfield Park, Kingswood																											
HO155	Maidstone urban extension																											
HO156	Tongs Meadow and land at Harrietsham Primary School, Harrietsham																											
HO157	Land south of Ashford Road, Harrietsham																											
HO158	Land at Langley Park, Sutton Road																											
HO159	Five Acre site adjacent to Bensted Close, West Street, Hunton																											

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Cycle routes Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area Archaeolony	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildlife sites	
HO160	The Grange, George Street, Staplehurst																										
HO2-161	Land to the west of Goudhurst Road, Marden																										
HO2-162	127 Hockers Lane, Detling																										
HO2-163	Oakdene Farm, Leeds Road, Langley																										
HO2-164	Land at the junction of Heath Road and Gallants Lane, East Farleigh																										
HO2-165	Barn Meadow (west of Oak Tree Cottage), The Street, Ulcombe																										
HO2-167	Winders (west of Reservoir Cottage), Lenham Road, Harrietsham																										
HO2-168	College Farm, Ulcombe Hill, Ulcombe																										
HO2-169	Jarrak Barn (south of 15 Caring Lane), Caring Lane, Bearsted																										
HO2-170	Land adjacent to Four Wents Orchard, Chartway Street, Sutton Valence																										
HO2-171	Land at George Street, Staplehurst																										
HO2-172	Land off Heath Road, Boughton Monchelsea																										
HO2-173	Land south of Court Lodge Cottages, Court Lodge Road, Harrietsham																										
HO2-174	Land south of Grigg Lane, Headcorn																										
HO2-175	Land at Green Lane, Langley																										
HO2-176	Whippet Meadow, Hockers Lane, Detling																										
HO2-177	Top Meadow, Hockers Lane, Detling																										
HO2-178	Land at the junction of New Cut Road and Bearsted Road, Maidstone																										
HO2-179	Upper Horseshoe Farm, Dean Street, East Farleigh																										
HO3-186	Haynes Brothers Ltd, Ashford Road, Maidstone																										

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	E.	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to pray space	Proximity to employment sites	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features		Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood risk	3	Local Wildlife sites
HO2-187	Whatman site, Springfield Mill, Sandling Road, Maidstone																							
HO2-188	Land parcel A at Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham																							
HO2-189	Springfield Square, Royal Engineers Road, Maidstone																							

(2014) Landscape character assessment Proximity to employment sites Scheduled Ancient Monument Access to GP or medical hub School Listed Building and features Proximity to outdoor sports Access to Primary School Loss of employment land? Proximity to greenspace Proximity to train station Proximity to Post Office Proximity to play space change Proximity to bus stop Kent Downs AONB Area sites Ancient woodland centres Agricultural land Access to Secondary Cycle routes Archaeology Flood risk Flood zone Air quality Green Belt Land use Local Wildlife Conservation þ Noise SSSI Site ID Site Name Location apacitv 9 Access andscape c HO3-200 Land adjacent to Forge House, Beresford Hill **Boughton Monchelsea** HO3-212 Green Lane **Boughton Monchelsea** H03-215 Land north of the Limes **Boughton Monchelsea** HO3-217 Land opposite the Limes **Boughton Monchelsea** HO3-220 Land at Hubbards Lane **Boughton Monchelsea** HO3-234 Land at Church Street **Boughton Monchelsea** HO3-245 Lyewood Farm, Green Lane **Boughton Monchelsea** Boughton Garage, Cock Street HO3-251 **Boughton Monchelsea** H03-269 Land west of Gandy's Lane **Boughton Monchelsea** H03-198 Yelton at Heath Road Coxheath HO3-201 Land adjacent to Woodview, Heath Road Coxheath 78 Heath Road HO3-203 Coxheath HO3-248 Herts Farm Coxheath HO3-256 North of Heath Road (Olders Field) (MX-4) Coxheath HO3-224 Upper Dane, Ashford Road Harrietsham HO3-266 Land off West Street Harrietsham HO3-282 **Bell Farm North** Harrietsham HO3-238 Land at Lenham Road Headcorn

Table 4: Housing sites options submitted for consideration following the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation

Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AUNB			andscape capacity to change (2014) Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO3-261	Land at Tong Farm between Mill Bank (A274) and Ulcombe	Headcorn								-												_			-					
HO-24 HO3-262	Roads, Headcorn - red area Land at Tong Farm between Mill Bank (A274) and Ulcombe Road, Headcorn	Headcorn																												
HO3-278	Moat Road	Headcorn																							/					
HO3-306	Land North of Lenham Road Headcorn	Headcorn																						Ť	/					
HO3-189	Land adjacent the Windmill PH, Eyhorne Street	Hollingbourne																												
HO3-247	Coutams Hall, Eyhorne Street	Hollingbourne																												
HO3-249	Grove Mill Cottage, Eyhorne Street	Hollingbourne																							/					
HO3-308	Land west of Eyhorne Street North of Millennium Green	Hollingbourne																												
HO3-195	Land r/o Loder Close, Ham Lane	Lenham																												
HO3-202	Land off Old Ham Lane	Lenham																												
HO3-209	Land between Robins Avenue and Hollywood Road	Lenham																												
HO3-219	Lenham Cricket Pitch, Ham Lane	Lenham																												
HO3-221	Grove Paddock, Ashford Road	Lenham																												
HO3-264	Land south of Old Ashford Road, Tanyard Farm	Lenham																												
HO3-297	Land S of Old Ashford Rd E of Tanyard Fm	Lenham																												
HO3-301	Land at Kilnwood Meadow Old Ham Lane Lenham	Lenham																												
HO3-197	Pattenden Farm	Marden																												
HO3-235	Land at Maidstone Road	Marden																												
HO3-246	Land South of the Parsonage	Marden																												

Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop		Noise Air cuality	Agricultural larid	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014)	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO3-190	Land Rear of Station Newsagents (known as Braemar)	Staplehurst																										
HO3-240	South of Marden Road, Staplehurst	Staplehurst																					\square					
HO3-259	Land at Henhurst Farm	Staplehurst																										
HO3-260	Land north of Henhurst Farm	Staplehurst																										
HO3-274	Duckhurst Farmyard, Clapper Lane	Staplehurst																										
HO3-275	Baldwins Farm, Marden Road, Staplehurst	Staplehurst																										
HO3-283	Land at Lodge Road	Staplehurst																					\square					
HO3-193	Whole site - Southfield Stables, South Lane	Sutton Valence																										
HO3-194	Area A - Southfield Stables, South Lane	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-196	Land at Wind Chimes, Chartway Street	Sutton Valence																										
HO3-199	Land at Tumbers Hill	Sutton Valence																										
HO3-216	Brandy's Bay, South Lane	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-227	Land North East of Old Belringham Hall	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-232	Land at Barchams, Wind Chimes and East Went	Sutton Valence																										
HO3-244	South Belringham, South Lane	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-250	Land at The Oaks, Maidstone Road	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-267	West of South Lane	Sutton Valence																					\square					
HO3-284	Forsham House, Forsham Lane	Sutton Valence																					?	Δ				
HO3-191	2 Orchard Cottages, Lughorse Lane	Yalding																					\square					
HO3-276	Cheveny Farm, Vicarage Road	Yalding																					\square					

																			1		r	r							
Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station Cycle routes	Air cuality	Action (Land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014) Flood zone	Flood rick	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO3-277	Wards Moat, Vicarage Road	Yalding																											
HO3-293	New Barn Farm, Yalding Hill	Yalding																											
HO3-305	Land South of Kenward Road Yalding	Yalding																											
HO3-304	Land north of Kenward Road Yalding	Yalding																											
HO3-192	Bridge Industrial Centre, Wharf Road, Tovil	Urban area																											
HO3-204	The Dunning Hall, off Fremlin Walk	Urban area																											
HO3-211	18-21 Foster Street	Urban area																											
HO3-213	Slencrest House,Tonbridge Road	Urban area																											
HO3-214	75-75a College Road	Urban area																											
HO3-223	The Russell Hotel, 136 Boxley Road	Urban area																											
HO3-225	Playing Fields at St Simon Stock Catholic School	Urban area																											
HO3-226	South of Hermitage Court, Hermitage Lane	Urban area																											
HO3-229	Land at Little Squerryes, Church Road, Otham	Urban area																											
HO3-230	Baltic Wharf, St Peters Street	Urban area																											
HO3-231	North Car Park, Baltic Wharf, St Peter's Street	Urban area																											
HO3-239	180-188 Union Street	Urban area																											
HO3-243	Land at Former Astor of Hever Community School	Urban area																											
HO3-254	Granada House, Lower Stone Street	Urban area																											
HO3-268	Tovil Working Men's Club	Urban area																											
HO3-271	Land south of Cripple Street, Loose	Urban area																											

			r																								 	- 	
Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Drovimity to train station	Cvcle routes	Noice	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014) Flood zone	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO3-272	Homewood Orchard, Farleigh Lane	Urban area																											
HO3-280	Banky Meadow, north of Fauchons Lane, Bearsted	Urban area																											
HO3-300	Bearstead Station Goods Yard	Urban area																											
HO-95	(part of) Half Yoke Land	Urban area																											
HO3-309	Land at Wrens Cross, Upper Stone Street	Urban area																											
HO3-295	Rear of the Orchard Spot, Downswood	Urban area																											
HO3-205	Land at Beechen Bank, off Lordswood Lane	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-208	Land Adjacent to Charlsford Avenue, Kingswood	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-210	Land at Butlers Farm, Horseshoes Lane, Langley	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-218	Eaglesham, Marley Road, Harrietsham	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-222	Land at Home Farm Oast, Lenham Heath	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-228	Land at Kingswood, Charlesford Avenue, Ulcombe	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-233	Dickley Court	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-236	Yew Tree House, Upper Leeds, Leeds	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-237	Land at the Old Forge, Chartway Street	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-241	Woodford Farm, Maidstone Road (MX-5)	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-242	Land sth of Lenham Road, Platts Heath	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-252	Oakdene Farm, Maidstone Road	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-253	Land next to the Old Cyder House, Teston Corner	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-255	Land at Bottle Screw Hill	Outside of settlements																											

Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014)	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildhife eitee	Local vviidlife sites
HO3-257	Land to the North of Langley	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-258	Land to the West of Young and Partners, Plough Wents Road, Langley	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-263	Keepers Farm, Old Ham Lane, Lenham	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-265	Land at Belmont, New Road, Langley	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-270	Bentlettes Scrap Yard, Laddingford	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-273	Adjacent Ivans Field, Chart Sutton	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-279	Knoll House/Ransoms/Tower House, A229	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-281	Land at rear of Peg Tile Cottage, Goudhurst Road, Marden	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-285	Frith Cottage, Dean Street, East Farleigh	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-287	Highlands Kennels, Chartway Street	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-288	Durrants Farm, Hunton	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-289	Lower Gallants Farm, East Farleigh	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-290	Pleasant Valley Farm, East Farleigh	Outside of settlements																											T	
HO3-291	Rear of Barker Cottages, New Cut, East Farleigh	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-292	St Helens Lane, East Farleigh	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-296	Land at Lested Lane, Chart Sutton	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-298	Land adj Turgis Close, Langley	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-299	Land west of Ledian Farm	Outside of settlements																												
HO3-302	Land between Forge Lane and Chapel Lane (rear of Green Court) Bredhurst	Outside of settlements																												

Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	o Secondar	Access to Primary School Drovimity to Doet Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	2 5	Proximity to greenspace	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	scape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014) Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
HO3-303	Land east of Gandy's Lane Boughton Monchelsea	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-307	Land rear of 127 Hockers Lane Thurnham	Outside of settlements																											
HO3-311	Land adj. Eden Lodge Pye Corner Ulcombe	Outside of settlements																											

		-														_													
Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to pray space	Provimity to employment sites/	Proximity to local centre	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station Cvcle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AUNB Groop Balt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014)		Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI 1 aad 1 Mildliff, a too	Local vviiglite sites
HO3-301	Kilnwood Land East of Old Ham	Lenham																											
HO3-312	Land adj. to Old Goods Yard	Lenham																											
HO3-313	Land adjacent Detling Aerodrome Industrial Estate	Detling																											
HO3-314	Land at Bydews Place	Tovil																											
HO3-315	Land at Downsoak Stud West Street	Harrietsham																											
HO3-316	Land at Ledian Farm Upper Street	Leeds																											
HO3-317	Land west at Ledian Farm Upper Street	Leeds																							1				
HO3-318	Land north east of Forge Lane	Bredhurst																											
HO3-319	Land south of Tovil	Tovil																											
HO3-320	Land south of Warmlake Road	Chart Sutton																											
HO3-321	Nutbrow Land adj. Boyton Court Road Tumblers Hill	Sutton Valence																											

Table 5: Housing site options submitted following focused consultation in 2015

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to deprived communities	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Schadulad Anciant Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
ED-1	Land to the rear of Barradale Farm, Maidstone Road, Headcorn				\angle																							
ED-2	Maidstone Market, Detling Industrial Estate, Detling				\angle																							
ED-3	Detling Airfield Industrial Estate, Detling				\square																							
ED-4	Land adjacent to Wheelbarrow Industrial Estate, Pattenden Lane, Marden				\angle																							
ED-5	Land at Hill Farm, Linton Hill, Linton			\angle	\angle	\square																						
ED-6	Waterside Park, land south of M20 junction 8 and east of Old Mill Lane					\square																						
ED-7	Weald Gardens, Maidstone Road, Staplehurst					\square																						
ED-8	Wickham Field, Pattenden Lane, Marden					\square	\square																					
ED-9	Land at Eclipse Park, Sittingbourne Road, Boxley						\square		/																			
ED-10	Island Site, Junction 6 M20, Chatham Road, Boxley						\square																					
ED-11	Land to the south of Claygate Distribution, Pattenden Lane, Marden																											
ED-12	Land at Woodcut Farm, Ashford Road, Hollingbourne			\angle		\square																						
ED-13	Haynes Brothers Ltd, Ashford Road, Maidstone				\angle																							
ED-14	Land at Lenham Quarry, Sandway, Lenham					\square																						
ED-15	Land at Newnham Park, Bearsted Road, Boxley						4		\square	//																		
ED2-16	Rough Shave Wood (west of Rose Croft), The Street, Ulcombe			\square			\square																					
ED2-17	Former Syngenta Works, Hampstead Lane, Yalding								Δ																			
ED2-18	Land at Westfield Sole Road, Boxley			\backslash	/																							

Table 6: Employment site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan.

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	nity to	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	loyment la	Proximity to deprived	to bus	Proximity to train station	Oycie routes Noise	Air guality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	sted Building and features	Conserv	aeolog	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character	Flood zone	Flood risk	>	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
ED2-19	Land at Cobtree Forstal, Forstal Road, Aylesford	\checkmark	\bigvee	\bigvee	\bigvee	\square	\land	\wedge	Λ	\wedge																				
ED2-20	Whatman site, Springfield Mill, Sandling Road, Maidstone			\square				\wedge	Δ	\land																				

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to deprived communities	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise Air guality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt I andscane character assessment	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
MX1	Land south of Headcorn railway station, Headcorn																											
MX2	The Old Goods Yard, Headcorn Road, Lenham																											
MX3	8 Faversham Road, Lenham																											
MX4	Land north of Heath Road, Coxheath																											
MX5	Woodford Farm, Maidstone Road, Staplehurst																											
MX6	Land at The Oaks, Maidstone Road, Sutton Valence																											
MX7	Duckhurst Farm, Clapper Lane, Staplehurst																					T						
MX8	Ledian Farm, Upper Street, Leeds																											
MX9	Former Pickfords Removals Ltd, Hart Street, Maidstone																											
MX10	Ringles Nursery, Grigg Lane, Headcorn																											
MX11	Land parcel A at Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham																											
MX12	Land parcel B at Tanyard Farm, Old Ashford Road, Lenham																											
MX13	Springfield Square, Royal Engineers Road, Maidstone																											
MX14	Land off Unicumes Lane, Maidstone																											
MX15	27 Mote Road, Maidstone																											
MX16	Clockhouse Farm, Heath Road, Coxheath																											

 Table 7: Mixed use and commercial site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Sor	Access to Primary School Proximity to Post Office	outdoc	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Proximity to deprived communities	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Lycle routes Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building and features	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
MX2-17	Maidstone East and Royal Mail Sorting Office, Maidstone																										
MX2-18	King Street Car Park and former AMF bowling site, Maidstone																										

Table 8 Site options appraised alongside the 2014 Regulation 18 Consultation on the draft Local Plan

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to Incal centre	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land I and use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment Landscape capacity to change (2014)	Elond zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
GT1	Congelow Farm																										
GT2	Greengates (plot 1), Lenham Road																										
GT3	Greengates (plot 2), Lenham Road																						1				
GT4	Hawthorn Farm, Pye Corner, Ulcombe																						1				
GT5	Cherry Gardens, Collier Street																										
GT6	Home Farm, Sweetlands Lane																										
GT3-9	Acers Place / Land adjoining Greengates																										
GT3-10	Quarter Paddocks, Bletchenden Road																										
GT3-11	The Chances, Lughorse Lane, Hunton																										
GT3-12	Ash Tree Place / Catchment cottages																										
GT3-13	Little Boarden, Boarden Lane																										
GT3-15	Perfect Place, Park Wood Lane																										
GT3-16	The Vine, Green Hill Lane, Ulcombe																										
GT3-17	Green Tops, Symonds Lane, Yalding																										
GT3-20	The Stables / Land east of Maplehurst Lane																										
GT3-21	Land rear of The Meadows (plots 1-10),																										
GT3-22	The Stables, Wagon Lane, Yalding																										

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality Acricultural Jand	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment Landscape capacity to change (2014)	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
GT3-23	Stilebridge Stableyard, Stilebridge Lane																											
GT3-24	Plot 3 The Meadows, Lenham Road																											
GT3-25	Franks Bridge, Smarden Road																											
GT3-26	Orchard Place, Benover Road, Collier Street																											
GT3-27	Lindfield Farm, WIllow Lane, Paddock Wood																											
GT3-28	The Paddock, Detling Hill, Thurnham																											
GT3-31	Land rear of Brickyard Cottages, Redwall Lane																											
GT3-33	The Three Sons, Hampstead Lane, Nettlestead																											
GT3-34	Eight Acres, Tilden Lane, Marden																											
GT3-36	Huntsman's Stables, Maidstone Road																											
GT3-37	Land at Cherry Tree Farm, West Wood Road																											
GT3-38	Land at Squirrel Wood, Rumstead Lane																											
GT3-39	Flips Hole, South Street Road, Stockbury																											
GT3-40	The Ash, Yelsted Road, Stockbury																											
GT3-41	Fairhaven, Queen Street, Yalding																											
GT3-42	Hertsfield Farm, Staplehurst Road, Marden																											
GT3-43	Plot 5, Land at Lughorse Lane, Hunton																											

Site ID	Site Name	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites/ Proximity to local centre	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality Adricultural Jand	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change (2014)	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI Local Wildlife sites	
GT3-44	Oak Lodge, Tilden Lane, Marden																												
GT3-45	Land rear of The Meadows (plot 13)																												
GT3-46	Oak Tree Farm																												
GT3-47	Park Wood Stables, Park Wood Lane																												
GT3-49	Land east of Water Lane, Water Lane																												

	iles previously considered as candidates		,	, , , ,	<u> </u>		741	. 0110	. 01																					
Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	GP or med	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Kont Downs AONE	Green Belt	Landscape character	Landscape capacity to change	Flood zone	Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
Possible Site 33	Land north of Haste Hill Road	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 34	Land south of the old Barn House	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 35	Land north of Green Lane, Laburnam Cottage	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 36	Land north of Green Lane, south of Lyewood	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 43	Land north of Heath Road, Parsonage Farm	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 46	Land north of Parsonage Farm	Stockbury																												
Possible Site 47	Land north of Church Lane, n. of South St	Stockbury																												
Possible Site 48	Land south of Church Lane, jct. South Street	Barming																												
Possible Site 65	Land at Dean Street	Coxheath																												
Possible Site 66	Land at Hurst Road	Bredhurst																												
Possible Site 67	Land off Dean Street	North of Coxheath																												
Possible Site 74	Monchelsea Farm	Boughton Monchelsea																												
Possible Site 78	Manor Farm	Sutton Valance																												
Possible Site 81	Land adjacent to The Nook	Yalding																												
Possible Site 84	Land adj Gallants Lane	near Coxheath																												
Possible Site 86	Land at Gallants Lane	Coxheath																												
Possible Site 87	Land at Lower Rd, Farleigh Green	East Farleigh																												
Possible Site 97	Land at Chart Sutton, Chart Sutton	Chart Sutton																												
Possible Site 98	Land at Tyland Lane	Sandling																												
Possible Site 101	The Stumps, Lenham Road	Kingswood																												
Possible Site 107	Land south Tumblers Hill	Sutton Valance																							\square					
Possible Site 108	Land south Ploughwents Road	Chart Sutton																												
Possible Site 110	Garages off Grasslands	Langley																												

Table 9: Sites previously considered as candidates for the potential public Gypsy and Traveller site

	Sites submitted as potential Gypsy and	Traveller Locations (Call	IOF S	nes	s 20	114).																		
Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres		Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	y to Post C	Proximity to outdoor sports Proximity to play space	Proximity to employment sites	Loss of employment land?	Proximity to bus stop Provimity to train station	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Land use	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Flood zone Flood risk	Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
GT3 50	Land Kingswood Farm	Ulcombe																						
GT3 51	Five Acres, Tilden Lane	Marden																						
GT3 J2	Blossom Lodge Stocket Lane	Coxheath																						
HO3 208	Land adjacent Charlesford Avenue	Kingswood																						
HO3 210	Butlers Farm, Horseshoes Lane	Langley																						
HO3 218	Eaglesham, Marley Road	Harrietsham																						
GT1	Congelow Farm	Yalding																						

Table 11:	Rejected housing, employment and mixed use	e sites from 2013 and 20	014 SF	HLA.	A/SE	EDL	AA								
HO3-198	Land adjoining `Yelton` at Heath Road, Coxheath	Coxheath													
HO3-281	Land at rear of Peg Tile Cottage	Marden & Yalding													
HO3-274	Duckhurst Farmyard, Clapper Lane, Staplehurst	Staplehurst													
HO3-291	Rear of Barker Cottages, New Cut, East Farleigh	Coxheath													
ED14	Sandway Quarry	Nr Lenham													
ED2 - 16	Rough Shave Wood	Ulcombe													

Table 10 Sites submitted as potential Gypsy and Traveller Locations (Call for Sites 2014)

Table 12 Existing permanent Gypsy and Traveller Sites with possible potential to expand or intensify

Site ID	Site Name	Location	Access to centres	Access to GP or medical hub	Access to Secondary School	Access to Primary School	Proximity to Post Office	Proximity to outdoor sports	Proximity to play space	Proximity to greenspace	Proximity to employment sites	Proximity to bus stop	Proximity to train station	Cycle routes	Noise	Air quality	Agricultural land	Scheduled Ancient Monument	Listed Building	Conservation Area	Archaeology	Kent Downs AONB	Green Belt	Landscape character assessment	Landscape capacity to change	Flood risk Ancient woodland	SSSI	Local Wildlife sites
4	Fairview, Osborne Drive	Detling Hill																										
5	Little Acre, Chart Hill Road	Chart Sutton																										
7	Peacock Farm, Chart Hill Road	Chart Sutton																										
8	Chart View, Chart Hill Road	Chart Sutton																										
9	Chart Hill Paddock, Chart Hill Road	Chart Sutton																										
42	Mulberry Farm. East Street	Hunton																										
57	The Kays, Heath Road	Linton																										
59	Plum Tree Farm, Park Road	Marden																										
80	Blue Bell Farm, George Street	Staplehurst																										
81	The Paddocks, George Street	Staplehurst																										
84	Kilnwood Farm, Old Ham Lane	Lenham																										
109	Near Neverend Farm, Pye Corner	Ulcombe																										
115	Roydon Farm, Pye Corner	Ulcombe																										
125	Emmett Hill Nursery, Emmett Hill Lane	Yalding																										
167	Cobnut Tree Place (plot 1), Church Hill	Boughton																						/				
168	Greenacre (plot 5), Church Hill	Boughton Monchelsea																										
170	Four Oakes (plot 2), Church Hill	Boughton Monchelsea																										
173	Granada, Lenham Road	Headcorn																							$\langle $			
186	Orchard Farm Nursery Plot 1	Chartway Street																										

APPENDIX V: APPRAISAL OF BROAD LOCATIONS FOR HOUSING

Introduction

As described within Part 2 of the main SA Report document, an interim stage of plan-making / SA involved appraising the following alternative approaches:

- 1) Broad Location for Housing Development in Lenham
- 2) Broad Location for Housing Development in Headcorn

The interim appraisal findings are presented in full within this Appendix. The appraisal table should be read alongside the corresponding section of Part 2, where an explanation can be found of the degree to which the Council took on-board SA findings when determining the preferred approach as set out in the Preferred Options consultation document.

Methodology

See discussion within Appendix II.

Appraisal findings

Sustainability	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u>		
objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2
Housing	Both options would have a significant positive effect on the baseline by supporting the development of a substantial amount of houses at a broad location. However, Lenham has capacity to deliver a higher volume of housing than Headcorn at a strategic broad location. The average house price in Lenham is currently lower than for Headcorn.		
Flooding	Development at a broad Location in Lenham would fall within Flood Zone 1. Development at a broad location in Headcorn would be mainly within Flood Zone 1, but would be surrounded by a substantial area at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3). Mitigation measures would need to be secured to ensure that development in Headcorn did not increase surface water run-off and the risk of flooding off site.	-	Û
lealth	Both locations are located within reasonable walking distance of a GP. The development of housing would also help to address housing affordability issues in the rural service centres, which could have a positive effect on wellbeing.	û	Û
Poverty	Neither alternative is likely to have a significant impact on the baseline position. Both locations do not fall within areas of deprivation and are unlikely to support regeneration in areas of need.	-	-
Education	Development at a broad location within Lenham would be accessible to a secondary school within walking distance. However, contributions towards enhancement would be necessary to support the significant increase in population. The closest secondary school to Headcorn is over 8km away and therefore less accessible. Contributions would also be required towards additional places at receiving schools in other settlements. It is uncertain at this stage whether the additional population would support the development of a secondary school in Headcorn. If this was possible, it could benefit the existing population.	Û	Û
Crime	Neither alternative is likely to have a significant impact on the baseline position.	-	-

Sustainability	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u>		
objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2
Vibrant Community	Neither alternative is likely to have a significant impact on the baseline position.	-	-
Accessibility	Both Lenham and Headcorn contain a train station, which could support public transport use. However, development at Lenham would be slightly closer to the train station on foot compared to development in Headcorn. The service from Headcorn consists of trains approximately every 30minutes towards Tonbridge, which connects to Maidstone Centre, with the journey time ranging from 49 minutes – 72 minutes. The service from Lenham towards Maidstone is less frequent with only one service an hour. However, the journey time to Maidstone is within 17 minutes. Both locations are within close proximity on foot to existing bus services. Arriva bus services from Headcorn to Maidstone are fairly frequent at peak travel times from 06.42am up until about 8.00am when the service becomes hourly. Return journeys from Maidstone run at a similar frequency ⁹⁵ . Stagecoach service 10X runs from Lenham to Maidstone starting at 6.47am. The services are fairly frequent until 8:00am and then they go hourly ⁹⁶ . On balance, the public transport links seem comparable at each broad location. In terms of access to local services and facilities, some parts of the broad locations at Headcorn and Lenham are not within reasonable walking distance of accessible natural greenspace or childrens play spaces. However, provision could be enhanced as part of any development. Access to primary schools is adequate at both locations, although Headcorn has poor access to a secondary school on foot. Both locations have access to GP services, although the capacity to take on additional patients at these practices is not known. Both locations would have positive implications in terms of promoting access to local services and facilities through development contributions. The impacts are not considered to be significant; but there is some merit in allocating a broad location for housing development at both locations.	Û	Û
Culture	Neither alternative is likely to have a significant impact on the baseline position.	-	-

 ⁹⁵ Available online at: <u>http://www.arrivabus.co.uk/serviceInformation.aspx?id=12386</u> [accessed March, 2014]
 ⁹⁶ Available online at: <u>http://www.nationalrail.co.uk/posters/LEN.pdf</u> [accessed March, 2014]

Sustainability objective	Discussion of significant effects			
	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	
Land Use	Both alternatives would result in the loss of greenfield land and some Grade 3 agricultural land. This would have negative implications.	Û	Û	
Congestion	The employment opportunities within each service centre are unlikely to support the increased population. However, of the two locations, Lenham is more closely related to key employment areas. For both alternatives, the majority of residents would be likely to travel by car to work, predominately into the Maidstone Town Centre and the strategic employment allocation at Newnham Park. Residents travelling by car from Lenham would be likely to use the M20 Motorway and/ or A20 to access Maidstone Town Centre for employment opportunities, whilst residents in Headcorn would be likely to use the A274. Increased flows of traffic into the urban area along these routes could have negative implications, especially within the 'inner corden'. The impacts are not thought to be significant in isolation, but would contribute to increased traffic cumulatively with other developments. Lenham offers much quicker journey times to the town centre by train than Headcorn, which could encourage the use of public transport. However, the service is infrequent.	<mark>ሁ</mark> በ	Û	
Climate Change	Development at either location would only be anticipated to take place later in the plan period. At this stage, it is expected that standards of sustainability in construction will be higher, possibly zero carbon. This would help to provide more efficient housing stock, having a positive effect in terms of reducing carbon emissions from the built environment. However, this would happen anyway as standards are set nationally. Both developments would be likely to promote the continued use of private cars, as higher-order retail, public services and employment opportunities would need to be sought outside the rural service centres. Whilst there are public transport links, these are not particularly frequent, and the evidence suggests that car use is high. Road transport emissions would therefore be expected to increase in line with current trends. Development at both locations would need to be designed to help adapt to the effects of climate change. Good design would help to ensure that the new communities were well adapted in terms of providing shading, appropriate landscaping and drainage. However, Headcorn is surrounded by areas at risk of flooding, so it would be particularly important to ensure that new development was resilient to and did not contribute to the effects of climate change on flood risk. Conversely, there might be opportunities to improve surface water drainage as part of new development, which could have positive implications.	-	?	

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects		
objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2
	Development at both broad locations has the potential for negative impacts on wildlife habitats and species, but the issues would need to be explored in greater detail at the planning application stage. Development at a broad location in Lenham could have an impact on a number of areas of ancient woodland around the settlement through increased recreation pressure and disturbance during construction. However, it should be possible to avoid impacts on these areas, and even perhaps to secure enhancements. An uncertain impact has been recorded at this stage.		
Biodiversity	Development in Headcorn could be constrained by the control of discharge into the River Beult (SSSI), as this is one of the primary reasons for its unfavourable condition. Additional housing would require treatment and disposal of waste water, but there are capacity issues with current infrastructure. There are also small patches of deciduous woodland (confirmed) and traditional orchard (unconfirmed) within close proximity, which are both BAP priority habitats. The potential for negative impacts is greater in Headcorn due to the sensitivity of the River Beult SSSI and potential difficulties in managing additional waste water. Mitigation might be possible, but at this stage the precautionary principle has been applied in determining a significant negative effect for alternative 2.	?	
Countryside and Heritage	Development at a broad location in Headcorn would be likely to encroach upon the open countryside in areas identified as 'highly sensitive' ⁹⁷ . Headcorn is washed over by the Low Weald Landscape of Local Value. Development of a broad location in Headcorn would also significantly alter the character and shape of the settlement. This would constitute a significant negative effect. Development at a broad location in Lenham would form a more logical extension to the settlement, but would nevertheless alter the scale and character of Lenham. There would also be potential significant negative effects on the settling on the Kent Downs AONB, but there are areas of Lenham that are better related to / screened from the AONB so it ought to be possible to direct development to the less sensitive areas within a broad location. Impacts would need to be explored further and mitigation measures would need to be secured at development application stage.	?	
Waste	Neither alternative is likely to have a significant impact on the baseline position.	-	-

SA REPORT: APPENDICES

⁹⁷ A number of site options (assessed in the SA) in Headcorn fall within areas identified as having low capacity to accommodate change. It is possible these would form part of a 'broad location' for growth.

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects		
objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2
Water Management	Both alternatives would be likely to increase the consumption of water and pressure on waste water systems. Development in Headcorn is currently constrained by the waste water treatment works which is at capacity. There are also tight constraints on discharges into the River Beult, and limited space on site to expand facilities. Therefore, development would need to be supported by significant infrastructure investment. There may also be the potential for negative impacts on the quality of water courses. This constitutes a significant negative effect. Development in Lenham would also require infrastructure improvements to support the development of 1500 dwellings, however there are fewer constraints compared to Headcorn.	Û	
Energy	Development at either location would only be anticipated to take place later in the plan period. At this stage, it is expected that standards of sustainability in design and construction will be higher, possibly zero carbon. This would help to provide more efficient housing stock, having a positive effect in terms of reducing carbon emissions from the built environment. However, the impacts have been identified as neutral, as standards are expected to improve at a national level, so there would be no significant change from the projected baseline position. The potential for positive impacts would be realised if development was supported by larger decentralised energy schemes that can help to reduce emissions for existing building stock. However, at this stage, it is unknown whether the sites would be suitable for decentralised energy schemes. Further studies would be required to identify opportunities, but it is expected that on-site building integrated renewables would be most suitable than large scale wind or heat networks.	-	-
Economy	Development in both locations would help to support the local economy of the rural service centres. However, it would not support economic revival in areas of regeneration priority. Housing development in Lenham would be closer to key employment areas, and would also have good links to the motorway to access Newnham Park or opportunities outside the borough. However, the spatial strategy seeks to expand B2 / B8 development at Barradale industrial estate to the North West of Headcorn. This could create about 180 jobs ⁹⁸ depending upon the use, which could be accessed on foot by local residents in Headcorn.	Û	Û

⁹⁸ Assumes 1FTE job per 30m² (total of 5500m²)

Summary

Development of a broad location at both locations would help to support housing need in the Borough, although Lenham has the potential to support a higher number of dwellings than Headcorn. Both developments would also support the local economy and viability of the service centres, providing that social infrastructure is enhanced to support an increased population. There are potential for negative landscape impacts at both locations, but it would be more difficult to mitigate these at Headcorn and the character / form of the settlement would change significantly. Both developments would also require infrastructure improvements to support the additional requirement for water consumption and disposal. However, there are significant constraints in Headcorn that could be extremely costly to mitigate and might lead to adverse effects on water quality and biodiversity in the River Beult SSSI. On balance, access to services is slightly better in Lenham. Both centres have comparable public transport links to Maidstone and other centres, but Headcorn is poorly related in terms of access to a secondary school. Whilst the areas for development would largely be within Flood Zone 1 at both locations; the risk of flooding in the surrounding vicinity of Headcorn is greater.

Overall, it is considered that Alternative 1 (a broad location in Lenham) is the most sustainable location when considering the outcomes of the appraisal over the breadth of sustainability objectives.

APPENDIX VI: APPRAISAL OF ALTERNATIVES (MODES OF TRAVEL)

Introduction

As described within Part 2 of the main SA Report document, an interim stage of plan-making / SA involved appraising the following alternative approaches to travel:

- 1) Identified Road Schemes
- 2) Status Quo parking
- 3) Expand park and ride
- 4) Alternatives to the car

The interim appraisal findings are presented in full within this Appendix. The appraisal table should be read alongside the corresponding section of Part 2, where an explanation can be found of the degree to which the Council took on-board SA findings when determining the preferred approach as set out in the Preferred Options consultation document.

NB: The appraisal of these alternatives was undertaken at issues and options stage and the findings presented in an interim SA Report in 2007. These SA findings have been presented in a different format in this report to ensure consistency with subsequent appraisal methodologies.

Methodology

See discussion within Appendix II.

Appraisal findings

Table presenting an appraisal of the policy options:

- (3) Identified Road Schemes
 (4) Status Quo Parking
 (3) Extend park and ride
 (4) Alternatives to the car

Sustainability objective	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)					
		Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	
Housing	Road building (option 1) can help to facilitate future housing development by providing essential infrastructure for development corridors. Option 2 may have negative effects for future housing needs – taking up valuable space for parking in towns where residential development is needed. The effect is not thought to be significant. Option 3 and 4 would have a negligible impact. Whilst park & ride will require land for construction if parking can be reduced in towns as a result there should be more available space in town for residential development. New developments of a certain size should also produce Green Travel Plans that address access to the site and surrounding facilities by means other than the car – particularly by foot and cycle.	Û	Û	û	Û	
Flooding	The impact of road schemes and park and ride schemes would depend upon their location. However, the broad locations would suggest that there are limited impacts in terms of flood risk. In terms of land use, increased areas of hardstanding can affect surface water run-off, but these impacts are negligible and could be mitigated at the project level.	-	-	-	-	
Health	The existing parking policy is encouraging cars to travel into urban centres and adding to congestion problems. Therefore, option 2 could have a significant negative effect. Option 4 would secure improved walking and cycling facilities, which should encourage more people to use these active options as a means of getting about. Option 1 could also have a positive impact by improving access to jobs and services. Consultation responses revealed that this option could also reduce the effects of congestion.	Û		Û	Û	
Poverty	Road infrastructure improvements could help reduce social exclusion & help reduce poverty through opening up development opportunities, but can also act to sever communities at the local level. Option 4 could assist in reducing social exclusion factors by improving accessibility between homes and other services.	-	-	-	Û	
Education	No significant effects.	-	-	-	-	
Crime	No significant effects.	-	-	-	-	

Sustainability	Discussion of significant effects				
objective	(and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4
Vibrant Community	No significant effects.				
Accessibility	Option 1 could have significant positive effects for communities through more efficient public transport, however it could also encourage continued reliance on private transport. Current parking policies encourage car use in the town centre which is not improving accessibility to services for those without access to a private vehicle. This option could therefore have a significant negative effect. Option 3 could help to reduce numbers of cars in the town centre, having positive implications. It could also make more parking spaces available for the disabled. Option 4 would help to secure public transport improvements and enhance walking and cycling links, which constitutes a significant positive impact.				
Culture	Option 3 could help to support a greater number of visitors into Maidstone. However, the effects are not deemed to be significant.	-	-	Û	-
Land Use	It is difficult to assess the impacts of road schemes without scheme details. However, there would be a likely impact on greenspace and landscape character that would need to be mitigated. Land required for park and ride and new cycle paths and footpaths may make use of previously developed land.	?	?	?	?
Congestion	Option 1 would help to relieve congestion in areas of road building, which would help to improve air quality for residents. However, there could be additional noise and light pollution with new roads. Current parking policy is encouraging traffic into the town centre with negative effects in terms of congestion and pollution, this option would therefore be likely to have a significant negative impact . Option 3 could help to reduce congestion in towns and thus improve air quality, and reduce noise Option 4 could help to achieve a reduction in journeys by private vehicle. This could help to improve local air quality and reduce noise pollution particularly if peak time traffic can be affected. Both these alternatives would be likely to have a significant positive impact on the baseline.	በ			
Climate Change	Option 1 encourages car use and resulting CO2 emissions, which would have a significant negative impact. However this could be offset to an extent by improved efficiency of public transport (buses). Option 2 does not deter car use in town centres, and therefore would also have negative implications. Park and ride reduces traffic volumes into town centres, but still encourages car use as well as other means (bus) as there is a need to drive to the park and ride facility. Option 4 would have a significant positive effect by encouraging a reduction in the use of cars and other forms of motorised travel for local journeys.		Û	Û	1
Biodiversity	Option 1 – The Leeds Langley bypass is likely to encroach or destroy ancient woodland and associated ecosystems – and is likely to increase habitat fragmentation, this constitutes a significant negative impact . Option 3 could also have a negative impact dependent upon the location of park and ride schemes. Option 4 could lead to increased disturbance of habitats if natural routes are developed as cycle and pedestrian routes. However, there would also be the potential to enhance habitats.		-	?	?

Sustainability objective	Discussion of <u>significant effects</u> (and discussion of <u>relative merits</u> in more general terms)					
		Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 4	
Countryside and Heritage	Options 1-3 have the potential to reduce congestion and pollution in towns, which could help to improve the character of the townscape. However, the routing of roads would need to be sensitive to heritage assets and landscape character. Option 2 would not discourage car usage in towns, which would do little to tackle issues of historic buildings and structures suffering from air pollution and vibration from traffic.		Û	압 ?	?	
Waste	No significant impacts - although road schemes could increase the use of natural resources and the generation of wastes.	-	-	-	-	
Water Management	No significant impacts - although road schemes could increase local surface water run-off.	-	-	-	-	
Energy	New roads and park and ride facilities are likely to have additional energy demands through lighting requirements. The effects are not significant.	-	-	-	-	
Economy	New road infrastructure facilitates conditional growth along route corridors. Strategic road building should stimulate economic revival (the Leeds Langley bypass would stimulate Park Wood for example?) Tourism would also benefit from improved road systems. This constitutes a significant positive impact . Parking policy does not currently encourage additional sustainable tourism – there may be times when it is a deterrent to trips into Maidstone. Therefore, option 2 is not desirable. Park and ride options could serve to promote conditional growth as infrastructure for travel into centres would be improved, facilitating opportunities for additional residential & employment development. It is also beneficial for the tourism sector as it provides better access to the town centre for people travelling from further afield. This constitutes a significant positive impact . Option 4 would not be likely to have a significant impact on the economy, but could have positive implications in terms of improving access to jobs, retail and recreation by sustainable modes of transport.		Û		Û	

Summary

Options 1, 3 and 4 would all have some beneficial effects on the baseline position. However, mitigation measures would need to be secured to deliver new road schemes and park and ride facilities. On balance, option 4 performs the best across the range of sustainability objectives, although a combination of the options may be required.

A new parking policy should be developed that reduced parking spaces in town centres and new developments and improves alternative transport links.

It was difficult to assess these options without knowledge (at the time of assessment) of the likely locations for park and ride schemes and exact location for road building projects: in relation to impacts relating to flood risk, biodiversity, and loss of agricultural land.